

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the East

Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science

Texts and Studies

Edited by

H. Daiber

VOLUME LXXVI

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the East

The Syriac and Arabic translation and
commentary tradition

By

Uwe Vagelpohl



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication data

Vagelpohl, Uwe.

Aristotle's Rhetoric in the East : the Syriac and Arabic translation and commentary tradition /
by Uwe Vagelpohl.

p. cm. — (Islamic philosophy, theology and science, ISSN 0169-8729 ; v. 76)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-16681-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Aristotle. Rhetoric. 2. Aristotle. Rhetoric—Criticism, Textual. 3. Aristotle—Translations into Arabic—History and criticism. 4. Aristotle—Translations into Syriac—History and criticism. 5. Philosophy, Ancient—Translations into Arabic. 6. Philosophy, Ancient—Translations into Syriac. I. Title.

PA3893.R4V34 2008

808.5—dc22

2008011343

ISSN 0169-8729

ISBN 978 90 04 16681 3

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
Chapter One: “Greek into Arabic”	I
Problems of translation history	I
The history of Greek-Arabic translations	10
Translation history	13
Chapter Two: The Arabic version	39
Manuscript and dating	39
The Syriac translation tradition	51
Chapter Three: Comparing Greek and Arabic	62
Introduction	62
Some qualifications	65
Text comparison and analysis	66
Findings	116
Sources for structural mismatches	120
The use of connectors and particles	124
Morphology and terminology	137
Transcription of proper names	150
The terminology	165
Chapter Four: The reception of the Arabic translation	181
Introduction	181
The ninth century: first encounters	183
The tenth century: laying the foundation	185
The eleventh century: elaboration and extension	191
The twelfth century: the return to Aristotle	196
Beyond the twelfth century	200
The Latin afterlife	202
Conclusions	205

Glossary	216
Greek-Arabic	216
Arabic-Greek	267
Bibliography	328
Index	342

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this book is translation—not just the translation(s) of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* the title alludes to but more generally translation as a phenomenon of cultural exchange. Why the choice of medieval translations into Arabic, particularly of this text?

In a series of publications dedicated, among other things, to the history of Islamic philosophy and the transmission of Greek philosophy to an Arabic-speaking audience, examining the “Arabic translation and commentary tradition” needs little explanation. At the core of this transmission process was what has come to be called the “Greek-Arabic translation movement”, a concerted effort to translate the available Greek scientific, medical and philosophical literature into Arabic, carried out between the eighth and the tenth centuries. Initially funded and supported by the authorities, the translation activities soon gained enough momentum to sustain themselves for a period of more than two centuries. As a result, large parts of the Greek scientific and philosophical heritage was transmitted to Arabic-speaking audiences.

The introduction of Greek knowledge had an immeasurable impact on Islamic culture and contemporary societies. The Greek-Arabic translation movement was, both in terms of its scale and its influence, an unprecedented process of cultural transmission and transformation. Working across a substantial linguistic and cultural divide, the translators developed whole new terminologies to describe subjects and disciplines for which there was no equivalent in contemporary Islamic culture. Their work and the subsequent writings of scientists and philosophers were not just an isolated episode in the history of science or philosophy, least of all a mere interlude in the history of “Western” scientific and philosophical activities as it has sometimes been understood. All of these Arabic-speaking scholars contributed to the formation of Islamic culture and, through the medium of Arabic-Latin translations produced from the twelfth century onward, left their mark also on Western medieval science and philosophy.

Given its longevity and impact, the study of the Greek-Arabic trans-

lation movement involves a number of fields and approaches. Even after more than a century of sustained research, many questions remain unanswered. On the level of the individual text, the identification of the sources used by the translators, the dating of translations and the study of translation methods and subsequent revisions of many extant texts is still in its infancy. From the point of view of the history of ideas, we are still only at the beginning of identifying translators and patrons, understanding their backgrounds and motivations and reconstructing networks of scholars and translators who cooperated in identifying texts they wanted to have translated and, once the translations became available, in giving rise to new research agendas fueled by newly available material. At the same time, the political calculations and conflicts that inspired the widespread and persistent financial support for the translation efforts by members of the intellectual, economic and political elite are still poorly understood.

There is no doubt, then, that the study of the Greek-Arabic translation tradition helps us understand many aspects of medieval Islamic society and at the same time serves as a very instructive example for the role of translation as a medium of cultural transmission. But why the *Rhetoric*?

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and its Arabic translation are not the most obvious choices through which to examine the inner workings of the translation movement. While respected in theory, the *Rhetoric* had never been an important text for the rhetorical teaching tradition in antiquity. It was soon replaced by textbooks which were better suited to the practical needs of students of oratory. In contrast to the lack of interest of late antique scholars and commentators, however, Islamic scholars actively engaged with the text. Their interest in this previously somewhat marginal work found its expression in numerous rhetorical treatises and commentaries. Unlike other Aristotelian writings translated into Arabic, the *Rhetoric* came without a ready-made framework for understanding it (e.g. in the form of a set of commentaries). Confronted with the obscurities of a text that is intimately linked to aspects of Greek culture they knew little about, Islamic philosophers assembled their own, highly individual and creative interpretation of the *Rhetoric* and its role in the context of Aristotelian philosophy and beyond.¹

¹ In medieval Islam, the rhetorical tradition we will be discussing in this book did not refer to "oratory" or "public speaking" in general. It meant a specific form of philosophical theorizing based on Arabic translations of Greek rhetorical writings, particularly Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The term for "indigenous" forms of oratorical activities such as Arabic

The *Rhetoric* is therefore a good example of several levels of involvement with the Greek heritage. As a text, it posed substantial philological problems and, as we will see, taxed the translators' abilities to and beyond breaking point. As such, it helps us to understand how translators operated by showing how this particular individual applied the whole range of methods and tools at his disposal. As a set of philosophical ideas, the *Rhetoric* illustrates the creative processes of assimilating an unfamiliar subject couched in an even more unfamiliar language into Islamic philosophy through several generations of commentators and philosophers. Posing both philological and philosophical problems, the *Rhetoric* can, I am convinced, throw some light on the larger questions of the Greek-Arabic translation movement outlined above.

Fortunately, the ground is well prepared for a study of the Arabic *Rhetoric*. Research on the Arabic commentary tradition and also its afterlife in the Latin West has been very active for a number of years. To understand this work, its position in the translation movement and its influence on Islamic culture and beyond, our task is therefore to combine these and other strands of research with a thorough study of the Arabic text of the *Rhetoric* itself: we need to situate it in its context as a Greek-Arabic translation, as a philosophical text and as part of a wider historical phenomenon.

Mapping out this context will be at the center of the first two chapters. The first chapter discusses the history of the Greek-Arabic translation movements, its motivations and some of the problems and issues affecting past and current research. In the second, we will focus on the history of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and review the (relatively small) body of information we have about the Arabic translation. The annotations in the margins of the single extant manuscript will lead us to a discussion of the possible role of a Syriac intermediary and the evidence we have for the reception of the *Rhetoric* among Syriac-speaking scholars.

Having assembled the relevant contextual information from the available secondary sources, we then turn to the text of the translation itself. At the center of the third chapter is a detailed analysis of a text sample from Book Three of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and a comparison with the Greek source text. Additional investigations of textual features of a larger text

literary style and practical genres such as preaching were called *balāgh* whereas "Hellenizing" philosophical rhetoric was taught and studied under the label *ḥaṭābah*. The difference between these two disciplines and their respective terminologies are discussed by Halldén (2005) and Larcher (1998).

sample together with a comparison with other products of the Greek-Arabic translation movement provide us with additional information on the development of terminologies and translation methods during different stages of the translation movement.

The fourth chapter explores the afterlife of the Arabic *Rhetoric* in Arabic and, several centuries later, in Latin. It surveys the Arabic commentary tradition which developed around the *Rhetoric* and describe some of the traces these writings left in the subsequent Arabic-Latin translation tradition.

In the concluding chapter, we will use the information gathered in the preceding chapters to assess the position of the *Rhetoric* as part of the Arabic translation tradition, its methodological underpinnings and the question of the translation's dating. Also, turning back to the issues raised in the introduction, we will attempt to determine how the study of this text helps us better to understand the translation movement and the intellectual world of ninth century Baghdad.

This book would not have been possible without the support of numerous friends and colleagues. I am indebted most of all to James Montgomery of Cambridge University who supervised the Ph.D. thesis on which this monograph is based. His patience and persistence during what turned out to be trying times for all of us was crucial for my project. Equally crucial was the encouragement and help I received in revising the thesis and turning it into a book by my current supervisor, Ralph Hexter, first at the University of California at Berkeley and now at Hampshire College. I have also benefited from the generosity of many colleagues who gave me invaluable corrections and suggestions or offered their support at critical junctures. Without in any way diminishing the gratitude I feel towards all of them, I would like to single out Fritz Zimmermann, Maria Mavroudi and Dimitri Gutas for their extensive feedback on previous versions of this book and/or their continuing goodwill and encouragement.

Finally, I would not have been able to write this book without the unfailingly generous support of my father.

CHAPTER ONE

“GREEK INTO ARABIC”

PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION HISTORY

The study of the Greek-Arabic translation movement is a scholarly field at the crossroads of a number of related subjects. On the one hand, it belongs to the domain of history, it is part and parcel of the political and intellectual history of medieval Islam. On the other, it is the subject of philological research by scholars of Arabic, Syriac and Greek. Other fields with an interest in the translation movement are the history of philosophy and the history of science but also linguistics, particularly the discipline of translation studies. That the character and outcome of past research depended to a large degree on the specific background of the scholars who worked in the field of Graeco-Arabica should therefore not come as a surprise. The same background sometimes also prevented them from asking important questions. Below, we will survey some of the issues that arose as a result of such individual perspectives. Some of them are inevitable and cannot be resolved satisfactorily. For some, however, remedies are available.

The philological perspective

Especially during the first hundred years of Greek-Arabic studies (which started in earnest around the middle of the nineteenth century), the majority of the pioneering scholars involved in the field came from a philological background associated with the Classics and Divinity. Given that they received their training in such an environment, scholars were at least in part motivated by the desire to search Arabic translations and literature for traces of Greek texts, either in order to check and possibly improve readings of extant Greek texts or even uncover such texts that had survived only in Arabic.

Apart from this strong motivation to study the Arabic translations, their background bestowed on some scholars what I would like to call their “philological outlook”: a tendency to look at the translation movement as a philological phenomenon in isolation from its political and

intellectual context. Studying Greek and Islamic science and philosophy in the form of isolated texts and comparing both traditions in a vacuum led to conclusions such as that the latter had to be completely dependent on the former—down to the level of particular terms and phrases.

In addition, this isolating perspective implies static concepts of meaning and translation, among them the (implicit) hypothesis that ideas expressed in a specific linguistic and cultural context retain their meaning unchanged from the moment of their creation and throughout their transfer into different languages. According to this view, there is an immutable semantic content which survives unscathed the history of translation of texts from Greek into Syriac, later into Arabic, later again into Latin and ultimately into the western vernaculars.¹

This implicit stance left little room for the role of adaptation, modification and assimilation of ideas beyond their mere rendering in a new language. It was incompatible with the idea of movement, development and change both on the side of the idealized and essentialized content of texts and the culture into which they were introduced. Incidences of social, cultural or intellectual continuity which require an even-handed appreciation of both pre-existing local cultures and the transmitted material interacting with it cannot be evaluated on the basis of an essentialist concept of the translation movement exclusively relying on texts. This perspective also underestimated the possibility of a diffusion and mutual inspiration of cultures in the Near East, be they Christian and Islamic or Greek and Arabic. The efficient and final causes of cultural interaction had to be textual, monolithic and codified.

The second aspect of what I have termed the “philological outlook” is its tendency to project a particular division of the “intellectual universe” on the medieval Islamic societies that initiated and nurtured the translation movement. Perhaps inevitably, the concept of a divide between science, philosophy and religion that is often taken as a point of departure for the study of the Greek-Arabic translations is our own, that of the contemporary observer. The writings of the eighth-century Islamic philosopher and polymath Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb ibn Ishāq al-Kindī (d. ca. 870) illustrate very well why such modern distinctions between different intellectual spheres stand in the way of a full appreciation of

¹ In the words of Hans Robert Jauss (1982, p. 9), this crude idealism (which affected not just the field of Graeco-Arabica) sought “the focal point of knowledge in the origin or in the atemporal continuity of tradition, and not in the presence and uniqueness of a literary phenomenon. The recognition of the enduring within perpetual change released one from the labour of historical understanding.”

medieval Islamic scholars and their thought: on the basis of an al-Kindī-commentary on a mathematical treatise about *The Measurement of the Circle* by the great mathematician and engineer Archimedes (d. ca. 212 BCE), Roshdi Rashed demonstrates al-Kindī’s reliance on mathematical proofs as both a “paradigm to be respected and an ideal to be attained”.² For al-Kindī, the study of mathematics was a necessary prerequisite for the study of philosophy and science. Philosophical argumentation provided him the means to reach an understanding of and defend religious doctrines. Unlike later philosophers, who stressed the role of logic as the paramount instrument for gaining knowledge, al-Kindī held that mathematical proofs supplied the unifying methodological framework for all intellectual activity, be it “science”, “philosophy” or “theology”.³ The example of al-Kindī casts considerable doubt on the validity of familiar distinctions between “science”, “philosophy” and “religion” in the context of the early translation movement.⁴

Likewise, the relation between science as understood by al-Kindī on the one hand, i.e. the totality of human intellectual effort, and translation on the other has often (but not always) been regarded as one of precedence in time and content: translations spawned “science”. Again, Roshdi Rashed persuasively argues for a less schematic approach. On the basis of examples from mathematics and optics, he demonstrates that the need for specific translations was often caused by previous research. Concrete research agendas led to the identification and translation of Greek texts deemed useful to solve specific scientific problems. Thus, the relationship between research and translation can be better understood as dialectical with research promoting translation and translations changing or giving rise to entirely new research agendas.⁵

Reconstructing transmission, oral and written

One consequence of the “philological outlook” is the centrality accorded to the *textual* transmission of Greek thought. Modern scholars concentrating on written texts often tend to underestimate the impact of oral

² Rashed (1993, p. 31).

³ Cf. Endress (2007, p. 338, 343f).

⁴ The problem of compartmentalizing spheres of thought and expression that were regarded as a continuum by contemporary observers also affects other genres Arabic writings. See Montgomery (2006, p. 91f) with further references on the problematic distinction between “thought” and “literature”.

⁵ Cf. Rashed (1989, p. 208).

communication and reinforce descriptions of the “Islamic scientific enterprise” as a phenomenon that logically depended on the production of translations, predicating the development of “science” on the textual transmission of Greek knowledge. Fortunately, they also now often acknowledge the undocumented but far-ranging consequences of oral translation and transmission.⁶

The bias of the historical picture in favor of written texts is all but inevitable, given the scarcity of relevant primary and secondary sources: translation techniques, the identity of translators and information about their life and times have to be inferred on the basis of a limited number of translations and an even more limited number of bibliographical works. These in turn are either useless, such as the pronouncements of the scientist and philosopher Ḥalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafādī (d. 1363),⁷ to be discussed below, or tied to a specific context, such as Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq’s (d. 870) *Risālah*,⁸ a letter by the most accomplished of all Greek-Arabic translators to one of his patrons, the Persian courtier and general ‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā al-Munāḡḡim. It is one of the most valuable sources for the chronology of translations and authors and the only comprehensive source we have on the details of translation methods but applicable only to Ḥunayn and perhaps his associates. Common sense alone tells us that in all probability, Ḥunayn did not invent these methods but only refined and systematized them. But a comprehensive description of the developing methodology of the translators remains a desideratum.⁹ Frequently, judgments about the identity of translators of a given text, their methodology, style and vocabulary are tentative at most. The common practice of revisions complicates matters even further by potentially burying translators’ idiosyncrasies in style and vocabulary under layers of later corrections, leaving the modern scholar with a jumble of sometimes contradictory findings.¹⁰

⁶ The role and importance of oral channels of transmission have been studied, among others, by Paul Kunitzsch (1975, p. 272 and 1976, p. 116ff) and Kees Versteegh (1979, p. 258 and 1980, p. 10f, 13f). The results of his analysis of the *Tafsīr* (Qurʾān commentary) by Muqātil ibn Sulaymān (d. 767) caused him to qualify his previous claims about Greek sources for the terminology of early Kufan grammarians (cf. Versteegh, 1990, p. 238); still, his overall concept of cultural contacts between Arab conquerors and the Hellenized cultures of Syria and Iraq remains convincing.

⁷ Cf. Mattock (1989, p. 73f).

⁸ Cf. Badawī (1968, p. 18f).

⁹ Some important work in this direction has already been done. See e.g. Brock (1983) on the development of the Syriac translation techniques that later influenced Arabic translators and Brock (1991) on the impact of this tradition on Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq.

¹⁰ Cf. Endress (1989, p. 106ff).

In addition, by its very nature, oral transmission is extremely difficult to document.¹¹ Short of filtering the entire corpus of classical Arabic literature for technical terms and ideas that potentially resulted from oral diffusion before or during the translation movement, there is no way to estimate the extent and consequences of oral transmission. Even if such a body of evidence were to be compiled, it would be even harder conclusively to disprove the the influence of (known or unknown) written sources.

Still, the evidence of transmission and cultural exchange that has been brought to light so far seems underdetermined by the corpus of translations, both lost and extant: we cannot explain every Graecism and every instance of terms and ideas apparently inspired by a Greek source, whether directly or indirectly.¹² To understand such phenomena, it is helpful to postulate a certain amount of oral communication across linguistic boundaries and “para-translational” phenomena which leave less conspicuous traces in a literary tradition than the outright translation of texts. Assuming such transmission processes has the added advantage of fostering an understanding of the translation movement that emphasizes the *processual* character of cultural exchange: instead of contrasting diachronic “before”- and “after”-snapshots of Islamic culture to demonstrate the impact of Greek-Arabic translations, commentators such as Endress describe the translation phenomenon and the unique cultural background it emerged from in a way that allows for numerous parallel, competing and converging channels of transmission and that offers a better and pointedly non-essentialist starting point for the explanation of specific linguistic and cultural phenomena.¹³

¹¹ Cf. Gutas (1994, p. 4947).

¹² As Gutas (1994, p. 4946) convincingly argues, the contents of such oral transmission could hardly have been entire systems of thought or complex doctrines.

¹³ Oral diffusion of terms, ideas and other disparate pieces of information in the multicultural and multilingual environment of early ‘Abbāsīd Baghdad does not necessarily deny the possibility and importance of independent intellectual developments Gutas (1994, p. 4948) stresses, let alone the independence and creativity of Islamic civilization. In view of the challenge of documenting oral transmission, it cannot be more than one explanation among many for particular intellectual and literary phenomena. This “minimalist” position may be read as negating its explanatory value, but I am convinced that it has an important role to play as an antidote to excessive reliance on written transmission as the ultimate vector of cultural exchange.

Translation “quality” and “equivalence”

The study of the translation movement, its exponents and its products is intimately linked with a vexing linguistic issue, that of the “equivalence” or, as it has sometimes been framed, the “quality” of translations. Naturally, translation meant different things to different people, not just to a Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq as opposed to modern scholars but also to modern scholars coming from different fields. We will discuss the issues that arise from differing “modern” understandings of translation below; suffice it to say that some commentators approached the products of the ninth- and tenth-century Greek-Arabic translation movement from a decidedly twentieth-century point of view and tended to regard some of them *qua* translations as something of a failure.

However, in spite of the obvious problems for a correct understanding of the translated texts this chapter will uncover—in a nutshell, secondary Syriac translations served Arabic translators as a basis for the understanding of a scientific and literary tradition as far removed from ninth- and tenth-century Baghdad as ancient Greece—scholars still frequently commend the products of the Greek-Arabic translation movement for their quality and philosophical subtlety.¹⁴

In part, the perhaps surprising ability of the translators to overcome linguistic and cultural obstacles stemmed from their own experience with and keen awareness of the problems involved in the transfer of ideas between structurally unrelated languages such as Arabic and Greek.¹⁵ Some apparently also realized that there not only existed a linguistic gap between classical Greek on the one hand and Syriac and Arabic on the other—all of which interfered with each other in the process of translation—but that a second gap had opened between the Greek of the philosophical and scientific texts they worked with and the Greek language they had learned as part of their schooling or training as translators. As important as it is for the study of Greek-Arabic translations, this phenomenon has not yet received the attention it deserves.¹⁶

The translators shared their awareness of the problems of translation with their readers, e.g. Islamic philosophers such as Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (d. 950) who was in personal contact with translators. Their debates about

¹⁴ E.g. Walzer (1945–1946, p. 167).

¹⁵ Cf. Walzer (1970, p. 39).

¹⁶ Daiber (1980, p. 39–61) documents the various levels of influence exerted by post-classical usage on the Arabic translation of the *Placita philosophorum* falsely ascribed to Plutarchus of Chaeroneia (d. ca. 127); cf. below, p. 139.

translational problems left traces in philosophical works, e.g. in a fascinating passage in al-Fārābī’s *Kitāb al-ḥurūf* and his commentary on Aristotle’s *De interpretatione* in which he gives a lengthy description of the structural and semantic differences between several languages, notably Greek and Arabic.¹⁷ The two problems al-Fārābī discusses in particular are the lack of congruence between the verbal systems of both languages, i.e. the difficulty to express the elaborate system of Greek verbal tempora in Arabic and the lack of an Arabic equivalent for the Greek copula discussed below.¹⁸

That the quality of many translations was not always up to the expectations of readers is illustrated by a long digression on translation in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* (*Book of Animals*) by the celebrated littérateur ‘Amr ibn Baḥr al-Ġāḥiẓ (d. 868/869).¹⁹ He lists a number of minimal qualifications for a translator: he has to be intellectually on a par with the author he is translating; he should be well versed in both source and target language and aware of their different structures, methods of argumentation etc. and the subtle ways those languages influence each other in the process of translation; the translator has to be familiar with the characteristics of different textual genres and the specific problems they pose for him (an amazing insight into a problem still discussed in contemporary translation theory); finally, he must be experienced in textual criticism and have a grasp of the problems manuscripts and their potential corruption can cause. Al-Ġāḥiẓ mentions several translators by name: Ibn al-Biṭriq (fl. in the first half of the ninth century), Theodore Abū Qurrā (d. ca. 820), ‘Abd al-Masīḥ ibn Nā‘imah al-Ḥimṣī (d. around 840), Ibn Fīhr and Ibn Wahīlī. The best known and probably most accomplished translator of his time, Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, does not appear—his translations might either not have been well-known by the time of al-Ġāḥiẓ or the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* was written before Ḥunayn produced his translations. The motivation for his detailed remarks might be found in contemporary discussions about the necessity of translating the Qur’ān for the benefit of

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. Mahdi (1969, p. 110–128) and, for the latter, Zimmermann (1981). Since al-Fārābī himself was unable to read Greek, his knowledge of specific linguistic phenomena must have been derived from secondary sources. Walzer (1970, p. 37) assumes that they go back to Ḥunayn’s discussion of the subject in a lost treatise known to the tenth-century translator and philosopher Abū Biṣr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnā’ī (d. ca. 940) and his associates who transmitted it to their contemporary al-Fārābī.

¹⁸ Walzer (1970, p. 37).

¹⁹ Hārūn (1965, vol. 1, p. 75–79). In spite of his opposition to many of the claims made by contemporary philosophers, al-Ġāḥiẓ happily quoted the translations of Aristotle’s zoological works in this compilation, cf. Endress (2007, p. 346 and n. 78).

the non-Arabic speaking population of the Muslim state (especially into Greek and Persian). Al-Gāhiz was apparently vehemently opposed to any such undertaking.²⁰

The one medieval Islamic source that is most often quoted in discussions of translation “quality” and “equivalence” is a classification of translations into word-by-word and sentence-based proposed by the Arab polymath al-Ṣafadī.²¹ He claims that before the time of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq (i.e. before ca. 850), translators operated on a word-by-word-basis, replacing each Greek word with its Arabic equivalent. Ḥunayn and his successors read whole sentences and rendered their semantic content, thereby preserving the meaning of the texts.²² An examination of the Arabic translation of the *Metaphysics*, produced by one of the most productive pre-Ḥunayn translators, Uṣṭāt (otherwise unknown, fl. probably during the first half of the ninth century), flatly contradicts al-Ṣafadī’s claims.²³ The degree of modulation in evidence in earlier translations is on the whole even *higher* than in later translations. Thanks to the activities of Ḥunayn and his associates, a complete inventory of technical terms in different disciplines evolved and became standard; additionally, the language of their translations conformed to contemporary literary tastes—which in turn facilitated the acceptance of both terminology and texts by their scholarly audience.²⁴ In a way, it would be more appropriate to describe the translation movement as progressing towards a higher degree of translational restriction—turning al-Ṣafadī’s scheme upside down.²⁵ The rig-

²⁰ Badawī (1968, p. 24f). On the problems associated with translating the Qur’ān and the history of Qur’ān translations, cf. Hartmut Bobzin’s article “Translations of the Qur’ān” in *EQ*, vol. 5, p. 340–358.

²¹ Mattock (1989, p. 74) observes: “The frequent citing of this passage illustrates quite a common phenomenon: if a quotation is useful, it will become authoritative by virtue of sheer frequency of repetition.” It has become something of a *topos* in studies of the Greek-Arabic translation movement; whatever an author may think about its validity, s/he has to discuss it.

²² E.g. Wälzer (1962d, p. 116, 118f).

²³ This point has been convincingly argued by Endress (1973, p. 154 and 1989, p. 110f), Mattock (1989, p. 74) and Gutas (1998, p. 142).

²⁴ Endress (1989, p. 110f).

²⁵ The Syriac translation movement went through a similar development; see Brock (1983). However, the Syriac methodology was explicitly developed in reaction to the need for higher precision in the rendering of religious source texts after the major christological conflicts of late antiquity. Any comparison between these two translation phenomena might therefore be of limited value. The parallel development towards translations that attempted to mirror the source text in ever greater detail in both Greek-Syriac and Greek-Arabic translations is also noted by Hugonnard-Roche (1991b, p. 201) and Gutas (1998, p. 142).

orous stylistic standards of Ḥunayn’s and later translations left their mark on scholarly writings which adopted a number of stylistic characteristics introduced during the translation movement.²⁶

Al-Ṣafadī’s statement is absurd not only because it contradicts the evidence of extant translations. It also contradicts linguistic common sense: due to the substantial structural differences between Greek and Arabic, divergences between source and target text were unavoidable and automatically render any description of early translations as “word by word-renderings” meaningless.²⁷ As far back as the late sixth century, translators themselves were aware of the need to balance their desire to reproduce the source text as precisely as possible and the necessity to stay within the semantic and syntactical boundaries of the target language.²⁸

The discussion of al-Ṣafadī’s remarks and scholarly positions on the “quality” of translations exemplifies a wider problem: a misleading concept of translation. As noted above, “translation” is often understood as the transfer of an unchanging semantic content from one language into another, an oversimplification that frequently prevents satisfactory explanations for the translational problems encountered in the Greek-Arabic translation movement. At the same time, however, “language” is often regarded with some suspicion: the obvious translation problems encountered in the products of the Greek-Arabic translation movement serve as evidence that “language” (specifically Syriac and Arabic) is an inflexible semantic system *unsuited* to convey terms and ideas from one linguistic and cultural system to another. Frequently cited examples include the mismatch between terms across languages, cultural and religious notions that influence the reading of texts or sometimes even vague claims about the incompatibility of the Arabic language with certain types of philosophical reasoning.

²⁶ Endress (1989, p. 121). In his comparison of translations of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* α by Uṣṭāṭ and Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn, Mattock (1989, p. 73) credits the latter with greater consistency in style and terminology while the former suffers from a primitive technical vocabulary, eccentricities of syntax and a “general unevenness of quality”.

²⁷ Cf. Endress (1989, p. 110).

²⁸ At the end of a Syriac translation dated to the end of the sixth century, the translator writes: “This [treatise] was translated and interpreted from Greek into Syriac word for word without alteration in so far as possible, so as to indicate, not just the sense, but, by its very words, the words of the Greek; and for the most part not one letter has been added or subtracted, *provided the requirements of the language have not hindered this*” (Brock 1983, p. 9f, my emphasis).

THE HISTORY OF GREEK-ARABIC TRANSLATIONS

Translating Aristotle's *Rhetoric* into Arabic was part of a wider process of cultural exchange that led to the adaptation and transformation of large parts of Greek learning to fit the unique religious, intellectual, political and social circumstances of Islamic culture. It is almost impossible to understand the significance of the Arabic translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* outside this historical and intellectual context. Our first task will be to trace the history, motivations and consequences of the so-called "translation movement", a sustained translation effort which spanned ca. two centuries and resulted in the translation from Greek into Syriac and Arabic of the bulk of the Greek philosophical and scientific literature that had become accessible to Arabic-speaking scholars following the conquest of large areas of the Middle East and North Africa by Muslim armies in the seventh and eighth centuries.

The following survey of translations, translators and issues of translation history is far from complete.²⁹ Its (more modest) aim is twofold: firstly, to present some background information about the history of Greek-Arabic translations to help us contextualize the Arabic *Rhetoric* and, secondly, to describe how various scholars have attempted to explain the occurrence of the translation movement in the first place and how these explanations included an ever widening range of historical factors.

From the very beginning of the study of the Greek-Arabic translation tradition, scholars were fascinated by the role Muslims played in preserving and passing on parts of the Greek philosophical and scientific heritage to the Latin West: the "continuity" of Western thought was regarded as crucial for the study of the translations and the Arabic scientific and philosophical writings they inspired. At least in part, the translations and the Islamic philosophical traditions based on them derived their value from being part of a larger tradition, from preserving rather than extending and developing Greek philosophical thought and deserved attention "for this reason alone".³⁰ The emphasis on the transmission rather than as-

²⁹ Other, much more accomplished scholars have already given as detailed accounts of the Greek-Arabic translation history as is possible at this stage. Among the more comprehensive ones are Endress (1987) and Gutas (1998). Goulet (1989–), supplemented by Goulet (2003), is an indispensable guide to the Syriac and Arabic translation tradition of Aristotelian works. The most comprehensive and up-to-date bibliographical resource on Islamic philosophy including translations and related texts is Daiber (1999).

³⁰ E.g. Richard Walzer (1962b, p. 2, 7f), one of the founding fathers of Greek-Arabic studies, who was one of the most important exponents of this perspective.

similation and development of Greek science in the Islamic tradition was, however, tempered by two factors: firstly, an appreciation of the role of a scholar’s historical circumstances, personal priorities and philosophical background. Modern commentators are fully aware that their historical judgments are necessarily relative, given that any understanding of the past can only proceed from their individual historical situation and experience.³¹ Secondly, an awareness of the achievements of Arabic translators and Muslim philosophers who, with the help of translated texts, created whole new disciplines—e.g. Islamic philosophy—together with the language to discuss philosophical and scientific ideas.³²

The impact of the Greek-Arabic translations and the subsequent re-translations of Arabic texts into Latin on the respective receiving cultures was immense. In addition to reviving Greek learning, the translations were instrumental in the very formation of Islamic culture.³³ Their impact was so tremendous that they have been likened to the European Renaissance.³⁴ In spite of the obvious differences between these two processes of cultural transformation—for one, on the Muslim side, it would be inappropriate to talk of a “recovery” of a cultural heritage that had been lost—the term conveys a sense of the rapid influx of new ideas and the upsurge in philosophical and scientific activities it brought about.³⁵ Its reach was not limited to those disciplines that were newly established on the basis of translated texts, e.g. philosophy and the natural sciences. In

³¹ Walzer (1970, p. 8f).

³² Among others, Walzer (1962a, p. 11) described it as a “‘productive assimilation’ of Greek thought by open-minded and far-sighted representatives of a very different tradition and thus a serious attempt to make this foreign element an integral part of the Islamic tradition.”

There is no doubt that the Arabic translation tradition can be a very useful tool for the study of Greek literature. In the case of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, the Arabic translation was helpful in clarifying issues of textual transmission and even confirm some hypothetical readings of the Greek original; cf. Bottin (1975, 1977).

³³ Rosenthal (1965, p. 28) writes: “Ein neues Lebensgefühl, eine geistige Ausrichtung, wie sie zuvor dem Islam fast unbekannt gewesen und nur rudimentär in ihm angelegt war, wurde geboren und damit das, was wir islamische Kultur nennen, erst eigentlich geschaffen.”

³⁴ Cf. Rosenthal (1965, p. 28, 30). Rosenthal’s student Joel Kraemer (1992, p. VII) defines the term “renaissance” in an Islamic context as “a classical revival and cultural flowering within the soil of Islamic civilization” and explains that “[t]he principal expression of this renaissance was a philosophical humanism that embraced the cultural and philosophical heritage of antiquity as a cultural and educational ideal.”

³⁵ Cf. Kraemer (1992, p. 1), who adds that each cultural flowering in history which has been labelled a “renaissance” was based on a different set of ideas and texts: “Each epoch selects and fashions its own antiquity” (p. 4).

spite of sometimes open hostility from some quarters, the knowledge derived from Greek texts permeated almost every field of Islamic thought.³⁶

Part of the creative achievement of the translators was to devise the very language with which to express the ideas and theories they were translating into Arabic.³⁷ As the results amply demonstrate, the Arabic language proved to be an ideal medium for the development e.g. of a philosophical terminology which in some cases became the model for technical terms in Western languages through the medium of Latin translations. Often, their precision even surpassed that of the original Greek texts.³⁸

In addition to creating a powerful technical language suitable for scientific and philosophical research and preserving Greek texts (even today, Arabic translations represent an important source of manuscript evidence for Greek writings), the Greek-Arabic translation movement sent a much more fundamental message that transcends the narrow confines of particular cultures and historical periods:

its significance lies in that it demonstrated for the first time in history that scientific and philosophical thought are international, not bound to a specific language or culture.³⁹

Once it had been passed on to Muslim scholars, Greek scientific and philosophical literature was not just passively transmitted to western, Latin-speaking scholars from the eleventh-century onward. Even before the systematic efforts in the West to find and translate Greek original texts that were a hallmark of the Renaissance, Latin translators had introduced their audience to those versions of Greek texts that had passed

³⁶ “La pénétration de la pensée grecque fut immense dans tous les domaines de la pensée arabe, même dans ceux où la résistance fut la plus vive: philologie, jurisprudence, et théologie. Le miracle grec a été reconnu par tous” (Badawī, 1968, p. 13).

³⁷ Even before the translation movement got under way, scholars had begun to create or systematize Arabic terminologies in other subjects. To cite but a few examples, Zafar Ansari (1972, p. 299f) has demonstrated the existence of a complex and precise legal terminology around the middle of the second century AH. Some fascinating examples for subtle terminological distinctions in the *Muwattaʿa*, a comprehensive handbook of legal rulings by the Medinese jurist and founder of the eponymous *madhab* (legal tradition or “school of law”), Mālik ibn Anas (d. 795), can be found in Dutton (2002, p. 40). For *kalām*, i.e. theology or, more specifically, the religious science that devises discursive arguments to defend religious doctrines, Richard Frank (1994) has shed light on the early development of a highly technical and systematic set of terms by analyzing the evolution of the phrase *lam yazal* (“was/has been from eternity”) in Muslim theological discourse. See also Louis Gardet’s article “Ilm al-kalām” in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, second edition (Gibb 1954–2005, henceforth *EI*²), vol. 3, p. 1141–1150.

³⁸ Cf. the remarks by Walzer (1968, p. 102–106).

³⁹ Gutas (1998, p. 192).

through the filter of Arabic translation and Islamic reception, together with parts of the commentary tradition built on those Arabic versions. These translations helped define the textual and theoretical corpus we know as the “Greek heritage”. This form of cultural influence manifested itself not only through the recovery of works lost in the West. Of equal importance was the transmission of several apocryphal texts that colored the entire reception of Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy throughout the Middle Ages.⁴⁰

Numerous studies of the translation movement, its history and its products have made abundantly clear that the Greek–Arabic translations are more than a mere episode in the history of philosophy and the sciences. Also, they are not the exclusive domain of philologists and students of literature. The impact the translations had on all branches of learning in the Islamic world, their political motivations and implications across two centuries (and beyond) and their sheer pervasiveness under the first ‘Abbasid caliphs in the late eighth and early ninth century document their relevance for the historian as much as the literary scholar and the linguist.

TRANSLATION HISTORY

Thanks to one and a half centuries of historical and philological research, the historical outlines of the “translation movement”, its development and its protagonists are fairly well known. Details, however, are harder to discern; our information about the output of specific translators is limited and a number of extant translations, including the Arabic *Rhetoric*, have so far resisted attempts to identify their author and historical context.

One important impediment remains the lack of reliable bibliographical and biographical sources. The *Risālah* (*Epistle*) of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq (d. 870) is one of the most valuable sources for the chronology of translations and authors. It is extant in two diverging recensions and was—as Ḥunayn himself admits—written from memory.⁴¹ Later bibliographical authorities such as the *Fibrīst* (*Catalogue*) of the Baghdad bookseller Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn al-Nadīm (fl. 987)⁴² and biographical collections such as the *Ta’rīḥ al-ḥukamā’* (*History of philosophers*) by the histo-

⁴⁰ Cf. Badawī (1968, p. 8f, 12).

⁴¹ Bergsträsser (1925, p. 1). The *Risālah* was edited and translated into German on the basis of a single manuscript by Bergsträsser (1925) with additions and corrections from a second manuscript in Bergsträsser (1932). See also Meyerhof (1926) and Strohmaier (1991).

⁴² Edited by Flügel (1871–1872) and translated into English by Dodge (1970).

rian ‘Alī ibn Yūsuf al-Qiftī (d. 1248)⁴³ and the ‘*Uyūn al-‘anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-‘aṭibbā’*’ (*The Sources of Reports on the Classes of Physicians*) by the historian Aḥmad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah (d. 1270)⁴⁴ did not always quote their sources correctly. Further complicating the situation are translations credited to the wrong author by copyists who wanted to improve their sales. In many cases, translated texts also show traces of several *layers* of modifications such as collation(s) and subsequent revision(s). We are often hardly able to determine the share different translators, collators, scholars and copyists had in shaping some of the extant translations.⁴⁵

The philological analysis of numerous translations at least allows us to assign specific texts to one of the several groups of translators who worked in close proximity during one or another stage of the translation movement. Thus, in tracing the sequence of events of the Greek-Arabic translation movement, it makes more sense to concentrate on what one commentator has called “complexes” of translators or of texts linked by a common subject matter instead of applying a purely chronological approach. Since each of these complexes operated with its own set of stylistic and terminological conventions, they are much easier to distinguish than individual translators.⁴⁶ The following historical sketch of the translation movement will concentrate on such “complexes” or groups of translators.

Richard Walzer, whose classification we will follow, distinguished four such groups during the course of the translation movement. The first operated until the accession of the ‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Ma‘mūn (r. 813–833). Information about its members is scarce; we know little more than their names. The second group spanned the reigns of al-Ma‘mūn and his successor al-Mu‘taṣim (r. 833–842). Among others, they produced the translations commissioned by the philosopher al-Kindī. The third such group, Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and his associates in Baghdad, was the mainstay of the translation movement from the reign of al-Mu‘taṣim well into the first half of the tenth century. Thereafter, a fourth group of translators centered around a succession of Christian Aristotelian philosophers in Baghdad continued to produce new translations in the tenth and eleventh centuries. For their source texts, they relied almost exclusively on Syriac versions of Greek works originating from the circle of Ḥunayn.⁴⁷

⁴³ Edited by Lippert (1903).

⁴⁴ Edited by Müller (1884) and Riḍā (1965).

⁴⁵ Endress (1989, p. 106ff).

⁴⁶ Cf. Gutas (1998, p. 141f, 149f).

⁴⁷ Walzer (1970, p. 32, 35). We will discuss the role of translations from Greek into Syriac below.

The members of these groups shared three characteristics. Firstly, their geographical focus: most, if not all translators worked in Baghdad, the political and intellectual center of the ‘Abbāsīd state, except those few who were already active before the foundation of the city in the year 762. Secondly, their religious affiliation: a majority of the dozens of translators we know of were Christians. Finally, their linguistic and educational background: for all we know, the Christian translators were largely a product of the church-based Christian educational system that continued to function under Muslim rule. The native language of the various Christian communities from which most of the translator hailed was Syriac.

Before we turn to the groups of translators listed above, we will first delineate the character and role of the Syriac translation tradition for the subsequent translations of Greek literature into Arabic. To get a better understanding of the environment in which the Greek-Arabic translation movement arose and flourished, we will then discuss the beginnings of these translation efforts and in particular the theories that have been suggested to explain why translation became such a prominent phenomenon shortly after the rise of the ‘Abbāsīd caliphal dynasty in the middle of the eighth century.

The Syriac translation precedent

In pre-Islamic Palestine, Syria and Iraq, Greek learning was mainly transmitted through the various Christian churches of the area. Many of the Christian scholars trained in the convents and churches that were part of the local educational system(s) were familiar enough with Greek to read Greek literature in the original but their native language was Syriac, a dialect of Aramaic that had become the dominant language of scholars and merchants in the “Fertile Crescent” in the wake of the spread of Christianity. The doctrinal conflicts between local churches and the Byzantine authorities which led to the establishment of several independent denominations with parallel ecclesiastical hierarchies and educational systems deepened the rift between local communities and the secular and religious authorities in Constantinople.⁴⁸ With few exceptions, Syriac became the language of instruction in local schools and convents where a growing number of monolingual speakers of Syriac received their training. To acquaint them with the body of theological and also secular texts

⁴⁸ Syriac also served as the language of liturgy in these new church organizations; cf. Brock (1977, p. 422 and 1999, p. 157ff).

that made up the curriculum in these schools, Syriac translations were needed. Starting with the New Testament, a vast amount of mostly theological literature was translated into Syriac from the third century onward. Secular translations are attested as early as the fourth century and side by side with the bulk of patristic writings, a steady (if much less prominent) stream of secular texts was rendered into Syriac.⁴⁹

The Syriac translation precedent provided both a body of Syriac translations and the know-how and translational expertise that the Arabic translators of the eighth to tenth centuries could fall back on. They operated in a multilingual environment in which translation was a routine method of transmitting information, both orally and in writing. Also, the Arabic translators worked with a textual corpus which had been established long before they started translating it into Arabic: it represented the syllabus of Greek learning as taught and transmitted in Syriac long before the Islamic conquest of the area in the seventh century.

At the time of the Islamic conquest, the centers of Greek scholarship in the eastern part of the Roman Empire and western Persia were Edessa, Nisibis, Seleucia (near Ctesiphon) and Gundīšāpūr (all of them dominated by Nestorian denomination) and Antioch and Amida (predominated by the rival Jacobite denomination). Secular sciences like philosophy, rhetoric, grammar, mathematics, astronomy, music and medicine were taught alongside religious subjects.

Philosophical studies were dominated by Aristotle, especially logic.⁵⁰ The body of Greek-Syriac philosophical translations constituted a substantial part of the “Greek philosophy” Muslim readers were familiar with; it consisted largely of the canon assembled by the philosopher Porphyry (d. 305) and other Neoplatonic commentators of his age and taught in the larger cities of the Byzantine East, including Alexandria, Gaza and Beirut. It included most of the works of Plato and Aristotle and a number of later commentaries and summaries.⁵¹ Among other benefits, Syriac intermediaries of Arabic translations had an important role to play in the practical day-to-day operations of translators: they could either be substi-

⁴⁹ Brock (1977, p. 422). Among the secular texts translated and commented on by Syriac scholars, Aristotle’s *Organon* played a particularly prominent role; cf. Hugonnard-Roche (2007), esp. p. 282–288.

⁵⁰ Badawī (1968, p. 15f) and also Daiber (2001, p. 336–343) with a sketch of the reception of Aristotelian logic in Syriac.

⁵¹ Cf. Walzer (1970, p. 13). Endress (1990, p. 244) emphasizes the exceptional contribution of the translators associated with the Kindī-circle (see below) in establishing the (Neoplatonically tinged) “Aristoteles Arabus” of Islamic philosophy.

tuted for a missing Greek source or used to cross-check and collate Greek and other Syriac manuscripts of the same text.⁵²

The relevance and range of secular Greek texts translated into Syriac and their contribution to and importance for the Greek-Arabic translation movement are still debated.⁵³ When assessing the role of Syriac translations for the Arabic translation tradition, we should keep in mind that the number of Syriac translations of scientific and philosophical texts known to us only tell us part of the story: many Syriac scholars and translators routinely consulted Greek sources which were not translated but read in Greek and used in writing commentaries on other texts.⁵⁴ Reducing the influence of Syriac translators to the (relatively small) number of attested translations tends to obscure the importance and consequences of this indirect transmission.

In addition, the Syriac scholarly tradition was still alive by the time the first Greek-Arabic translations were produced in the second half of the eighth century, particularly in Edessa, one of the most prominent centers of Greek scholarship.⁵⁵ At the very least, the activities of Syriac scholars at this point in time suggest that the Syriac scholarly infrastructure—monasteries with their schools and libraries—was still to some extent functional and could have given the first generations of Greek-Arabic translators access to scientific and philosophical scholarship and to Greek texts and Syriac translations.⁵⁶

⁵² Walzer (1945–1946, p. 168, 171).

⁵³ For a pessimistic view, see Gutas (1998, p. 138). Henri Hugonnard-Roche (e.g. 1987, p. 3 and 1990, p. 133f), who concentrates on the tradition of logical texts and translations, tends to see its role in a more positive light. The tradition of rhetorical learning in Syriac and possible influences of the Syriac version of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* has been studied by John Watt (1993a, 1995b, 1998).

⁵⁴ Hugonnard-Roche (2007, p. 283f) cites the example of George, Bishop of the Arabs (d. 724). His commentaries on Aristotelian works clearly demonstrate that he was familiar with commentaries produced in the school of the Neoplatonic philosopher Ammonius of Alexandria which, to our knowledge, were never translated into Syriac.

⁵⁵ Drijvers (1995) gives a concise overview of our knowledge about the history of the “School of Edessa” and its impact.

⁵⁶ Cf. Hugonnard-Roche (2007, p. 290f) and, on the continued existence of the Syriac scholarly tradition up to and beyond the accession of the ‘Abbāsīd dynasty in 750, Conrad (1999). Brock (2007, p. 299ff, 305f) points out that the ongoing activities of Syriac monkscholars in numerous monasteries attest to the existence of well-stocked libraries long after the Muslim conquest. He cites interesting manuscript evidence, e.g. for continuing scholarly work at the monastery of Qartmin as late as the ninth century.

The beginnings of the translation movement

The task of reconstructing the earliest history of translation into Arabic is closely linked with that of determining the intellectual and political factors that generated the need for translation and sustained the practice for more than two centuries. A number of basic historical facts are well established: translation (mostly oral) and the transmission of information between the various languages of the new Islamic state must have been a regular occurrence ever since the conquests of the seventh century brought large areas inhabited by non-Arabic speakers under Muslim control. Of the languages spoken by the new subjects in the formerly Byzantine and Persian territories, three were of particular importance: Greek (in Egypt and the urban centers of Syria and Mesopotamia), Aramaic (in Syria and Mesopotamia) and Persian (in Persia). The “Arabization” of the areas under Muslim control that had been heavily impacted by late antique Hellenism was a long, drawn-out process and the number of Persian and Greek administrative terms that entered into the Arabic language attests to the importance of non-Arabic speaking administrators and the extent of cultural exchanges in the early period of Islamic expansion.⁵⁷ However, evidence for the systematic collection and translation especially of Greek scientific and philosophical literature only emerges in the second half of the eighth century. The ‘Abbāsīd caliphs of the first half of the ninth century, in particular the celebrated al-Ma’mūn and his successor al-Mu’tasīm, are credited with instituting state sponsorship of translation and related scientific activities.

Less well established than these historical facts are the motivations of the various people involved, the translators, scientists, philosophers and, most of all, the rulers who took such an active interest in promoting translation. In this section, while tracing the development of the early

⁵⁷ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 416). Lutz Richter-Bernburg (1989, p. 46) emphasizes the reciprocal influence of Hellenism and local cultures. The cultural environment of early theologians and translators bore traces of indirect and direct Greek influences, it was an amalgamation growing out of a variety of cultural and intellectual roots. In the context of social and political thought, Louise Marlow (1997, p. 44f) stresses the wide diffusion of “Hellenism” in local cultures in Syria and Egypt and states that the influence of “Hellenism” was not restricted to urban environments but adapted to local rural traditions as well. She concludes that “[t]he assimilation of Hellenism into the culture of the eastern Mediterranean in the course of the sixth and seventh centuries foreshadowed the permeation of Islamic thought by Classical Greek and Neoplatonic social ideas”. Michael Morony (1984, p. 7ff) presents several theoretical models for cultural exchange and transmission to back up and explain evidence for cultural diffusion in Iraq after the Islamic conquest.

Greek-Arabic translations as reconstructed by various modern scholars, we will survey in some detail their answers to this key question: how and why did systematic Greek-Arabic translations arise? As we will see, they built on and extended each others' increasingly complex theories about the origins of the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

That translators received support and encouragement from the political elite of the late eighth and early ninth century, notably from the caliphs al-Ma'mūn and al-Mu'taṣim, is abundantly attested in Arabic sources. In the 1950s, Richard Walzer maintained that apart from their alleged sympathies for the theological doctrines of the *mu'tazilah*,⁵⁸ the reasons for their remarkable and long-lived interest in Greek science and philosophy were unclear.⁵⁹

To add to existing explanations for the support of the authorities for translation, Franz Rosenthal examines the political background of the translation movement. He maintained that already before the rise of Islam, there existed a certain degree of cultural contact between the Arabian Peninsula and the cities of Palestine and Syria, mainly through the medium of caravan trade. According to Rosenthal, Hellenism quickly became the chief cultural force in these areas and (somewhat later) in the

⁵⁸ A theological school originating in the first half of the eighth century which defined itself by its belief in five key doctrines: the oneness of God; the justice of God; the promise of paradise for repentant sinners and, conversely, the threat of eternal hellfire for those Muslims who die unrepentant; the status of a sinning Muslim as a *fāsiq* (“evildoer”) which puts him between the believer (*mu'min*) and the unbeliever (*kāfir*); the Qur'ānic obligation of every Muslim to “command the good and forbid the evil” (*al-amr bi-l-ma'rūf wa-l-nahī 'an al-munkar*). Cf. D. Gimaret's article “Mu'tazila” in *EI*², vol. 7, p. 783–793.

⁵⁹ Walzer (1962a, p. 3, 6). The alleged link between al-Ma'mūn's policies and the theological doctrines of the *mu'tazilah* have been called into question by more recent research. John Nawas (1994, p. 616f) presents a concise and clear discussion of the reasons for al-Ma'mūn to promulgate the doctrine of the createdness of the Qur'an and institute—a few years later and just months before his death in 833—the *miḥnah*, the prosecution of legal and theological scholars rejecting this doctrine. He shows that al-Ma'mūn's alleged sympathies for the *mu'tazilah* cannot be conclusively proven from our sources. Dimitri Gutas (1998, p. 28f, 161, 189–92) agrees that the support of the 'Abbāsids must have been politically motivated and maintains that al-Ma'mūn consciously instrumentalized the *mu'tazilah* for political ends. As to the reasons for the introduction of the *miḥnah*, Josef van Ess (1965–1966, p. 92–96) attributes it to al-Ma'mūn's desire to unify the Muslim community. It had been torn apart by years of persecution of the proto-*ṣūfī* movements who supported various pretenders against the 'Abbāsīd dynasty. He also notes the influence of *mu'tazili* theologians at his court and his claim that the caliphal office should provide the community with both political and spiritual leadership—similar to the claims of the various leaders of the 'Alid movements the 'Abbāsīd authorities fought against. Cf. also Crone and Hinds (1986, p. 94, 96) and Martin Hinds' thorough discussion in the article “Miḥna” in *EI*², vol. 7, p. 2–6.

Arabian Peninsula.⁶⁰ But the influence of Greek science and philosophy remained muted for some time. Under the first caliphal dynasty of the expanding Islamic polity, the Umayyads (661–750), the adoption of Greek thought was, as Rosenthal explains, considered inopportune: the ongoing political and military conflict with the Byzantine empire and the promotion of “Arabism”, i.e. the attempt of the conquering Arab tribes to hold on to their native cultural traditions and prevent assimilation by the older, established and more sophisticated cultures of the Byzantium and Persia, fueled the resistance against the indiscriminate adoption of ideas, texts and other cultural artifacts that had become abundantly available. According to Rosenthal, this resistance occurred even though the Umayyad government, in order to ensure the continuance of government in the newly conquered territories, depended on the services of Byzantine administrators who had stayed on in the formerly Byzantine provinces of the Islamic state:⁶¹ Arabic replaced Greek only from ca. 680 as the chief medium of administrative communication.

The caliphs of the dynasty that succeeded the Umayyads, the ‘Abbāsids (750–1258), were not affected by any politically motivated anti-Hellenistic resentment.⁶² On the contrary, their accession after several years of civil war proved auspicious for translation into Arabic. Due probably to their “Persian”⁶³ background, the first attested translations of the ‘Abbāsīd period were possibly produced on the basis of Indian and Iranian sources. Rosenthal conjectures that the first information on Aristotle might have reached an Arabic-speaking audience via Pahlavi translations or abridgements. An additional powerful incentive to make Greek knowledge available was the necessity to study Christian theological arguments for apologetic ends and to obtain argumentative tools for theolog-

⁶⁰ Marlow (1997, p. 46) speculates about the emergence of an independent Arabo-Hellenistic “sub-culture” in the course of pre-conquest Arab migration into Syria. On the linguistic level, Greek influences were felt long before the beginning of systematic translation activities. Greek terms infiltrated the Arabic language even before the rise of Islam and left their mark on the very vocabulary of the Qurʾān itself; cf. Andrew Rippin’s article on “Foreign Vocabulary” in the *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān* (henceforth *EQ*), vol. 2, p. 226–237.

⁶¹ The implied “cultural control” exerted by the Greek administrators and their backers that supposedly nipped any translation effort in the bud cannot be reconciled with the evidence for the oral diffusion of ideas emphasized by Versteegh (1980, p. 10f) and supported by Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 417) and Gutas (1998, p. 16, 23).

⁶² Rosenthal (1965, p. 13ff).

⁶³ On the composition and motivations of the so-called “Persian faction”, the alliance of Persianized Arabic tribes and other ethnic and linguistic groups in eastern Persia who backed the ‘Abbāsīd takeover, cf. Gutas (1998, p. 28f).

ical disputes among Muslims.⁶⁴ Rosenthal also notes the chronological coincidence between the translation movement, supported by the ‘Ab-bāsid court, and the predominance of religious scholars associated with the *mu‘tazilah* which was adopted as the official theology of the court during the reign of al-Ma‘mūn.⁶⁵

Apart from the possible political reasons outlined above, Rosenthal identifies a more general cultural factor for the success and longevity of the translation movement: the Qur’ānic concept of *‘ilm*, posited by the Prophet as the crucial factor for religious observance and a righteous life.⁶⁶ In his opinion, the quasi-religious zeal for the acquisition of knowledge betrayed by the breadth and seriousness of the translation effort was inspired in part by personal piety, at least on the side of its patrons and sponsors.⁶⁷

The Islamic Middle East also offered the necessary human resources to initiate the translation movement: the bilingual, sometimes even trilingual Syriac translators who had inherited both their translation experience and a number of crucial texts from their own, church-based scholarly tradition. The concentration of the translation movement in Baghdad led to the situation that most translators knew Syriac better than Greek (if they knew it at all): before the Muslim conquest, Mesopotamia had been part of the Persian empire. Persian was the language of the Persian administrators while a majority of the population spoke dialects of Aramaic or Arabic. Unlike formerly Byzantine areas such as Syria where Greek continued to be spoken for some time, Greek speakers were few in and around Baghdad. Ḥunayn’s knowledge of Greek and that of some of the associates of his “school” was probably the exception, not the rule.⁶⁸ The linguistic limitations of some early translators were all too obvious, but that did not necessarily turn out to be a disadvantage: they were unen-

⁶⁴ Rosenthal (1965, p. 17f). The author frequently stresses the overwhelmingly practical orientation of the Greek-Arabic translations, i.e. its concentration on material which could be put to practical use, e.g. in Rosenthal (1940, p. 392): “The æsthetic enjoyment of the texts translated, and the unselfish pleasure merely in possessing what the Ancients had possessed, and in regaining their own words as they were spoken by them, are lacking. What was sought was nothing else but the contents and the substance of the texts, the practically and theoretically realizable knowledge they offered”.

⁶⁵ The role of the *mu‘tazilah* and its relation to both the court and the translation movement is still debated, see our discussion above and Ivry (1974, p. 22–34).

⁶⁶ Cf. his interpretation of the Qur’ānic usage of the root ‘-l-m (Rosenthal, 1970, p. 28–32).

⁶⁷ Rosenthal (1965, p. 17f).

⁶⁸ Rosenthal (1965, p. 19, 21). Endress (1997, p. 48f) rejects the notion of “school” and the degree of organization and cohesion it implies.

cumbered by the niceties of Arabic literary style and free in their attempts to render source texts into Arabic.⁶⁹

Thus, under the early 'Abbāsīd caliphs, key conditions for the initiation of systematic translation from Greek and Syriac into Arabic were met: there was a demand for translated texts; strong motivations to spend the requisite time and resources to meet it; and the manpower to do the actual work. Rosenthal reckons that the first translations were produced around the year 800. He rejects claims about translations allegedly produced before this time, e.g. of an alchemical work by a certain Iṣṭifān commissioned by the Umayyad prince Ḥālīd, son of the Umayyad Caliph Yazīd I. (r. 680–83), as a later invention; another alleged very early Arabic translation of the Syriac medical encyclopedia of Ahrun (fl. 610–640) ascribed to a certain Māsārğawayh may also be apocryphal.⁷⁰ In his opinion, the available evidence suggests little beyond the fact that the earliest translations were restricted to practical subjects, especially medicine and alchemy. If translations were produced at all in the Umayyad period, they might not have been more than short notes for private purposes or oral information provided by the numerous native speakers of Greek still available in Syria.⁷¹

With a growing amount of documentary evidence, accounts of the early history of Greek-Arabic translation such as Rosenthal's and Walzers' which concentrated on political factors gave way to more comprehensive theories that took into account social and economic circumstances. Also, the role of translation before the inauguration of a systematic Greek-Arabic "translation movement" was reappraised. Gerhard Endress points to the coexistence of different cultural, linguistic and ethnic groups as a key element in the reception of the Greek and Iranian heritage already in Umayyad times. It was characterized not only by explicit translations of texts but also by frequent oral communication between exponents of different cultures. During this period, Arabic gradually became the *lingua franca* and accelerated this process.⁷² According to Endress, informal

⁶⁹ Rosenthal (1965, p. 22f).

⁷⁰ Cf. Baumstark (1922, p. 189) who refers to Müller (1884, vol. 1, p. 109).

⁷¹ Rosenthal (1965, p. 15f). On the basis of additional evidence, later authors have pushed back Rosenthal's date by about half a century; cf. p. 27 below.

⁷² Endress (1997, p. 416f). Paul Kunitzsch (1976, p. 118f) connects the linguistic assimilation of the conquered territories to the rise of "Middle Arabic", a form of the Arabic language derived from the classical *'arabīyah* of the Muslim rulers but heavily influenced by the linguistic and conceptual contributions of the various subject populations, accounting for the extraordinary flexibility of this language and its suitability for translation. The

exchanges and discussions between exponents of different cultures were probably limited to what he terms “popular” and “parascientific” subjects, especially alchemy,⁷³ but they nevertheless exerted an important influence on the subsequent development of the natural sciences.⁷⁴

In his explanation of the birth of the translation movement, Endress lists three key factors which converged to initiate the large-scale translation efforts we witness in the ninth and tenth centuries: on the linguistic level, the displacement of the languages of the Middle East (chiefly Greek, Aramaic and Persian) through growing “Arabization”; on the social and cultural level, the social promotion of the *mawālī*,⁷⁵ the assimilation of Arabs and non-Arabs in the aftermath of the ‘Abbāsīd takeover and the concomitant growth in prestige of the *mawālī*’s cultural heritage; and on the political level, the necessity of cultural appropriation for the advancement of Islamic culture and the generous support these appropriation efforts received from the authorities.⁷⁶

Like Rosenthal, Endress dates the beginning of a systematic translation movement to the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century. He connects it with the foundation of the so-called *ḥizānat al-ḥikmah* (“Repository of Wisdom”, the predecessor of the *bayt al-ḥikmah*, “House of Wisdom”) by the caliph Hārūn al-Rašīd (r. 786–809), apparently the

sources and emergence of this type of Arabic has been studied, among others, by Blau (1967, 1999).

⁷³ Endress’ categorization of alchemy as “parascientific” does not do justice to a field which has seen its share of serious scientific attention. In the case of the famous physician and scientist Abū Bakr al-Rāzī (d. 923), Sarah Stroumsa (1999, p. 92) maintains that his “interest in alchemy was part and parcel of his scientific quest” and that his alchemy was “thoroughly experimental, and he clearly regarded it as belonging to the scientific study of the world.”

⁷⁴ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 418).

⁷⁵ Pl. of *mawālā*, a term that denotes various kinds of legal relationships between a client and a patron. In our context, it means “client” or “protégé”, more specifically converts to Islam among the populations of the territories conquered by Islamic armies in the seventh and eighth centuries who had to secure the protection of an Arab Muslim clan or tribe and be assimilated into the tribal structure of early Islamic society to become Muslims. Cf. Patricia Crone’s article “Mawālā” in *ET*, vol. 6, p. 874–882.

⁷⁶ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 418). Kraemer (1992, p. 287) stresses the role of contemporary bureaucrats (*kātib*, “scribe”, pl. *kuttāb*) with a Persian cultural background and notes that “[t]he early *kuttāb* were deeply immersed in the transmission of the ancient Persian and Greek legacies to the world of Islam during the first wave of translation activity”. Heinrichs (1969, p. 40f) points out that the first and most obvious source for the administrative know-how of the *kuttāb* and their educational ideal was what he termed the “legacy of the destroyed Sasanian empire”; translations from Pahlavi, he claims, started already in the second quarter of the eighth century and formed the basis for the literature and cultural attitudes of the scribal class.

first institution solely devoted to the transmission and study of the scientific heritage. It marked the start of the most productive period of translation, reaching its peak under the reign of his successor al-Ma'mūn.⁷⁷ With the latter, the *ḥizānat al-ḥikmah* was allegedly extended to a full-fledged academic institution and supported by a staff of bookbinders, scribes and scholars⁷⁸ studying an ever-growing number of scientific subjects. Even philosophical works, ostensibly without any practical value, were translated. According to Endress, the reason was to be found in the theological predilections of al-Ma'mūn who sanctioned the rational exegesis of the Qur'ān and the *sunnah*⁷⁹ to strengthen the defence of the Islamic brand of monotheism.⁸⁰ Since, according to Gutas, the range of scientific and philosophical writings transmitted through the Greek-Syriac translation tradition was limited,⁸¹ Greek sources were consulted already at an early stage of the translation movement for a broader knowledge of Greek thought, a process which involved the outlay of vast sums of money and the efforts of numerous scholars and translators. With growing demands on the skills of the translators and the correctness of translations, older translations were subjected to scathing criticism.⁸²

⁷⁷ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 421).

⁷⁸ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 423) bases his claim about the supporting staff at the *bayt al-ḥikmah* on a quotation from Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* that mentions a bookbinder among its members (cf. Flügel 1871–1872, p. 10): *Ibn Abī al-Ḥarīš wa-kāna yuḡallid fī ḥizānat al-ḥikmah li-l-Ma'mūn*, "Ibn Abī al-Ḥarīš used to bind books in the 'Repository of Wisdom' of al-Ma'mūn". Due to the scarcity of evidence for the functions and structure of the *bayt al-ḥikmah*, its role for the translation movement is still debated. Noting the absence of clear evidence for an act of foundation by Hārūn al-Rašid or al-Ma'mūn, Gutas (1998, p. 54ff, 58f) maintains that it was a library, possibly already established a generation earlier by the caliph al-Manšūr (r. 754–775) and responsible for the housing of documents and translations relating to the history and culture of the Sasanian dynasty in Persia (226–651) which ended with the conquest of the Persian empire by Muslim armies. Under al-Ma'mūn, it appears to have been a place for astronomical and mathematical activities (in tune with al-Ma'mūn's alleged "rationalist" orientation). While apparently not directly connected to the translation movement—it is not mentioned in Hunayn ibn Iṣḥāq's *Risālah*—it fostered a climate that supported translation and gave the translation activities, even if only indirectly, a semi-official veneer.

⁷⁹ The body of reports about the sayings and actions of the Prophet Muḥammad.

⁸⁰ Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 423). Nawas and Gutas take a less charitable view of the caliph's motives, see Nawas (1994, p. 624) and Gutas (1998, p. 54, 82f) on al-Manšūr and al-Ma'mūn.

⁸¹ Gutas' pessimistic views on the importance of the Greek-Syriac translation movement will be discussed below.

⁸² Not just by fellow translators and scholars but also other leading intellectuals of the time, e.g. the famous al-Ġāḥiẓ. More on his take on the Greek-Arabic translation activities at the end of this chapter.

In conscious opposition to previous, more philologically oriented approaches, Dimitri Gutas stresses the social dimensions of the translation movement and claims that it can only be sufficiently explained as a *social* phenomenon. Lasting two centuries and involving huge expenditures covered by a diverse group of supporters ranging from merchants to rulers, “it was not the pet project of any particular group in the furtherance of their restricted agenda.” The rigorous scientific standards of the translators and the longevity and quasi-programmatic approach of the translation movement across generations express “a social attitude and the public culture” of early ‘Abbāsīd society and cannot be accounted for by stressing one particular factor at the expense of others: neither the scholarly pursuits of Syriac Christians nor the philanthropic tendencies of a handful of “enlightened rulers” conclusively explain the translations; no single faction or class can be identified as the primary backer of the movement. The necessary funding was provided by a group of people cutting across all religious, ethnic and linguistic lines.⁸³

In his account of the political, social and economic developments which paved the way for the initiation and rapid growth of translation activity, Gutas stresses three fundamental factors:

Firstly, the integration of Egypt, the Fertile Crescent, Persia and parts of India into a single political and economic space following the Muslim conquests facilitated trade and increased agricultural productivity, especially in the former border zone in Mesopotamia, generating wealth for landowners and merchants and raising the general standard of living. Innovative goods such as paper could propagate quickly, scholars from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds could travel freely and exchange knowledge, thereby creating a pool of scientific expertise drawn from different sources. Their multilingualism allowed for the transmission of knowledge without translation.⁸⁴

Secondly, the shift of the capital to Baghdad encouraged a more positive attitude to Greek secular learning: influenced by the anti-Hellenistic and anti-secular bias of contemporary Byzantine theological disputes, the Christian administrative elite serving the Umayyads in Damascus was not prepared to support the adoption of Hellenistic secular thought whereas the Christian denominations in Iraq, themselves victims of theological strife with Byzantine orthodoxy, had a less negative view of Hellenistic learning. Paradoxically, the transfer of power from Syria to the east pre-

⁸³ Gutas (1998, p. 2, 7).

⁸⁴ Gutas (1998, p. 12ff, 16).

served a substantial portion of the classical learning that had largely been consigned to (temporary) oblivion in contemporary Byzantine intellectual circles.⁸⁵

Thirdly, the influence of pre-ʿAbbāsīd translation activities on the translation movement made itself felt in a number of different ways. Gutas takes a pessimistic stance on the role of Syriac translations and notes that the share of secular texts translated from Greek into Syriac before the Greek-Arabic translation movement was rather small.⁸⁶ Even if Syriac scholars contributed their skills to the translation movement, its initiative, direction and management emanated from the context created by early ʿAbbāsīd society.⁸⁷ Greek-Arabic translations in Umayyad times were limited to politically and economically relevant documents, conditioned by the practical necessities of administration. Still, *ad hoc* oral translations were a necessity and daily occurrence in the multilingual environment of Umayyad Syria.

In addition to the source languages already mentioned, there were also translations from Sanskrit which apparently took place during the earliest phase of the translation activities. They seem to have focused on astronomical material; some of the texts were probably transmitted through Persian intermediaries.⁸⁸ Pahlavi texts, partly based on Greek sources, fall into several groups. Some early Greek-Pahlavi translations were commissioned by Persian rulers and justified on the basis of a theological premise, i.e. that all knowledge was ultimately derived from the *Avesta*, the most important collection of Zoroastrian religious texts. Their relevance lies less in the (comparatively small) amount of texts translated but in the “culture of translation” they documented; according to Gutas, it survived until the ʿAbbāsīd era. In the period of Umayyad decline in the 730s and 40s, politically motivated translations into Arabic appeared: sponsored by Persian groups or individuals to further their political interests, especially in connection with the activities of ʿAbbāsīd propagandists who undermined the authority of the Umayyads, astrological material was

⁸⁵ Gutas (1998, p. 17f, 20), echoing Rosenthal who, as we have seen above, already pointed out the differing attitudes of Umayyad and ʿAbbāsīd rulers and courtiers to Greek knowledge.

⁸⁶ Unlike Hugonnard-Roche (1989a, p. 7), who reminds his readers of the high esteem Ḥunayn expressed for at least a part of the translations into Syriac by the prolific translator, philosopher and physician Sergius of Rešʿaynā (d. 536). The logical tradition in particular was deeply influenced by earlier Syriac translations of the relevant Greek texts (cf. Hugonnard-Roche 1989b, p. 3 and 1987, p. 205).

⁸⁷ Gutas (1998, p. 20ff).

⁸⁸ Gutas (1998, p. 23ff).

consciously used to connect Sasanian imperial ideas with the ‘Abbāsīd “ideology”, serving as an important element of their political justification.⁸⁹

Gutas traces the beginnings of a *systematic* translation movement back to the reign of the second ‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Manṣūr, a generation earlier than Endress and Rosenthal. With the adoption of Sasanian imperial ideology⁹⁰ as part of his political creed and his support for the translation of astrological works that were used to justify ‘Abbāsīd rule as the inevitably ordained successors to the dynasties of the Middle East, he secured the continued loyalty of the above-mentioned Persian faction that had helped sweep the dynasty to power.⁹¹ His choice of court functionaries and administrators reflected his ideological preoccupations: they were to a large extent drawn from a pool of Persian or Persianized subjects subscribing to the same imperial worldview that was at the heart of his ‘Abbāsīd ideological “program”.⁹²

The reign of al-Manṣūr’s son al-Mahdī (r. 775–785) witnessed the first translation of Aristotle’s *Topics*, commissioned by the caliph himself. It signaled the increasing significance of religious polemics as a driving force for translation: with the rise of active proselytism in the course of the ‘Abbāsīd revolution and the growing need to defend the ‘Abbāsīd interpretation of faith against Christians, Jews, Manichaeans and others, the demand for more sophisticated argumentative techniques for Muslim apologists became more and more pressing. Numerous translations of the *Topics* attest to its importance for inter-faith debates and its role in the conflict with religious and political opponents. The translations of Aristotle’s *Physics* answered a sudden need to study cosmological issues. These came to prominence through theological debates engendered by the conflict between Muslim apologists and the different strands of heresy subsumed under the term *zandaqah*, i.e. Manichaeism, Bardesanism and

⁸⁹ Gutas (1998, p. 25ff).

⁹⁰ For a summary of his thinking on the ideological underpinnings of early ‘Abbāsīd rule and its sources, cf. Gutas (2001).

⁹¹ Gutas (1998, p. 28f, 46, 49f).

⁹² Gutas (1998, p. 53). His sustained emphasis on political motivations during the initial phase of the Greek-Arabic translation movement tends to obscure some of the other important factors at work during this period. Research into the history of mathematics and astronomy in the Muslim world has thrown light on the connection between religion and the growing interest for Greek mathematics and astronomy, e.g. for the determination of prayer times and direction and the regulation of the lunar calendar; for a concise overview, cf. King (1990). On the basis of numerous sources, Ragep (2001) makes a very good case for the reappraisal of the relation between religion and science in the field of astronomy.

Marcionism.⁹³ Moreover, cosmology was a vital part of the astrological worldview so important to the ‘Abbāsids, their partisans and their courtiers.⁹⁴

The civil war between the sons of Hārūn al-Rašid, the murder of the older brother al-Amīn (r. 809–813) and the accession of al-Ma’mūn plunged the ‘Abbāsīd state into a severe crisis of legitimacy.⁹⁵ Al-Ma’mūn was confronted with a number of political and religious interpretations of Islam fostered by the climate of debate his predecessors had allowed to flourish in their attempt to accommodate and co-opt ideological dissenters. To wrest religious authority from these centers of power and centralize them in the person of the caliph and a theological elite dependent on him, al-Ma’mūn instituted the *miḥnah* in the year 833.⁹⁶ His efforts to recover religious authority were paralleled by his financial, political and military reforms aimed at centralization and match remarkably well his alleged emulation of the policies of the founder of the Sasanian dynasty, Ardašīr I. (r. 224–242).

The translation movement offered al-Ma’mūn support for both objectives, i.e. centralization and proselytism. His upbringing could have been another reason for his fervent support for the translation movement: it took place in an environment that regarded translation as useful, even necessary. His stint as governor in Marw, the capital of the eastern Persian province of Ḥurāsān, only strengthened this attitude by bringing him into contact with the land-owning provincial elite which subscribed to Sasanian imperial values and the appreciation of translation it fostered. In the field of foreign policy, al-Ma’mūn amplified the conflict against the Byzantines to justify his accession and to bolster his Islamic credentials and instigated a propaganda campaign depicting the Byzantines as unbelievers—*qua* Christians—and unworthy—*qua* intellectually inferior to the ancient Greeks: anti-Byzantinism as philhellenism.⁹⁷

⁹³ The term *zandaqah* was used both as a pejorative term for Manichaeism and, more generally, all kinds of heresy and unbelief. Cf. François de Blois’ article “Zindīk” in *EP*, vol. II, p. 510–513.

⁹⁴ Gutas (1998, p. 67, 69ff).

⁹⁵ Tayeb El-Hibri (1995, p. 364) argues that the blow the dynasty’s prestige and legitimacy suffered in the wake of the regicide helps to explain al-Ma’mūn’s subsequent autocratic tendencies, including the institution of the *miḥnah* and the adoption of the title *ḥalīfat Allāh* (“vicegerent of God”) instead of the customary *ḥalīfat rasūl Allāh* (“vicegerent of the Prophet of God”).

⁹⁶ Gutas (1998, p. 75ff, 82). Cf. n. 119 on p. 33 on some of the politico-religious issues at stake during the *miḥnah*.

⁹⁷ Gutas (1998, p. 80, 83f).

The education of the *kuttāb*, the administrative officials, was to be fashioned along Sasanian lines as well. This included a mastery of theoretical fields like mathematics and their practical application in timekeeping, engineering, surveying etc.—thereby contributing to the expansion of the translation movement and explaining the prominence, in its early stages, of mathematics on the one hand and astronomy and agriculture on the other.⁹⁸ After its initiation, the widening and intensification of translation activities beyond the needs of imperial policy was due also to the interests of scholars themselves. After the scientific “community” in Baghdad had reached a “critical mass”, scientists started to figure prominently as patrons for translations. The development of mathematics over and above the practical needs of administrators can be interpreted as an example of translators and scientists interacting in the furtherance of their subject. Medicine, a prominent field of translation from the very beginning, profited from commissions by the famous families of physicians; their fame (and pecuniary rewards) rested on a scientific expertise that had to be continually extended by means of research and translation.⁹⁹ In the case of astrology, the demand for translations expressed by ‘Abbāsīd caliphs to further their dynastic claims spread to the political class who absorbed the cultural attitudes of their rulers. According to Gutas, similar developments can be discerned for a number of scientific fields in which translations would spawn research which in turn would generate demand for further translation activities.¹⁰⁰

Philosophy, too, received its share of attention: al-Kindī commissioned translations of numerous philosophical works. He wanted to advance knowledge with the help of the most scientifically and methodically rigorous discipline available, i.e. philosophy, and attempted to integrate his philosophical approach into the religious and theological discussions of his time. His use of translated texts exemplified an attitude apparently widespread among contemporary scholars in Baghdad and beyond.¹⁰¹

Even though some religious and/or ethnic groups seem to have participated more actively in the translation movement than others, its flourishing was due to the joint effort of all groups involved. While active support and participation was restricted to the affluent and powerful, its

⁹⁸ Gutas (1998, p. 111f, 115).

⁹⁹ Gutas (1998, p. 16ff).

¹⁰⁰ Gutas (1998, p. 108ff). Cf. also Rashed (1989, p. 208) on the mutual inspiration of research agendas and translations.

¹⁰¹ Gutas (1998, p. 120). Al-Kindī and the translators working for him will be discussed below.

effects “trickled down” to the literate but less well-off strata of society: translated texts were available to anybody with the means to employ a scribe to copy manuscripts—as indicated by the wide diffusion of scientific literature listed in Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist*.¹⁰²

Turning to the translators and their background, Gutas presents an outline for the development of translation expertise that, as we have seen, squarely contradicts received wisdom about the seminal role of Syriac scholars in the beginning of the translation movement.¹⁰³ He notes that since the earliest translations from Greek had to be commissioned by the authorities from high-ranking Christian clerics, experts in Greek-Arabic translation were obviously hard to come by at the beginning of the ‘Abbāsīd era. Competence and supply of translators increased only with growing demand. Their lack of sophistication and poor style attest to the fact that the sponsors of early translations were, at least in the beginning, willing to put up with a comparably low level of stylistic quality due to high demand. In addition, even though early translators could fall back on older Syriac versions and translation methods, these were, due to the completely different motivation and methodologies involved in the Greek-Syriac translation tradition and the limited range of translated texts, of little help. Their often poor quality (a frequent complaint in Ḥunayn’s *Risālah*) further diminished their usefulness.

Gutas concludes that Greek culture did not exactly flourish in Syriac monasteries prior to the rise of Islam and that the small number of qualified Syriac-speaking scholars could certainly not satisfy contemporary demand for translation experts.¹⁰⁴ The translation standards re-

¹⁰² Gutas (1998, p. 134f). Although the translation movement, as Gutas points out, rested on many shoulders, the aims of different groups in supporting translators and commissioning texts were many and varied. Apart from genuine scientific and political interests, social advancement could have figured prominently (cf. e.g. Gutas 1998, p. 130f). Also, religio-political factors probably directly influenced the direction of the translation movement. Endress (1997, p. 48) refers to the correspondences between certain translators and the political and religious background of their sponsors; Montgomery (2007, p. 449) hints at links between religious (*šrī*) tendencies of the sponsors of the translation movement and their interest in philosophical, particularly Neoplatonic material.

¹⁰³ Gutas’ opinion is corroborated by Brock (1982, p. 25) who acknowledges that the number of Greek secular texts translated into Syriac was relatively small. On the other hand, the large number of Greek technical terms that were “acculturated” and became part of the Syriac vocabulary of science and philosophy suggests that their influence—irrespective of the potentially small amount of texts translated—was substantial and lasting.

¹⁰⁴ Gutas (1998, p. 137f). As we have seen above on p. 17, Gutas’ verdict needs to be qualified: the supposedly small number of relevant texts translated into Syriac and available to

quired by rich sponsors and the amount of money they were willing to pay quickly improved the translators’ proficiency: translation, especially if competently done, was a lucrative business. Not only growing experience but improved knowledge of Greek furnished better translations; increasing linguistic abilities in turn were fostered by the high demand and the money at stake in translation.¹⁰⁵

The Kindī-circle

By the time the philosopher al-Kindī around the mid-ninth century, the “infrastructure” of translation was firmly in place. The collection of Greek and/or Syriac manuscripts for translation was put on a semi-official footing early on. In addition to visits to Syriac monasteries and their libraries, translators such as al-Biṭrīq (fl. in the second half of the eighth century), Sallām al-Abraš (fl. during the reign of Hārūn al-Rašīd, 786–803), Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and Qusṭā ibn Lūqā (d. 912) traveled to former centers of Greek learning. Official missions were sent across the Byzantine border to buy texts, e.g. one equipped by the caliph al-Maʾmūn or another by the wealthy Šākīr brothers around the same time. Others were collected as reparations after border conflicts.¹⁰⁶ This put at al-Kindī’s disposal not just a number of translations but allowed him actively to commission a group of translators working in Baghdad during his lifetime to produce new ones.¹⁰⁷

Arabic translators is not a very good indicator of the true influence of the Syriac scholarly tradition. Thanks to fact that many of them were able to read Greek, Syriac scholars did not need translations to access large parts of the Greek philosophical and scientific heritage (cf. Watt 1995a, p. 64f). Through their commentaries and their own philosophical and scientific writings, Arabic translators had at least indirect access to some of this material. Also, Syriac scholarly activity did not die down immediately after the Muslim conquest. On the contrary, we have evidence for the continued existence of some of the Syriac schools well into the eighth century; cf. Hugonnard-Roche (2007), esp. p. 290f, and Conrad (1999).

¹⁰⁵ Gutas (1998, p. 139, 141).

¹⁰⁶ Badawī (1968, p. 16f).

¹⁰⁷ The philosopher Abū al-Walīd ibn Rušd (d. 1198) refers to a translation of Aristotle’s *De caelo* into Arabic allegedly carried out by al-Kindī. Like previous authors, Endress (1966, p. 106f) rejects the claim that al-Kindī translated any text himself, as he did not know Greek. Among the translators he sponsored were Uṣṭāṭ who translated the larger part of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* and Ibn Nāʾimah al-Ḥīmṣī who translated a collection of Neoplatonic metaphysical material that became known as the *Theology of Aristotle*. According to Endress, all of the so-called “translations of al-Kindī” mentioned in various sources were in fact produced for him by others and belong to the output of an earlier generation of translators—which also explains why Ibn Rušd repeatedly complains about their deficiencies.

There is also evidence for revisions of older translated texts: the deficiencies in Arabic of most of the Syriac-speaking translators necessitated later revisions and corrections. This practice seems to have become widespread by the time of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and continued afterwards.¹⁰⁸ Al-Kindī himself apparently revised some translations, albeit probably only in matters of style and vocabulary. Even though few early translations are extant and we have little evidence to assess his role in the early development of the Arabic scientific and philosophical terminology, we find in later literature many of the terms he adopted from translations at his disposal (or even coined himself in his own works).¹⁰⁹

The creation of Arabic terminologies was one of the crucial achievements of the older translators working with al-Kindī. They were the first to tackle many philosophical and translational issues in the medium of the Arabic language.¹¹⁰ To illustrate the terminological problems faced by philosophers, Endress cites the well-known example of the absent copula and the headaches it gave translators working on metaphysical, especially ontological texts. Several terms and even whole groups of expressions, derived from different Arabic roots, were coined in the course of the earliest stage of translation activities and competed against each other.¹¹¹

According to Endress, what set al-Kindī and his circle apart from earlier and also later groups of scholars was their full-fledged philosophical “program” of research founded on philosophical tenets al-Kindī took from Greek sources: philosophy defines the aims of science in an Islamic soci-

¹⁰⁸ Badawī (1968, p. 25f). On the basis of his findings from the translation of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics α* by Uṣṭāṭ, James Mattock (1989, p. 101) also maintains that successive revisions were accepted and common practice.

¹⁰⁹ Badawī (1968, p. 29–32).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Endress (1973, p. 192f).

¹¹¹ Endress (1989, p. 135f). The fascinating problem of the missing copula and its consequences for translators and Muslim philosophers has been studied by numerous modern scholars, e.g. Afnan (1964, p. 29f, 89f), Kahn (1972) and Shehadi (1975): the Arabic language lacks a direct equivalent to the Greek auxiliary verb *εἶναι*. Of its many meanings, those of attribution (“A is green” [i.e. has the attribute “greenness”]), identity (“A is B” [i.e. is identical to B]) and existence (“A is” [i.e. exists]) figure prominently in philosophical discourse, e.g. in logic, epistemology and ontology. Arabic translations of philosophical texts attest to the ingenuity with which the translators created a whole new terminology to replicate the exact meaning of the term whenever it occurred in their source texts. But often enough, they misunderstood it or encountered ambiguities they were unable to resolve.

Whereas the terminology of most disciplines created or affected by the translation phenomenon had reached a high level of consistency by the end of the ninth century, Endress (1989, p. 140) explicitly excludes philosophy and notes its lack of terminological standardization.

ety and at the same time points the way and provides a methodology to accomplish them.¹¹² One of the key elements of this philosophical “program” of the Kindī-circle¹¹³ was the extraction of theological elements of Platonism, surviving only on the fringes of the late Hellenistic philosophical traditions in Gnostic and Hermetic “subcultures”, as a religion for intellectuals.¹¹⁴ To that end, al-Kindī portrayed philosophy as part of a universal *ḥikmah* (as mentioned in the Qurʾān)¹¹⁵ by explaining its consistency with revealed religion and, following Hellenistic Platonism, elaborating the concept of blissful rational contemplation as the perfection of man.¹¹⁶

Due to government support and generous funding by the urban elites for translators and the “Hellenistic movement”, its exponents—al-Kindī among them—found themselves in active competition with traditionists (*ʿabl al-ḥadīth*)¹¹⁷ and rational theologians (*mutakallimūn*)¹¹⁸ for the backing of the authorities.¹¹⁹ All sides claimed equal command of the Arabic language and knowledge of the sacred scriptures and traditions and

¹¹² Cf. especially Endress (1994).

¹¹³ Already broached in Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 429 and 1990, p. 239).

¹¹⁴ Endress (1997, p. 64). Considering al-Kindī’s desire to reconcile revealed and philosophical truths, this can only mean that he intended it as a more “intellectually” attractive description of truths expounded by revelation: a psychological soteriology.

¹¹⁵ The term *ḥikmah* plays an important role in Qurʾānic diction. It means “wisdom”, specifically a form of wisdom that implies higher spiritual truths. We find it either in isolation (2:269, 16:125, 17:39, 31:12, 33:34, 38:20, 43:63 and 54:5) or in combination with *al-mulk*, “power” (2:251) or, most prominently, *al-kitāb*, “scripture” (2:129, 151, 231; 3:48, 81, 164; 4:54, 113; 5:110 and 62:2). Cf. A.-M. Goichon’s article “Ḥikma” in *ET*, vol. 3, p. 377f.

¹¹⁶ For the key role of the concept of *ḥikmah* in al-Kindī’s philosophy, cf. Hugonnard-Roche (1991b). Carmela Baffioni (1989) traces the history of the term and its use in philosophical literature. For a comparison of the use of *ḥikmah* by al-Kindī and the contemporary author of the anonymous *Liber de causis*, a collection of Neoplatonic material derived chiefly from Proclus’ (d. 485) *Elementatio theologica* and Plotinus’ (d. 270) *Enneads*, see D’Ancona Costa (1995, p. 176f). In his article on the meaning of *ḥikmah* in early Islamic philosophy, Jean Jolivet (1991) maintains that al-Kindī’s adoption of the term in his philosophical and scientific writings illustrates his attempt to establish common criteria for “right” and “wrong” in all scholarly fields. Mathematics prescribe the methods of argumentation; *ḥikmah* represents the shared truth criteria.

¹¹⁷ Collectors and transmitters of reports about the sayings and actions of the Prophet Muḥammad.

¹¹⁸ Cf. n. 37 above.

¹¹⁹ Endress (1997, p. 44f). In his comprehensive and carefully argued article “Miḥna” in *ET*, vol. 7, p. 2–6, Martin Hinds argues that one of its aims was to rein in popular *ḥadīth* enthusiasts; the caliph’s interests coincided with those of prominent adherents of the *muʿtazilab* who insisted on the primacy of the Qurʾān as the source of Islamic religious and legal doctrine at the expense of *ḥadīth*.

vied for mastery in literary expression. Parallel to the various interests and affiliations of their sponsors, translators themselves fell into different, sometimes overlapping communities.¹²⁰

After the reign of al-Ma'mūn in 833 and, 15 years later, the end of the *miḥnah*, the persecution of theologians whose beliefs conflicted with his alleged sympathies with the *mu'tazilah*,¹²¹ Greek sciences fell out of favor—the aggressive religious policies inaugurated by al-Ma'mūn and upheld by his successors al-Mu'tasim and al-Wāṭiq (r. 842–847) had unleashed a reaction that threatened the stability and cohesion of the state and ultimately discredited the Greek sciences so vigorously promoted by them.¹²²

In this contentious climate, the single most important driving force behind al-Kindī's activities seems to have been the need of scientists for a justificatory “ideology” “to safeguard their position in an Islamic society” in the face of competition from theologians. While wishing to aid rationalist *mutakallimūn* to defend reason against the traditionists, he nevertheless rejected their claim to superior explanation and explicitly extols the reasoning of Greek philosophy in comparison to the deficiencies of contemporary exegesis of the scripture. Aided by the previous Hellenization of *kalām*, “philosophy was to join forces with the defenders of Islam” against Greek *gnōsis* and *zandaqab*, dualist Manichaean gnosticism and Mazdakism.¹²³ The ultimate aim: to raise the prestige of the “scientific community” and to bolster its Islamic credentials.¹²⁴ Scientists,

¹²⁰ Endress (1997, p. 48f) points out that these groups were “definitely ... not ‘schools’ ... but groups held together by various bonds of origin, scientific orientation and, most important, by their patrons”.

¹²¹ Cf. above, p. 19.

¹²² Endress (1987, vol. 2, p. 429). His account of the impact of the *miḥnah* on the standing of the “Greek sciences” leaves the impression that, after its failure, they were immediately relegated to the fringes of the Islamic scientific enterprise. But they had already left their mark on “traditional” Islamic scholarship and continued to influence the dominant theological and legal discourses (Endress, 1987, vol. 2, p. 401).

¹²³ The term *zandaqab* was also often used by opponents of certain *ṣūfī* beliefs which, according to Montgomery (2007, p. 456), were a key element of ninth-century religious, political and intellectual debates and also influenced the course of the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

¹²⁴ Endress (1997, p. 65). About the justificatory dimension of al-Kindī's “program”, Endress writes in an earlier publication: “Le philosophe devient idéologue de la communauté scientifique et se prépare à la défendre en proclamant l'identité de ses convictions avec les objectifs de la communauté religieuse. Pour établir la philosophie dans la société islamique, al-Kindī invoque les autorités qui avaient donné à sa tradition scientifique la méthode, l'expression et l'orientation spirituelle [sc. Plato and Aristotle]” (Endress, 1990, p. 239).

al-Kindī was convinced, were better equipped to defend rationalism and faith by virtue of their superior methods and rationality.¹²⁵

The circle of translators working with and for al-Kindī differed markedly from the earlier translators of the late eighth and early ninth centuries also in their ethnic and cultural background. The latter, consisting mostly of people from Christian Aramaic clans from southern Iran and Iraq, were allied with early astronomers and astrologers with a decidedly Iranian bias. These, in turn, were close to the ‘Abbāsid caliphs and the ruling class. The slightly later Kindī-circle, on the other hand, comprised people with a Byzantine or Hellenized Near Eastern background. The unique feature of this group seems to have been its focus on philosophical translations, readily explainable by the philosophical interests of the circle’s mentor al-Kindī.¹²⁶ Philosophy served as a weapon in the hand of Hellenized scientists to validate and vindicate their intellectual contribution. Greek philosophy vied against Iranian court etiquette and princely ethics, Greek science competed against Iranian know-how.¹²⁷

Without the pioneering work of al-Kindī and his circle, Endress concludes, none of his successors would have been conceivable. He helped fashion an Arabic philosophical language without which future generations of translators and philosophers would have been “speechless”. Al-Kindī and his circle started the linguistic process that equipped the Arabic language with the tools for cross-cultural communication, an instrument “to give names to the principles of being and the condition of man” common to both Islamic and Western philosophers.¹²⁸

Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and his associates

The next group or “generation” of translators represented the fully mature stage of the Greek-Arabic translation movement. Their methodological accomplishments are linked mainly with the name of the head of the group (or even “school” as it is occasionally but misleadingly called), Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq. He is routinely singled out for his exemplary mastery of all three languages involved in the translation process (Greek, Syr-

¹²⁵ Endress (1997, p. 65ff, 75).

¹²⁶ Connecting the philosophical bent of the Kindī-circle to the wider sphere of contemporary discourses, Endress (1997, p. 49) emphasizes the competition between traditionalist and rationalist factions, signalling “the rise of a philosophical rationalist discourse as opposed to the traditionalist discourse of the ‘ulūm islāmiyya”.

¹²⁷ Endress (1997, p. 50).

¹²⁸ Endress (1997, p. 76).

iac, Arabic) and his stylistic and terminological superiority compared to earlier translators.

Apart from producing his own translations, Ḥunayn is credited with the revision of existing texts.¹²⁹ Moreover, tools like glossaries and dictionaries helped to improve the quality of translations at the time and imposed a standard terminology and phraseology that could not be ignored by subsequent generations of translators and scholars.¹³⁰

In his *Risālah*, a treatise listing his and other translators' Syriac and Arabic translations of the works of the Greek physician Galen (d. 200), Ḥunayn described his method of establishing a source text before producing a translation: he collated a Greek text from all available manuscripts and, in the case of texts extant in only a single manuscript, postponed translation until he had secured more manuscripts.¹³¹ We can be more or less certain that the methodological standard established by Ḥunayn was followed by those translators who learned their craft from and closely collaborated with him, chiefly his son Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. 910) and his nephew Ḥubayṣ ibn al-Ḥasan (d. ca. 890). Modern scholars have disagreed as to whether they were also applicable to later translators; if so, we have little evidence to prove it.¹³²

Thanks to the work of previous translators, Ḥunayn already had a wide variety of technical terms and phrases at his disposal and could freely choose between them. One important detail that is often overlooked in tracing the development of the Greek-Arabic translation movement is the fate of those older translations that Ḥunayn revised or even replaced with better texts: they did not simply disappear. Some of them were superseded by superior translations from Ḥunayn's workshop, some were merely revised and presumably retained much of their "archaic" terminology and phraseology. But some of them seem not to have attracted Ḥunayn's or his colleagues' attention at all and remained throughout the translation movement and beyond the "canonical" or even only translations for certain texts. Older translations, even those for which more recent versions became available, continued to be read.¹³³

¹²⁹ Endress (1966, p. 98f).

¹³⁰ Endress (1989, p. 104ff).

¹³¹ Cf. Bergsträsser (1925, p. 5/arabic).

¹³² Cf. Walzer (1962d, p. 116), qualifying his earlier, more optimistic stance (e.g. in 1962a, p. 6ff) and Badawī (1968, p. 18f).

¹³³ The decision-making process of translators—what to translate, what to revise, what to ignore—was undoubtedly influenced by numerous factors including fortuitous ones such as lack of time or personal preferences and tastes of individual translators.

Thus, the reception of Greek thought in the Islamic world as well as the development of a technical terminology in the disciplines covered by the translation movement seems to have been characterized not so much by a succession of terminological systems and textual versions exhibiting a linear growth in quality. Rather, coexistence and competition between terms and texts with changing patterns of sub- and co-ordination on the part of the reading public seems to have been the norm. Extrapolating the collation of manuscripts and the comparison between older and newer translations as well as processes of revision as described in Ḥunayn’s *Risālah* into the work of subsequent generations of translators, the resulting model of translation history suggests a convergence towards a “median” text incorporating traces of all versions available to the author with the number of “source texts”, i.e. Greek and/or Syriac versions and various extant Arabic translations, proliferating over time. At the same time, the terminology may have converged towards a standard enforced by the statistical distribution and the diffusion of a “preferred” set of terms not only via translations, but also a growing number of word lists, glossaries and later dictionaries.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, due to the coexistence of old and new texts and terminologies throughout the history of the translation movement and beyond, complete standardization could not be achieved—and was perhaps not even desired.

The Baghdad Aristotelians

In hindsight, the final phase of the Greek-Arabic translation movement seems one of decline: the standardization of methodology and terminology for most subjects was achieved by the time of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq and his circle. Thereafter, translation activities fell off: virtually all important works of the late Hellenistic canon of scientific and philosophical works (but not literary prose and poetry) had been translated. While during the tenth century a group of translators continued to work in cooperation with the Christian Aristotelian philosophers of their time, e.g. Abū Biṣr Mattā, ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq ibn Zurʿah (d. 1008) and Ibn Suwār (d. 1017), the era of translation came, with very few exceptions, to a close after the end of the tenth century.¹³⁵

Those translations that were still being produced were apparently based exclusively on previous Syriac translations instead of the Greek origi-

¹³⁴ On the translators’ tools, see, among others, Endress (1989, p. 106).

¹³⁵ Rosenthal (1965, p. 22f).

nals:¹³⁶ knowledge of Greek was no longer part of a translator's required qualifications. Like the Islamic philosophers such as al-Kindī, al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037) and Ibn Rušd, their knowledge of Greek philosophy was derived from translations. For later Aristotelian studies and Islamic philosophy however, the texts provided by the circle of Ḥunayn and the revised translations and commentaries by these same Aristotelian scholars in Baghdad connected with Abū Bišr Mattā and Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī (d. 974) were of the greatest importance.¹³⁷

The most impressive document to emerge from the activities of these later translators is the *Organon* manuscript which contains the Arabic *Rhetoric*. It will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter. At this point, suffice it to say that it highlights not just their activities as translators—some of the translations gathered in the manuscript were produced by the Baghdad Aristotelians themselves, albeit on the basis of Syriac rather than Greek source texts—but also their role as compilers and commentators. Even though their work may seem less pioneering than that of their predecessors, their achievement is no less important for the Islamic philosophical tradition. They pulled together the available translations, collated and corrected them, linked them with available commentaries and produced a comprehensive panorama of the logical knowledge available to them.

¹³⁶ Badawī (1968, p. 18f).

¹³⁷ Walzer (1970, p. 32, 35).

CHAPTER TWO
THE ARABIC VERSION

MANUSCRIPT AND DATING

Among other treasures, the manuscript ar. 2346 at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris contains the unique extant Arabic translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.¹ In spite of the importance of the manuscript, there is no comprehensive codicological description including information on its binding etc.² With the exception of the *Rhetoric*, none of the individual texts contains any information that could help us date the manuscript. Of its history, next to nothing is known before the year 1738 when it was acquired by the French consul in Cairo, Benoît de Maillet. Somewhat later, we find it in the French royal library; it is sometimes still quoted with its old shelfmark (ancien fonds no. 882a).³

The Arabic *Rhetoric* in this manuscript forms part of a collection of Arabic translations of the entire Aristotelian corpus of logical writings, the *Organon*. It was compiled at the end of the tenth century by the philosopher Abū al-Ḥayr al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār, also known as Ibn al-

¹ Cf. Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. ii–iv). The text has been edited by Badawī (1959) and Lyons (1982). The former was reviewed by Anawati (1959–1961a); the latter by Heinrichs (1984), who commented in some detail on Lyons' reconstruction of the transmission history, and Wansbrough (1984). More recently, Panoussi (2000, p. 238–247) compiled a list of some of the deficiencies of both editions, concentrating on Badawī's text. In his discussion of the shortcomings of Lyons' edition, he suggests a number of emendations based on the Greek version and the Syriac translation Panoussi claims was used by the collator of the Arabic text.

² A number of scholars have given descriptions of the manuscript which focus on its contents, among them Margoliouth (1897, p. 376f) and (in more detail) Georr (1948, p. 183–200) and Hugonnard-Roche (1992). See also the remarks by Badawī (1948–1952, vol. 1, p. 20–32), and Stern (1956, p. 41–44). Its catalogue entry (de Slane, 1883–1895, p. 411, no. 2346) notes that it consists of 380 paper folios measuring 30 by 43 cm with 21–25 lines of text per page. The author of the catalogue already pointed out that some parts of the text were very difficult to decipher. The deterioration of the manuscript continued throughout the twentieth century, prompting the Bibliothèque Nationale to withdraw it from circulation. At this point, the only way to consult the manuscript is a microfilm produced in 1978 which unfortunately often cuts off the marginal notes (cf. Lyons 1982, vol. 1, p. xiii and Panoussi 2000, p. 233f).

³ Hugonnard-Roche (2001, p. 21, n. 5); additional information in Tkatsch (1928, vol. 1, p. 142f).

Ḥammār, a student of Yaḥyā ibn ‘Adī.⁴ Ibn al-Nadīm has the highest regard for his achievements:

[هو] من افاضل المنطقيين ممن قرأ على يحيى بن عدي في نهاية الذكاء والفطنة
والاضطلاع بعلوم اصحابه⁵

The translations in this manuscript cover the entire period of Greek-Arabic and Syriac-Arabic translation activities: for the *Categories* and *De interpretatione*, the editor chose translations by Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. 910), the son of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and a highly regarded member of his circle; the *Poetics* and the *Posterior Analytics* were rendered into Arabic by Abū Biṣr Mattā, one of the most prominent “Baghdad Aristotelians”; Porphyry’s *Isagoge* and the *Topics* were based on versions by another close collaborator of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, Abū ‘Uṭmān Sa‘īd ibn Ya‘qūb al-Dimaṣqī (d. after 914), the *Prior Analytics* on a pre-Ḥunayn translation by a certain Taḍārī.⁶ The *Sophistical Refutations* appear in three different versions: an old text, attributed to Ibn Nā‘imah al-Ḥimṣī, a translator associated with the Kindī-circle; one by Yaḥyā ibn ‘Adī; and another version by his student Ibn Zur‘ah, both leading members of the second generation of Baghdad Aristotelians of the tenth century.

In his account of the history of the manuscript which was bound together from texts written by different scribes at different times,⁷ Khalīl Georr distinguishes five text groups: firstly, the *Rhetoric* in a copy by Abū ‘Alī ibn al-Samḥ (d. 1027), a translation which Georr dates back to the beginning of the ninth century; secondly, the *Poetics*, date and copyist unknown; thirdly, the *Categories*, *De interpretatione* and Porphyry’s *Isagoge*, all executed in a large, perfectly readable hand and accompanied by numerous notes and comments; fourthly, the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics* and the first five books of the *Topics*, written in different hands but at the

⁴ Ibn al-Nadīm mentions his activities in the fields of philosophy, medicine etc. and credits him with a number of translations on various subjects from Syriac into Arabic (Flügel, 1871–1872, p. 265).

⁵ Flügel (1871–1872, p. 250), translated by Dodge (1970, vol. 2, p. 632): “He is one of the best of the logicians who studied under Yaḥyā ibn ‘Adī, having the greatest intelligence, comprehension, and ability for the sciences of his associates.”

⁶ Identified by Kraus (1934, p. 3) and Walzer (1962c, p. 68) as the Melkite bishop of Ḥarrān, Ṭābit Abū Qurrah (d. 826). In his discussion of this and other theories about Taḍārī’s identity, Lameer (1994, p. 3ff) conclusively demonstrates that none of them can be reconciled with the evidence and suggests that the person in question is a certain Taḍārī ibn Basīl Aḥī Iṣṭifān, the brother of another translator (Iṣṭifān) who worked with Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq.

⁷ Cf. Tkatsch (1928, vol. 1, p. 141).

same time and consecutively paginated; and, finally, the three remaining books of the *Topics* and three different versions of the *Sophistical Refutations*, also written by different hands but simultaneously: several scribes worked on sections of the same work and different hands reappear in all four texts.⁸

This diversity is matched by differences in the quantity of marginal notes in the manuscript: the editor's interest in the texts varied widely—at least as far as we can judge from the number and contents of his notes. Each text had its own specific history before being collected and written into the manuscript we now have.⁹ Compared to the generous amount of glosses and notes in the margin of e.g. the *Prior Analytics*, Georr notes the relative scarcity and shortness of such notes in the *Rhetoric*, a fact that even a cursory examination of the manuscript confirms.

In the Arabic *Rhetoric*, the large majority of marginal notes consist of glosses and explanations of single terms and variants (often introduced with *ya'nī*, “that is” or “it means”) and are, according to Georr, later additions. The copyist furthermore refers in several places to variants, both in another Arabic version and in the Syriac text.¹⁰ Also in the margins of the text, we frequently find *hamzah*-shaped markings, often on the inside of the page. In one of the notes at the end of the text, the copyist reproduces Ibn al-Samḥ's explanation of these markings which he placed next to lines in which he encountered problematic terms or phrases, particularly those he could not explain on the basis of the second Arabic version he claims to have used or the Syriac text that was his last resource.¹¹ The huge majority of notes is in black ink and by the same hand but there is a number of notes in red ink (allegedly by the same scribe) and some in black that are clearly in a different hand.¹²

⁸ Georr (1948, p. 184f). Other scholars have suggested different groupings, e.g. Hugonnard-Roche (2001, p. 22), who divides the manuscript into two groups of texts: firstly, the books of the “standard” *Organon* (including the *Isagoge*), copied in similar ways. They are all followed by three successive colophons: the first, written by same hand as the text itself, marks its end while the second and third, written by different hands which remain the same across the various books, document the source of the copy and the collation process. All of these books are explicitly connected with Ibn Suwār. Secondly, the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* which are not codicologically connected with Ibn Suwār and do not have the same colophon structure. They are linked with Ibn al-Samḥ. Stern (1956, p. 41) already noted that the *Rhetoric* probably formed an independent volume which was then bound into the beginning of Paris ar. 2346.

⁹ Hugonnard-Roche (1991a, p. 193ff, 208f).

¹⁰ Georr (1948, p. 188).

¹¹ Cf. Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. iif).

¹² Cf. also Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. vi–xiii).

Commending the philological acumen of the people involved in collecting and annotating the texts in the *Organon* manuscript, Walzer suggests that the notes were part of an effort to recover a version of the text that was as close and faithful as possible to Aristotle's original.¹³ In his analysis of the annotations and marginal comments contained in the translation of the *Prior Analytics*, Hugonnard-Roche on the other hand concludes that they were not intended as an exercise in textual criticism but illustrate Ibn Suwār's and later readers' concern with understanding the *logical* content of the text. He notes that the rather periphrastic Tādārī-translation of the *Prior Analytics* chosen by the editor would have offered ample opportunity for criticism and correction when compared to the translations produced by Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq and his son. The glosses and annotations provided by Ibn Suwār and other logicians perusing the manuscript illustrate their "logical" concerns, their efforts to understand and incorporate the logical content of the text into their own thinking.¹⁴ Hugonnard-Roche's interpretation is based on a text that was much more thoroughly annotated than the *Rhetoric*; for an understanding of the notes added to our text, Walzer's emphasis on philological accuracy seems a much better fit.

The history of the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric* in this manuscript remains obscured by the lack of later sources that could help to ascribe it to a specific translator or period. According to the notes we find after the colophon at the end of the anonymous translation (f. 65v), it was copied from a manuscript belonging to the Aristotelian scholar and logician Ibn al-Samḥ in 1027, the year of his death. Like Ibn al-Ḥammār, Ibn al-Samḥ was a student of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and belonged to the circle of Christian Aristotelians.¹⁵ The copyist of the manuscript carefully transcribed Ibn al-Samḥ's own notes as he found them in his source manuscript. In two longer excurses appended to the translation, Ibn al-Samḥ describes his procedure in collating the text. Since the first one gives us valuable information about his philological methods and the texts available at the time, it deserves to be quoted in full:

هذا الكتاب لم يبلغ كثير من قرأ صناعة المنطق الى درسه ولم ينظر فيه ايضا نظرا شافيا
فلذلك ليس يوجد له نسخة صحيحة او معنى مصحح ما ووجدت له نسخة بالعربية
سقيمة جدا جدا، ثم قد وجدت له نسخة اخرى بالعربية اقل سقما من تلك فعولت

¹³ Cf. Walzer (1962b, p. 65f).

¹⁴ Hugonnard-Roche (1993, p. 27f).

¹⁵ Stern (1956, p. 31f).

على نسخ هذه النسخة من هذه النسخة الثانية ومهما وجدته في النسخة الثانية من غلط كنت ارجع فيه الى تلك النسخة، فان وجدته صحيحا اثبت ما اجدته فيها على الصحة، وان وجدته سقيما ايضا رجعت فيه الى نسخة سريانية، فاذا وجدته صحيحا اثبته عربيا بحسبها وان وجدته سقيما اثبته على سقمه وعلمت على السطر الذي هو فيه علامة هي هذه ء، وقابلت على هذه النسخة واجتهدت ان لا يقع في المقابلة بها شيء من الغفل، فليعلم جميع ذلك ان شاء الله وله الحمد حق حمده.¹⁶

Taking a somewhat defective Arabic copy as his starting point, Ibn al-Samḥ applied corrections on the basis of another, even less dependable Arabic copy and a “sound” (*ṣaḥīḥah*) Syriac version. According to Lyons, the copyist of Ibn al-Samḥ’s manuscript added another note to the effect that he compared a certain passage (1477b11) with “the Greek” (*al-yūnānī*)¹⁷ and found the manuscript’s reading to be correct. These notes suggest that at this stage of the transmission process, even a relatively prominent exponent of the Aristotelian tradition in Baghdad who had been taught by the best philosophers of his time had access only to a relatively small sample of texts due to what he claims was a lack of scholarly interest in the *Rhetoric*. As we will see in the fourth chapter on the Arabic commentary tradition, his statement is somewhat at odds with the substantial philosophical activity surrounding the *Rhetoric* in the ninth

¹⁶ “[N]ot many students of the art of logic have arrived at a study of this book or have investigated it satisfactorily. For that reason, there is not to be found any sound copy or anything that has been corrected. I did find an Arabic copy that was very defective indeed and then I found another Arabic copy less defective than the first. I relied upon this second copy in my transcription of this version and where I found a mistake in the second copy I had recourse to that (other) version. If I found it given correctly there, I would copy down what I found in that version in its correct form, but if I found that it was defective there, too, I would check back on the point to a Syriac manuscript. If I found the (Syriac) manuscript reading to be sound, I would produce an Arabic version to match it, but if it was defective, I would enter it, defective as it was, and mark the line in which it occurs with the following sign [here, the copyist wrote out a *hamzah*-shaped character]. I have checked over this copy and done my best to see that there has been no carelessness. Let all know this, if God wills and to him be His due of praise.”

This version of the note was reconstructed and translated by Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. iif) who also signals the variants between his reading and those of Badawī and Georr (none of which substantially change the meaning of the note). Panoussi (2000, p. 236ff) relies largely on Lyons, both for his reading and his translation.

¹⁷ The emendation *al-suryānī*, “the Syriac”, suggested by Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. iv), agrees with the information in the two previous notes which do not mention any Greek version as part of the collation process. On the other hand, we are not in a position categorically to exclude the use of a Greek text even as late as the eleventh century just on the basis of the (widely held) notion that the knowledge of Greek had more or less disappeared by that time.

and early tenth century: some of the most prominent “students of the art of logic” read and commented on it.

The note above and the second one describing (in less detail) the collation process are not the only ones appended at the end of the *Rhetoric*; there is a second set at the end of the text and in the margin of the same folio which apparently deals with the translation’s provenance. Only partly legible, these notes contain several dates and names which offer ample room for speculation. We will discuss them in detail below.

Another important source of information is Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist*. The entry on the *Rhetoric* in his chapter on Aristotle’s works reads as follows:

الكلام على ريطوريقا ومعناه الخطابة يصاب بنقل قديم وقيل ان اسحق نقله الى العربي
ونقله ابراهيم بن عبد الله، فسره الفارابي ابو نصر رأيت بخط احمد بن الطيب هذا
الكتاب نحو مائة ورقة بنقل قديم¹⁸

The second translator mentioned in this passage, Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh (al-Dimašqī),¹⁹ puts in two more appearances. On the preceding page of Flügel’s edition of the *Fihrist*, he is credited with the partial translation of another Aristotelian work, the eighth book of the *Topics*. The second reference in the *Fihrist*’s entry on Alexander of Aphrodisias contains another piece of information:

وقال ابو زكرياء انه التمس من ابراهيم بن عبد الله فصّ سوفسطيكا وفصّ الخطابة
وفصّ الشعر بنقل اسحق بخمسين دينارا فلم يبعها واحرقه وقت وفاته²⁰

The first note lists two, probably even three Arabic translations of the *Rhetoric*: an “old” one (*naql qadīm*), confirmed by a note written by Aḥmad ibn al-Ṭayyib al-Saraḥsī (d. 899);²¹ one by Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh

¹⁸ Flügel (1871–1872, p. 250); translation: “An account of (the work) *Rīṭūrīqā*, which means ‘Rhetoric’:—it is found in an old translation; it is said that Ishāq b. Ḥunayn translated it into Arabic and it was translated by Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh. Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī wrote a commentary on it. I have seen in the handwriting of Aḥmad b. al-Ṭayyib (a note to say): ‘this book is about 100 pages (long) in the old version’” (Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. i).

¹⁹ He is credited with numerous scientific works in Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist* (Flügel 1871–1872, p. 244, 249f, 252f, translated by Dodge 1970, vol. 2, p. 588, 600, 1010). His version of the eighth book of the *Topics* has survived and forms part of our manuscript.

²⁰ Flügel (1871–1872, p. 253): “Abū Zakariyā’ [Yaḥyā ibn ‘Adī] said that he offered fifty gold coins ... to Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh for a copy of the Sophistici, a copy of the Oratory [Rhetoric], and a copy of the Poetry [Poetica], as translated by Ishāq, but he would not sell them. At the time of his death he burned them.” (Dodge, 1970, vol. 2, p. 609)

²¹ Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Marwān ibn al-Ṭayyib al-Saraḥsī was a student of al-Kindī and himself a noted philosopher. After a distinguished career as teacher, boon

and one by Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn. As the passive *qīla* indicates, Ibn al-Nadīm knows the latter two versions only from hearsay.

The second note, on the plausible assumption that *bi-naql Iṣḥāq* refers to all the texts listed by Ibn al-Nadīm, would confirm the existence of Iṣḥāq's translation of the *Rhetoric*. While explicitly ascribing the *faṣṣ* of the *Poetics* to Iṣḥāq, however, the reference can be read in several ways: Iṣḥāq could have been the author of one or both of the *Sophistical Refutations* and the *Rhetoric* or of none of these two. The note does not throw any more light on the role of Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh. It would be rash either to identify the text of the *Rhetoric* mentioned in this context with the translation by Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh listed in the first note or with the earlier version by Iṣḥāq. Ibrāhīm could have been involved in various capacities: as translator, corrector or perhaps only as the owner of the text in question.

This leaves us with three translations, two of which must have been into Arabic.²² In fact, Ibn al-Nadīm does not mention any Syriac version at all. Badawī and Heinrichs date the "old" translation the early eighth century and identify it as the text in our manuscript; Lyons agrees with Badawī who refers to the quality of the translation as falling short of the standards established by Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq and later translators.²³

There is a consensus on the early, probably Umayyad date of the *Rhetoric* and its identification with Ibn al-Nadīm's "old" version. Arguments for the discussion have been drawn from three sources: notes contained in our manuscript, the testimony of the *Fihrist* and judgements about the purportedly poor quality of the translation. Before accepting these conclusions, we should ask how strong the evidence actually is.

There are some obvious problems with Ibn al-Nadīm's account: his only first-hand experience seems to have been with the "old" translation. The Iṣḥāq-translation and that by Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh was known to him only from reports from an unnamed source; his authority for the "old" version is a comment about its length by Ibn al-Ṭayyib al-Saraḥṣī.²⁴

companion and confidant of the later Caliph al-Mu'taḍid (r. 892–902), he was imprisoned and died shortly afterwards; the reasons for his fall from grace and death are unclear (cf. Rosenthal 1943, p. 25–39). Apart from original works on various subjects, he produced a number of abridgements and short commentaries on Aristotelian works (cf. Flügel 1871–1872, p. 261f and Dodge 1970, vol. 2, p. 626ff).

²² Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. i) persuasively argues that Ibn al-Nadīm's readers would, unless otherwise specified, always assume a translation to be Arabic.

²³ Cf. Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. i), Heinrichs (1969, p. 51) and Kassel (1971, p. 90f). According to Gutas (1993, p. 252f), *naql qadīm* was a technical term for pre-Ḥunayn translations.

²⁴ Peters (1968, p. 28) interprets Ibn al-Nadīm's note as evidence for a copy *made* by

While it seems justified to accept al-Sarāḥsī's remark as confirmation for the existence of an "old" version, Ibn al-Nadīm's testimony leaves much unsaid. A reconstruction of the translation history of the *Rhetoric* into Arabic cannot trust in his words alone.

The notes in the margin and body of the manuscript also pose problems. Successive scholars have tried to make sense of the partly illegible text and offered readings and interpretations which determined their reconstruction of the text's history. The progressive deterioration of the manuscript in the course of the twentieth century has made the notes even harder to read. In the following paragraphs, we will limit our discussion to the readings proposed by Lyons, Stern, Georr and Badawī²⁵ together with my own examination of a microfilm copy of the manuscript.

Lyons reconstructs eight notes,²⁶ which are below the text towards the bottom of f. 65v (nos. 1–3 below) or in the left margin of the folio (4–8). Their placement on the page is as follows: notes 1–3 are written one after another in separate lines at the end of the text. On the left margin, note 5 is the topmost, followed by note 8 about midway down the page. We find notes 6, 4 and 7 (in this sequence) in the left margin of the bottom third of the page. As previous commentators have pointed out, some of them are exceedingly difficult to make out, especially on microfilm. My observations are therefore tentative at best.

The various notes seem to be written in different hands. This is most obvious in the case of notes 6 and 7 as compared to notes 4, 5 and 8 (which seem to be by the same scribe). Except for note 3, those at the bottom of the page are harder to decipher; my suspicion is that all of them are written in yet other hands, even though notes 2 and 3 could have been added by the same scribe. The microfilm gives no indication that any differently-colored inks were used except for parts of note 4 (see below).

Ibn al-Ṭayyib or another of al-Kindī's followers: "this copy of the *vetus* made by one of his pupils suggests that the *Rhetorica* was also studied in the circle of al-Kindī; in whose translation is not known."

His claim about the copy's origin is very difficult to verify; Peters' suggestion that the *Rhetoric* was known to and studied by members of the Kindī-circle sounds more promising. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 461) presents the material pertaining to writings on the *Rhetoric* ascribed to al-Kindī and his contemporary Muḥammad ibn Mūsā (d. 873). The translation's relation to the output of the Kindī-circle will be studied in the following chapter. For a succinct presentation of the available material on the Kindī-circle's interest in the *Rhetoric*, see Montgomery (2006, p. 99ff).

²⁵ Badawī (1959).

²⁶ Cf. Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. ivff).

The first three notes are below Ibn al-Samḥ's *explicit* on f. 65v:

(١) [...] سنة ثلاثة (؟؟) وتسع و [...] ثلثين لاسكندر بن فيليس²⁷

It is impossible to draw any information from this all but illegible passage. The next note is more informative:

(٢) للشيخ ظفر بن منصور بن [يوحنا] في التاريخ [...] عشر وهي سنة [...]
ثلثمائة وثلثين لاسكندر²⁸

Badawī proposes a different reading:

نسخ ظفرت منصور بن [...] في التاريخ [...] وهي سنة ثلثمائة وتسع وثلاثين
للاسكندر²⁹

Assuming that an 'alf ("thousand") is missing, this note would put us in the year 1339 of the Seleucid calendar; a concrete date which fits well into the reconstruction of the history of the text: 1339 equals 1027 CE, the year of Ibn al-Samḥ's death. Unfortunately, neither of the lacunae would be a suitable place for an addition. His discussion of this note suggests that there is no gap where we would expect the 'alf, viz. between *sanab* and *talātumi'ab*. Without it, the date becomes incomprehensible.

(٣) بلغت مقابله في التاريخ [...]³⁰ سنة ثمانى عشرة واربع مائة لهجرة سيدنا
محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم³¹

The note gives the same date 418 AH, which corresponds to the year 1027 CE.³²

Stern reads the first notes somewhat differently. He does not mention the first and presents the text Lyons assigns to notes 2 and 3 as a single comment:

²⁷ "[In] the year three (??) [...] and nine and [...] thirty according to the reckoning of Alexander, son of Philip". Square brackets indicate conjectures and manuscript damage.

Badawī can only identify the words *tis'ūn* and *li-l-Iskandar ibn Fīlibus*. The ascription *li-Iskandar ibn Fīlibus* refers to the Seleucid calendar, the first year of which began in autumn 312 BCE.

²⁸ "For the *šayb* Zafar ibn Manšūr ibn [Yūḥannā] at the date [...] ten and that is the year [...] three hundred and thirty according to the reckoning of Alexander".

²⁹ "Manuscripts were acquired [by] Manšūr ibn [...] at the date [...] and that is the year three hundred and thirty-nine according to the reckoning of Alexander".

³⁰ Badawī: الذي.

³¹ "Its collation was achieved at the date [...] [in] the year four hundred and eighteen after the *hiğrab* of our lord Muḥammad, praise be upon him".

³² *Muqābalah* means "collation", "comparison" or also "correction"; cf. Gacek (2001, p. 112, s. v. *q-b-l*).

... ظفر بن منصور بن ... في التاريخ وهي سنة الف ثلاثمائة وتسع وثلثين لاسكندر
في التاريخ الذي سنته ثمانين عشر واربع مائة لهجرة سيدنا محمد صلى الله عليه
وسلم³³

According to Stern's reading, the phrase *balaġat muqābalah*, placed at the beginning of note 3 by Lyons, belongs in the the margin of the manuscript, right after *li-l-Iskandar*. He explains that it should not be joined to the following line and be linked to the second date (as Lyons assumes), but continues the previous line and follows right after the first date. He maintains that it refers to the copying of the manuscript at the time of the first date, not to a collation at a later point. Interestingly, Stern is able to make out in the manuscript (which in this place is badly damaged) the 'alf' missing in both Lyons' and Badawī's second note. Hence, according to his reading, both dates identical.³⁴

His claim that notes 2 and 3 belong together is plausible, should they indeed refer to the same date in different calendar systems; however, as I have mentioned above, my inspection of the microfilm left some doubts whether they were written in the same hand.³⁵

(٤) بلغت المقابلة من النسخة التي بخط ابي علي ابن³⁶ الشيخ³⁷ ووقع التصحيح بحسبها والله الحمد سنة³⁸ تسع³⁹ ومايتين⁴⁰

Going back in time, we are now in the year 209 (or 207), apparently

³³ "... Zafar ibn Maṣūir ibn ... at the date which is the year one thousand and three hundred and thirty-nine according to the reckoning of Alexander at the date of which the year was four hundred and eighteen after the *hijrah* of our lord Muḥammad, praise be upon him".

³⁴ Stern (1956, p. 42f).

³⁵ Given the sorry state of the manuscript, the date of the consultation by these various scholars must have substantially influenced their respective readings and, based on it, their views on the history of the manuscript and the Arabic *Rhetoric*. As far as we know, Lyons' edition is based on a transcript produced in 1959 (cf. Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. xiii). He was preceded by Stern who must have consulted the manuscript in or before 1956 and also relied on a second examination of the colophon by George Vajda (Stern, 1956, p. 43, n. 1, 3). Georr must have seen the manuscript before the publication of his monograph on the Syriac and Arabic versions of Aristotle's *Categories* (Georr, 1948). The first Western scholar to study the colophon to the *Rhetoric* was Margoliouth (1897, p. 377). He still found a text he described as "easily legible, except where the paper is damaged". Unfortunately, he did not include a transcript of these invaluable notes in his article.

³⁶ Badawī: بن.

³⁷ Georr: emended to بن السمع.

³⁸ Georr: om. والله الحمد, cont. لسنة.

³⁹ Badawī: سبع.

⁴⁰ "The collation was achieved from the manuscript which was in the hand of Abū 'Alī

AH. This marginal note has been variously interpreted: Stern and Georr want to emend the name to read Ibn al-Samḥ which would invalidate the reading of the year and, given that the date is indeed corrupt, possibly duplicate information already contained in note 3., i.e. the fact of Ibn al-Samḥ's collation.⁴¹ The term *taṣḥīḥ* can refer to a number of activities, among them a "correction" on the basis of the abovementioned manuscript or even the production of an edition.⁴² Georr contends that the name has been changed through diacritical points in a different handwriting and proposes the same emendation. The microfilm reveals that the diacritics Stern and Georr claim to be later additions are indeed somewhat bigger than the diacritics in the rest of the note. Additionally, the dots above the letters *ṣ* and *ḥ* seem to be in a slightly different color than the remainder of the note.

Lyons doubts the necessity of such an intervention and maintains that the person in question is someone other than Ibn al-Samḥ. Read this way, note 4 can be interpreted as an indicator for yet another stage in the transmission of the text, a collation that took place in either 824/5 or 822/3 CE. But without any corroborating evidence, all this, as Lyons reminds us, "must remain mere speculation".

Some even more interesting scraps of information are to be found in the four remaining notes, written on the margin of the same manuscript page. The first one reads:

(٥) [...] هذه النسخة عن⁴³ نسخة كانت بخط ابي العباس بحسب الطاقة والاجتهاد [لسنة] ثلثمائة وعشرين⁴⁴

Another date, 320 AH (932 CE), and another name, Abū al-ʿAbbās. With Stern, one might argue that this snippet, written in the left margin of the page, was copied from Ibn al-Samḥ's manuscript.⁴⁵ On the other hand, it seems odd that it was added in the margin like a later addition rather than integrated into the notes at the end of the text body where the scribe quoted the colophon from Ibn al-Samḥ's text.

ibn al-Ṣayḥ and the correction [or edition] on the basis of it [sc. the manuscript in the hand of Abū 'Alī] took place—thanks be to God—[in] the year two hundred and nine."

⁴¹ Stern (1956, p. 43), Georr (1948, p. 189).

⁴² Cf. Gacek (2001, p. 82, s. v. *ṣ-ḥ*).

⁴³ Badawī: على.

⁴⁴ Badawī: مستمائة وعشرة. The note translates as "this copy from a copy which was [written] in the hand of Abū al-ʿAbbās to the best of his abilities [lit. 'according to the ability and effort'] [(in) the year] three hundred and twenty".

⁴⁵ Stern (1956, p. 42f).

(٦) طالع فيه ابراهيم الدمشقي اليوسفي ١١٣⁴⁶

According to this note, a certain Ibrāhīm al-Dimašqī al-Yūsufī “studied” the text.⁴⁷ More interesting than al-Dimašqī’s activities is the number 113 written, strangely enough, as a number instead of being written out as a date. Lyons cautiously approves Stern’s interpretation: the earliest year given in these notes, i.e. 113 AH (731 CE), could be taken as the actual date of translation. This would place the *Rhetoric* at the very beginning of the Greek-Arabic translation activities. With no other evidence to start from than the aforementioned set of notes, Lyons’ carefully worded conjectures have not yet been challenged. Heinrichs finds the argument behind Lyons’ dating not entirely persuasive but still maintains that an Umayyad-era translation remains a distinct possibility.⁴⁸

The last two notes do not add any significant information to our account so far. A certain ‘Abd al-Faḳīr Muṣṭafā studied the text at an unspecified date and the manuscript ended up in the library of a Cairene named ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Īsā in the year 509 AH (1115 CE). They read as follows:

(٧) طالع فيه العبد الفقير [مصطفى] بن [...] ⁴⁹

(٨) ملك عبد الله بن عيسى القاهرة سنة تسعا وخمسمائة⁵⁰

As we have seen, the elaborate argument behind the Umayyad dating of the translation of the *Rhetoric* proposed by Lyons and others rests on a number of assumptions and conjectures, beginning with their reconstruction of the notes discussed above. Choosing to overlook several of their inconsistencies, some of which can be clearly seen in their conflicting interpretations of the notes,⁵¹ Stern’s and Lyons’ account remains at

⁴⁶ “Ibrāhīm al-Dimašqī al-Yūsufī studied it [in] 113”. Georr omits the number even though it is clearly visible on the microfilm of the manuscript and placed right beneath the note in a way that suggests that they belong together.

⁴⁷ The verbal noun *muṭāla‘ah* can also refer to notes produced during study; cf. Gacek (2001, p. 93, s. v. *ṭ-l-’*).

⁴⁸ Heinrichs (1984, p. 313).

⁴⁹ “‘Abd al-Faḳīr [Muṣṭafā] ibn [...] studied it”. The letters visible in what Lyons marked as the second lacuna seem to form at least two words, possibly additional parts of the name. Neither Badawī nor Georr quote this note.

⁵⁰ Badawī: om. وملك عبد الله بن عيسى القاهرة. تسع. Translation: “Property of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Īsā, Cairo, [in the] year five hundred and nine”.

⁵¹ We should again remind ourselves that their variant readings and interpretations could have been caused by the deterioration of the manuscript.

least highly attractive: it provides a framework for the history of the text and, most importantly, limits the translation timeframe.

Part of its attractiveness lies in the fact that it would place the text *before* the translation activities collectively classified as the Greek-Arabic translation movement which, according to Dimitri Gutas, did not begin in earnest before the ‘Abbāsīd revolution.⁵² It could have preserved traces of a stage in translation techniques and terminological remnants antedating the later, more systematic translation efforts. These considerations should be addressed in any attempt to date our text.

With Ibn al-Nadīm and internal “metatextual” evidence thus weakened, there is only one more source to turn to for the verification of an early date: the translation itself, its formal and textual features. These will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Apart from the translation date, the structure and style of the text can shed some light on another, equally important question of text history: the involvement of a Syriac intermediary. As will be seen below, findings from our translation have been drawn on to argue both for and against the mediating role of a Syriac text in the transmission of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* to the Islamic world.

THE SYRIAC TRANSLATION TRADITION

In our historical sketch in the previous chapter, we have seen that the history of the Arabic translations is intimately linked to the preceding Syriac translation tradition. The reception of the *Rhetoric* in Syriac was in turn bound up with the transmission of Aristotle’s logical writings, the *Organon*. Contrary to present-day perceptions, both Aristotle’s *Poetics* and his *Rhetoric* were seen as an integral part of the *Organon* by Arabic observers—whence its inclusion in our manuscript which represents, in the words of Dimitri Gutas, “a one-volume encyclopedia of the history of Arabic logic in Baghdad for over a century”.⁵³ How did the *Rhetoric* come to be seen as a “logical” treatise and how did this classification influence its transmission into Syriac and Arabic?

⁵² Cf. Gutas (1998, p. 23f).

⁵³ Gutas (1998, p. 147). The classification of the *Rhetoric*—as a logical work in the Arabic tradition and, together with his ethical writings, as part of practical philosophy in the Latin tradition—constitutes a key difference between the reception in the Islamic world and the Latin West during the Renaissance; cf. Rapp (2002, vol. 1, p. 296). On the theory of the “poetical” syllogism, cf. Schoeler (1983).

Aristotle's own remarks about the closeness of the *Rhetoric* to the art of dialectic on the one hand⁵⁴ and politics on the other certainly facilitated the process of assigning the work to the logical arts; this classification was "formalized" around the fifth century by the late antique commentators who added it to the *Organon*.⁵⁵ It was well established in the late Alexandrian tradition, possibly by the time of the Neoplatonic philosopher Ammonius (of Alexandria, d. 517 or 526);⁵⁶ his pupil Simplicius (fl. ca. 530) already takes it for granted.⁵⁷ Statements by these commentators show that both the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* were assumed to describe types of fallacious reasoning, an idea that was taken up and elaborated by Muslim philosophers such as al-Fārābī.⁵⁸ In several of his works, the philosopher expressed contemporary ideas about the classification of the logical disciplines and justified the "logical" relevance of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* with a variety of arguments, some of which directly reflect late antique thinking about the status and contents of these two books. They depended on a view of Aristotle's *Organon* which assigned specific roles to each of its components: the first two treatises introduced the basic building blocks of reasoned speech, i.e. terms (in the *Categories*) and propositions (in the *De interpretatione*). On this basis, Aristotle developed a general theory of rational argumentation in his *Prior Analytics*: the *sylogism*. Subsequent treatises described specific applications of the theory of syllogistic reasoning, namely demonstrative or scientific arguments in the *Posterior Analytics* and dialectic reasoning in the *Topics*. The remaining three books of the *Organon* dealt with flawed or inferior types of rea-

⁵⁴ *Rhetoric* 1354a1. Cf. Brunschwig (1996) on the similarities and differences between the *Rhetoric* and the central Aristotelian work which discusses the theory and practice of dialectics, the *Topics*.

⁵⁵ Würsch (1991, p. 1).

⁵⁶ Cf. Goulet (1989-, vol. 1, p. 168ff).

⁵⁷ Heinrichs (1969, p. 105f). Walzer (1962e, p. 133ff) traces the classification of the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* as logical treatises in the Alexandrian commentary tradition.

⁵⁸ Cf. Boggess (1970, p. 86–89) and Black (1990, p. 1f). The latter source is fundamental for the history of the "logical" interpretation of the two books in antiquity and medieval Islam. The author traces the history and philosophical implications of the inclusion of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* in the *Organon* under the (somewhat opaque) label "context theory". The verdict of most of her reviewers was unqualifiedly positive; cf. Rosemann (1991), Leaman (1992), Ormsby (1992) and Würsch (1994).

In his carefully argued and detailed review, Lameer (1993) criticizes some of the philosophical arguments and textual evidence Black cites to support her central claim that Muslim philosophers devised their own theory about the logical relevance of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* instead of, as Lameer suggests, taking it for granted since it was part of the very same body of late antique commentary sources from which they derived large parts of their interpretation of Aristotle's logical works.

soning which do not result in incontrovertible truths such as sophistical arguments (*Sophistical Refutations*) and rhetorical and poetical reasoning (*Rhetoric* and *Poetics*).⁵⁹

The study of rhetorical reasoning was not just intended to identify and avoid it as a defective, pseudo-logical form of argument, it also served a number of positive purposes: firstly, as al-Fārābī explained, some problems are not amenable to be solved by any of the logical methods that lead to absolute certainty, they can only be argued effectively with lesser methods of reasoning such as rhetorical proofs. Secondly, rhetorical and poetical reasoning play an important role in education, e.g. during those stages in which students do not yet understand methods of reasoning that lead to certainty. Rhetorical proofs and poetic images, he claimed, are constructed on the model of the latter or can at least potentially be transformed into valid proofs. Finally, different audiences require philosophical truths to be couched in different terms corresponding to their level of comprehension: there is an elite of the “initiated”, properly trained in philosophy, who understand syllogistic proofs whereas rhetorical arguments and poetic images are proper for “the masses”. The methods described in the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* are appropriate for “uninitiated” students who have not been exposed to philosophy and are therefore still incapable of understanding higher forms of logical reasoning.⁶⁰

The classification of the two works as belonging to logic is an integral part of the Islamic philosophers’ understanding of Aristotle and his works: al-Kindī presents it in his treatment of the order and relevance of the Aristotelian corpus in his *Risālah fī kammīyat kutub Aristū*.⁶¹ It plays a decisive role in a number of works by al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd and left its mark also in scientific encyclopedias and the bio-bibliographical literature.⁶² The value of a theory of philosophical rhetoric and poetics and the link between these disciplines on the one hand and logic on the other, however, was not obvious to every contemporary observer. In his *al-Maṭal al-sā’ir fī ‘adab al-kātib wa-l-šā’ir*, the historian ‘Alī ‘Izz al-Dīn ibn al-Aṭīr (d. 1233) thoroughly rubbished Ibn Sīnā’s theories of poetry and rhetoric presented in his *Kitāb al-šifā’* (*The Cure*), a multi-volume exposition of all fields of philosophy. Ibn al-Aṭīr reserved particular scorn

⁵⁹ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 487).

⁶⁰ Galston (1988, p. 207ff).

⁶¹ *On the Quantity of the Books of Aristotle*, edited by Guidi and Walzer (1940) and Abū Rīdā (1950–1954, vol. 1, p. 362–374) and translated into English by Rescher (1963); cf. also Jolivet (2004).

⁶² Black (1990, p. 2).

for the idea that rhetorical and poetic texts do or should conform to the structure of logical syllogisms.⁶³

Obviously, the assignment of the *Rhetoric* to the field of logic had a huge impact on its translation and interpretation: almost without regard to the relevance of its subject matter to the study of literature, the text was relegated to the field of philosophical inquiry.⁶⁴ Commentators and translators from late antiquity to Islamic philosophers such as Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd expended a considerable amount of energy on discovering the “logical” relevance of both the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. Translations and commentaries eloquently testify to their immense efforts to match the text to their preconceptions.

The previous Syriac reception of the *Rhetoric* was equally affected by the late antique interpreters and their insistence on the book’s logical affiliation. Potentially, Syriac translation(s) of this text and the other components of the *Organon*, not to mention kindred texts such as summaries and commentaries, would have been an obvious transmission channel for this and other ideas.⁶⁵ To assess the likelihood of a Syriac intermediary for the Arabic *Rhetoric*, we will now turn to the history of the Syriac translation tradition.

Strikingly, evidence for the existence of rhetorical literature in Syriac seems to be exceedingly sparse. Apart from a Syriac translation of the *Rhetoric* of uncertain date (more on which below), the first conspicuous example of a rhetorical text appears relatively late: a rhetorical treatise by Antony of Tagrit, placed in the ninth century by the prolific scholar and writer Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286) and epitomized in Jacob (or Severus) bar Šakko’s (d. 1241) *Book of Dialogues*.⁶⁶ Antony’s work was apparently not influenced in any way by Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* but already exhibits the same link between rhetoric on the one hand and political life on the other that was to be such a prominent element in al-Fārābī’s rhetorical

⁶³ al-Hūfi and Ṭabānah (1959–1962, vol. 2, p. 5f), quoted and translated by Heinrichs (1969, p. 110f).

⁶⁴ Heinrichs (1969, p. 103f, 106).

⁶⁵ On the basis of the correspondence of the Nestorian Catholicus Timothy I (d. 823), Berti (2007) illustrates the relegation of the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* to Aristotle’s *Organon* in the Syriac philosophical tradition.

⁶⁶ Cf. Watt (1987) on Antony’s *Rhetoric* and possible Greek and Latin sources for his theory of rhetorical figures; Watt (1995a, p. 65f) lists some of the finer points of Antony’s rhetorical thought which he inherited mostly from Hellenistic rhetorical authorities instead of the classical Greek rhetorical literature. His work, the only of its kind in Syriac literature, intended to be a guide to the practice of rhetoric rather than its theory; cf. Baumstark (1922, p. 278).

thought.⁶⁷ Watt notes an apparent lack of interest in rhetorical learning in Syriac writings but also maintains that rhetorical concepts were assimilated continuously into Syriac literature between the fourth and the ninth centuries and explicitly singles out theological works, particularly the sermon genre, as a fertile ground for the application of rhetorical knowledge.⁶⁸

Logical texts, on the other hand, found a receptive Syriac audience. The importance of logic was recognized early on, e.g. by the sixth-century scholar Sergius of Rēš'aynā who maintained that it was an indispensable tool for the study of philosophy and science.⁶⁹ Not only that, theologians soon realized that it could be forged into a powerful weapon against dissenters and heretics.⁷⁰ Studies of Greek logic were undertaken mainly in the seventh century in the monastery of Qennešrīn under the influence of Severus Sēbōht (d. 667). His pupils, Athanasius of Balad (d. 686) and Jacob of Edessa (d. 708) and Jacob's friend and student George, Bishop of the Arabs, were among the most important translators of the *Organon* into Syriac.⁷¹ A glance at the known translations of and commentaries on Aristotle's logical works shows that late antique Syrian scholars concentrated their efforts on three key texts: the *Categories*, *De interpretatione* and the *Prior Analytics*. In addition, they translated and commented on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, often added to the *Organon* as a general introduction to Aristotelian logic.⁷²

Contemporary interest in logic was not just limited to secular (philosophical and scientific) learning; much more importantly, theological studies, specifically the need for a conceptual framework to formulate and debate theological doctrines, provided a motivation to study logic outside the small circles of scholars engaging in philosophical and scientific research.⁷³ Many theological scholars of the time were also trained physi-

⁶⁷ Watt (2005, p. 9f). He also speculates that al-Fārābī's ideas on the political role of rhetoric could have been inspired by the Christian Baghdad Aristotelians who were the heirs of the same tradition that inspired Antony of Tagrit, a topic he treats in more detail in Watt (1995b); cf. also Watt (1993b) on further parallels between Antony and al-Fārābī.

⁶⁸ Watt (1994, p. 244, 246ff). For examples of indirect transmission of rhetorical and rhetoric-political concepts into Syriac and then on into Arabic literature, cf. Watt (1995a, p. 67f, 71–75).

⁶⁹ Hugonnard-Roche (1991b, p. 187f).

⁷⁰ Cf. Würsch (1991, p. 5).

⁷¹ Hugonnard-Roche (1990, p. 138).

⁷² Cf. Brock (1993, p. 3–7).

⁷³ The theological dimension of logical studies found one of their most vivid expressions in the introduction to a commentary to the *Prior Analytics* by George, Bishop of

cians. Since logic was an integral part of the medical curriculum at late antique schools (e.g. in Alexandria), there was a certain demand for the translation of logical texts into Syriac. The connection between theological, medical and logical studies was so close that we often find the same scholars translating both theological and logical writings.⁷⁴

Apart from the works listed above, the *Rhetoric* also seems to have received some attention in Syrian scholarly circles: in a seventh-century letter to a fellow scholar, Yaunan the *Periodeutēs*,⁷⁵ Severus Sēbōht refers to some problems discussed in the *Rhetoric*. According to Lyons, his remarks might not help us to identify a Syriac source for our Arabic translation but they provide at least some evidence for the existence of a Syriac version as early as the seventh century.⁷⁶ If not for any other reason, the *Rhetoric* may have been translated because it was regarded as a logical work and part of the *Organon*.

Taking a closer look at the letter, however, Gerrit Reinink establishes that the problems Severus examines all relate to logic, in particular to Yaunan's understanding of issues treated in *De interpretatione* and in the *Prior Analytics*. No reference is made to the *Rhetoric*, not even in Severus' answer to Yaunan's question regarding the arrangement of Aristotle's logical works.⁷⁷ The evidentiary value of Severus' scholia to the *Rhetoric* has been called into question by Heinrichs who cites the existence of Arabic notes and smaller writings on the *Poetics* even before its translation by Abū Bišr Mattā and argues that we do not have any conclusive evidence for Syriac translations of the *Rhetoric* or the *Poetics* prior to the rise of Islam.⁷⁸ To underline the need for new sources on the question of an early Syriac translation of the *Poetics*, he presents two conflicting arguments, both of which apply equally well to the *Rhetoric*: firstly, the inclusion of both the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* into the *Organon*, firmly established in the Alexandrian tradition since at least the beginning of the sixth century, could have been introduced into Syriac scholarly circles by Sergius of Rēš'aynā who studied in Alexandria. Assuming that Syriac translators

the Arabs, in which he outlines a complex web of symbolical correspondences between philosophy and theology; cf. Daiber (2001, p. 340).

⁷⁴ Cf. Rescher (1964, p. 16).

⁷⁵ In the Syrian churches, the *periodeutēs* was an itinerant priest who inspected the rural clergy for the local bishop.

⁷⁶ Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. i).

⁷⁷ Reinink (1983, p. 101ff).

⁷⁸ Heinrichs (1969, p. 126). There is sufficient evidence to show that a Syriac translation of the *Poetics* at least must have existed in the second half of the eighth century, cf. Berti (2007, 312f) and Schrier (1997).

and philosophers, as much as their later Arabic-speaking counterparts, endeavoured to have the entire *Organon* at their disposal in spite of their problems in understanding the subject matter of both works, it is not unlikely that the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* were at some point translated into Syriac.

Secondly, on the other hand, the study of the *Organon* in Christian schools was for religious reasons apparently restricted to certain parts of the corpus which could have excluded both texts from the early wave of translations of logical texts.⁷⁹ This phenomenon, which has a direct bearing on the Syriac reception of the *Rhetoric*, deserves some attention.

Several Muslim historians and physicians have preserved reports about the alleged transmission of philosophical and medical learning from late antique Alexandria to Islamic Baghdad. This group of purportedly historical accounts, called the “Alexandria to Baghdad” narrative, is extant in different versions transmitted in sources written between the tenth and the thirteenth century. The most famous, reported in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah’s *Ṭabaqāt al-‘aṭibbā’*,⁸⁰ is quoted on the authority of the philosopher al-Fārābī. He traces the history of philosophical instruction down from the time of Aristotle (d. 332 BCE) to the lifetime of his own teacher Yuḥannā ibn Ḥaylān. The element of the story we are interested in and that also forms part of the other versions of the narrative is the assertion by al-Fārābī that sometime after the advent of Christianity (which, he claims, led to the cessation of philosophical teaching in the city of Rome), the Christian authorities stepped in and reformed the philosophical curriculum in Alexandria: they restricted the teaching of logic by removing those parts of the *Organon* from the official curricula which they considered “harmful” to Christianity, including everything that followed after the discussion of the assertoric syllogism in the *Prior Analytics*.⁸¹ This meant that parts of the *Prior Analytics* (after the seventh chapter of Book One) and the *Posterior Analytics*, *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations* in their

⁷⁹ Heinrichs (1969, p. 114f).

⁸⁰ Müller (1884, vol. 1, p. 134f), translated into English by Rosenthal (1992, p. 50f). This particular version of the narrative has been commented on by numerous scholars. For the most recent and comprehensive interpretation and a detailed discussion of previous attempts to understand the report, cf. Gutas (1999) who is the main source for my own remarks.

⁸¹ As Daiber (2001, p. 334) notes, there never was an ecclesiastical decree restricting logical teaching in Alexandria. Given the relatively peaceful co-existence of Christians and pagans in contemporary Alexandria, such an intervention would have been highly unlikely. On the Christian teaching tradition in Alexandria, its institutional structure and its historical background, cf. van den Broek (1995).

entirety, called “the part that is not studied” by al-Fārābī, were not officially taught any more. He adds that this restriction was lifted only after the Muslim conquest; more specifically, he credits his own teacher and his generation with expanding logical teaching to include the neglected texts.⁸² None of the extant reports mentions the *Rhetoric* or *Poetics* but it would not be too far-fetched to assume that they were also affected: considered part of the *Organon*, late antique scholars listed them right after the *Sophistical Refutations* in their registers of Aristotle’s logical writings.

The historicity of al-Fārābī’s account (and that of the other versions of the report) is debatable⁸³ but he is not our only evidence for a change in logical teaching in late antique Alexandria. In a twelfth-century treatise on syllogistics, the scientist and logician Aḥmad ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 1153) refers to the branches of logic that follow the assertoric syllogism as “the part which is not read”, a label he ascribes to late antique Alexandrian scholars. Also, Pines points to the existence of Syriac manuscripts which only contain the first seven chapters of Book One of the *Prior Analytics* and maintains that the text was not translated into Syriac in its entirety before the ninth century—i.e. only with the advent of the Arabic-Greek translation movement.⁸⁴ The Syriac commentary tradition also reflects the distinction between the first chapters of the first book and the rest of the text: already at the time of the sixth-century translator and commentator Prōḃā, commentaries of the *Prior Analytics* stopped after the seventh chapter of Book One. The shortened *Prior Analytics* also found its way into Arabic logical literature: at the very beginning of the Arabic logical tradition, the *kātib* (court official) and translator Ibn al-Muqaffāʿ (d. 756) penned a paraphrase of Aristotelian logic which also stops with *Prior Analytics* I.7, informing the reader that this is the end of the book.⁸⁵

On the basis of a thorough analysis of all versions of the narrative

⁸² Gutas (1999, p. 183f).

⁸³ As is the extent to which Syriac and early Arabic logical literature reflect any limitations on the texts which were studied and commented upon; there is also no evidence for it in the Greek sources which formed the basis for the Syriac reception. If anything, the noticeable focus of Syriac and early Arabic scholars on the first seven chapters of Book One of the *Prior Analytics* more likely resulted from practical considerations, e.g. the fact that these chapters presented a self-contained discussion of the three types of syllogisms which were most useful as instruments in contemporary theological debates and the justification of church dogma; cf. Daiber (2001, p. 334f).

⁸⁴ Pines (1996, p. 127f).

⁸⁵ On this interesting text which had long been assumed to be translated from Persian, see Hein (1985, p. 41–46) and Lameer (1994, p. 11f). It has been edited by Dānēš-Pāžūh (1978).

(which differ on some important details), Gutas isolates two distinct developments that were conflated by the sources of the various “Alexandria-to-Baghdad” reports: the first one, affecting the *Greek* teaching tradition, is a reform of the Greek medical and logical curriculum in Alexandria in the sixth century. In an effort to streamline medical education, certain texts (including a number of treatises of the *Organon*) were not officially taught any more but could still be studied in private. The second, two centuries later, concerned *Syriac* logical teaching and involved its expansion to include those texts that had not officially been taught before. The confusion of the different versions of this narrative centers on which texts exactly were taught in which tradition (Greek or Syriac) in the course of medical and logical training.⁸⁶ The relegation of some texts to “what was not read/studied” left its traces in the Syriac and (at least at its beginning) the Arabic translation and commentary tradition: we know of several Syriac translations and commentaries for each of those texts that were officially taught but virtually none for the rest.⁸⁷ If we take the same to apply to the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* (and it has to be repeated that the above evidence is indirect at best), the case for an early Syriac translation of the *Rhetoric* would look very weak indeed.

So far, all we can say with some assurance is that Syriac authors were probably acquainted with the text but that does not require the existence of written or textual knowledge. As it is, the only reliable witness for the existence of a Syriac translation—which we are not in a position to date—is the Arabic *Rhetoric* itself. There are two types of evidence that have been derived from the Arabic translation: Ibn al-Samḥ’s marginal notes referring to a Syriac version; and terminological features of the translation that point to a Syriac source text. We will look at both of them in turn.

Like the other translations of logical works included in our manuscript, the *Rhetoric* contains several marginal notes which seem to indicate the existence of a Syriac version. These notes are partly anonymous and most of them, due to their re-translation into Arabic by Ibn Suwār or some other commentator, cannot be identified and assigned to concrete translations or authors, but they are sufficient to confirm the existence of a Syriac version at the time of the eleventh-century collator of the text, Ibn al-Samḥ.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Gutas (1999, p. 184ff).

⁸⁷ Cf. the lists compiled by Brock (1993).

⁸⁸ Hugonnard-Roche (1991a, p. 195) and Watt (2005, p. 7).

John Watt's research on the major Syriac compendium of Aristotelian philosophy, Bar Hebraeus' *Butyrum sapientiae* (*Cream of Wisdom*), has opened up a new perspective on the question of a Syriac intermediary for the Arabic *Rhetoric*. The *Butyrum*, completed shortly before its author's death in 1286, covers the entire sweep of Aristotelian philosophy including the *Rhetoric*. In the first section of the book which deals with logic, Bar Hebraeus takes up the writings of the *Organon* according to the canonical sequence established in late antiquity and adopted by Muslim philosophers, starting with Porphyry's *Isagoge* and ending with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*. He mainly paraphrases the corresponding sections of Ibn Sīnā's *Kitāb al-šifā'*, supplementing it with material from additional sources. The section on the *Rhetoric* consists of a paraphrase which depends both on Ibn Sīnā and the text of the Arabic *Rhetoric*. Where Bar Hebraeus only paraphrases the translation (e.g. sections of the text which Ibn Sīnā passes over), he remains very close to the Arabic translation: indeed, closer to the Arabic version than to any Greek text we know. On the other hand, he often transcribes Greek terms where the Arabic translation (and also Ibn Sīnā) use genuinely Arabic equivalents. Assuming that the Syriac text contained in the *Butyrum* was not translated from the Arabic version (a very unlikely possibility), these findings can be explained in two different ways: either the Arabic translation was effected on the basis of the Syriac version or both the Arabic and Syriac *Rhetoric* were produced from very similar Greek source texts. A combination of the two explanations would also be plausible: the Arabic translator, working from the Greek, may have consulted the same Syriac version which was subsequently used in Bar Hebraeus' *Butyrum*. Whatever the case, the evidence from the *Butyrum* suggests that a Syriac translation of the *Rhetoric* antedates Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq since it is at least as old as—if not older than—the Arabic translation.⁸⁹

The terminology of the Arabic *Rhetoric* is the second important source of information about a potential Syriac intermediary. In his remarks on some of the quirks of the text, Malcolm Lyons takes the existence of such an intermediary more or less for granted.⁹⁰ His position on the existence and use of a Syriac translation in the production of our Arabic version has found widespread acceptance.⁹¹ In support of a Syriac *Vorlage*, Es-

⁸⁹ Cf. Watt (2005, p. 8, 22–29).

⁹⁰ Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. i, xvi); cf. also Panoussi (2000, p. 234) for examples of translated terms that, according to the author, strongly suggest a Syriac source text.

⁹¹ Cf. Würsch (1991, p. 8).

tiphan Panoussi cites the evidence of transcribed names, some of which, he claims, can only be explained on the basis of a Syriac source text.⁹² As convincing as the evidence may look, it is far from conclusive. Syriacisms can have entered a text at different stages of translation and transmission. In the case of the *Rhetoric*, Ibn al-Samḥ's collation procedure is as likely a source for the alleged Syriac terminology as the translator himself.⁹³ Even if a closer analysis of the Arabic *Rhetoric* should uncover more evidence for a Syriac intermediary, Fritz Zimmermann's advice still applies:

We must bear in mind that a Christian translator accustomed to Syriac routines of literary expression might commit Syriacisms even when translating from Greek. Only in very special cases does a peculiar turn of phrase in a Graeco-Arabic text point unequivocally to a Syriac substratum.⁹⁴

In the end, the textual evidence may be sufficient to make a Syriac intermediary "likely", but it does not amount to conclusive proof. Irrespective of Watt's arguments for a Syriac translation of the *Rhetoric* antedating Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq and its potential role in the production of our Arabic version, the contribution of the Syriac translators to the Aristotelian rhetorical tradition in the Islamic world seems negligible beyond faint echoes and vague influences. Was this because the *Rhetoric* was relegated to "what was not read" in late antique educational institutions? We have no way to tell.

⁹² Cf. Panoussi (1989, p. 196ff, 200). He also speculates about the existence of a Pahlavi intermediary between the Greek source text and the Syriac translation.

⁹³ Heinrichs (1984, p. 313f), echoed by Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 1, n. 2) and Watt (2005, p. 7). An instructive example for the role given to Syriacisms in arguing for a Syriac intermediary of an Arabic translation is Dunlop et al. (2005, p. 104–107). Dunlop compiles an impressive list of transcribed names in the Arabic *Nicomachean Ethics* which, he claims, originated from a Syriac text. At the end, he acknowledges that the role of a Syriac source text is difficult to demonstrate, only to maintain that it was "evident" since at the time this translation was produced, the use of Syriac intermediaries was a common occurrence.

⁹⁴ Zimmermann (1986, p. 114).

CHAPTER THREE
COMPARING GREEK AND ARABIC

INTRODUCTION

Now that we have shed some light on the background of the Arabic *Rhetoric* as an individual translation and as part of a wider translation tradition that links Greek, Syriac and Arabic cultures, we are in a better position to approach its text. Our focus will be on two questions: firstly, what can it tell us about the process of translation and the methods of the translator? And secondly, how can it help us supplement and specify our historical knowledge about the Greek-Arabic translation tradition and the position of the *Rhetoric* as part of this tradition?

Instead of the entire text of the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*, the following analyses (including the subchapters on translation methods, terminology and phraseology) only cover a sample amounting to about one sixth of the work. A study of such a substantial part of the *Rhetoric* will provide enough data to extrapolate findings and apply them to the rest of the text. Additionally, concentrating on a limited portion of the work enables us to apply a wider range of analytical methods and allows us to evaluate and consolidate a range of results which we can then compare to relevant data from other translations.

One decisive advantage of the slice of text we have chosen, the first half of Book Three of the *Rhetoric*, is its manageable size. Also, it represents a more or less self-contained and sustained discussion of a single subject: the role and use of style in speech. The book falls into three parts with subdivisions: the introduction (Chapter 1), the treatment of λέξις, i.e. word choice and sentence structure (Chapters 2–12) and Aristotle's discussion of τάξις, the arrangement of the parts of a speech (Chapters 13–19). Thus, the first half (which we will focus on) consists of the introduction and Aristotle's account of λέξις. The Arabic text at our disposal is somewhat shorter than the Greek source: due apparently to a missing leaf, the Arabic translation breaks off at 1412a17 and recommences at 1415a4,¹ cutting off Chapter 12 and the much of Chapter 11.

¹ Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. xiii).

From a comparative perspective, Book Three shares an important part of its subject matter and terminology with the *Poetics*, which the sample we will examine below explicitly refers to. The *Poetics*, extant in a translation produced by Abū Bišr Mattā, belongs to a later stage of the Greek-Arabic translation activities than the *Rhetoric* and provides an interesting insight into the development of the vocabulary of literary theory. Moreover, it helps us to appreciate the problems both our translator² and Abū Bišr Mattā in the early tenth century had to face while attempting to translate the wealth of literary quotations liberally sprinkled over both the discussion of Greek stylistic phenomena contained in the first half of Book Three of the *Rhetoric* and corresponding passages in the *Poetics*.³

The procedure we will follow in this chapter consists of the following steps: in the first part, we will concentrate on the introduction to Book Three of the *Rhetoric*, contrasting the Greek source text with the Arabic translation and an English rendering of the Arabic version.⁴ This English translation aims to reflect the structural and terminological features of the Arabic text as closely as possible. Each of the subdivisions we will identify, labelled “texts” and “sections”, will be prefaced with a short sketch of its contents and the structure of the arguments pursued in the Arabic version.⁵ In addition to terminological and syntactic phenomena, we will comment on textual problems.

² References to “the translator” should not be construed as glossing over problems of authorship, redaction and instances of correction and addition to the translated text. The translation we find in the Paris manuscript is anonymous and contains glosses, notes and additions by later readers. In addition, it might have undergone modifications at the hand of collators and copyists. “The translator” only serves as a shorthand for a long process of translation and tradition possibly involving several scholars.

³ For a study of literary quotations in the *Rhetoric* and their handling by the translator, see Lyons (2002). None of the quotations Lyons examines occur in the sample we will analyse in depth below.

⁴ The introduction corresponds to the first chapter of Book Three (1403b6–1404a39) according to the chapter divisions introduced by George of Trebizond in the fifteenth century, which in most cases represent relatively self-contained logical units (Kennedy, 1991, p. 13).

⁵ Both the terminology for textual units as well as elements of our approach are inspired by a set of text analytical tools developed by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason. They define a *text* as “a coherent and cohesive unit, realized by one or more than one sequence of mutually relevant elements, and serving some overall rhetorical purpose” (Hatim and Mason, 1990, p. 178). Whereas *elements* as the smallest rhetorically relevant unit (roughly coinciding with clauses or sentences) and *sections* (made up of one or more elements) only provide building blocks and cannot in themselves fully express rhetorical purposes (they only contribute to their formulation), *texts* represent rhetorically “complete” parts of linguistic phenomena.

At the same time, we will attempt to reconstruct the argumentative structure of both versions and identify sources of disagreement between them. In addition, we will analyse the translator's handling of a sample of Greek connective particles which, in the absence of graphical clues for the argumentative structure of the text, guided him in tracing and remodeling the arguments of the Greek text in his translation.

Secondly, we will introduce a comparative perspective by contrasting the first half of Book Three of the *Rhetoric* and a number of other translations spanning several phases of the Greek-Arabic translation movement, examining several terminological and lexical issues across the texts.

As we will see in our discussion of the Arabic translation, the translator had a hard time recreating Aristotle's arguments. In some places, mistranslations lead to substantial reshuffling and restructuring of the reasoning contained in the source text. The proposed analysis of the Greek and Arabic versions of the *Rhetoric* involves reconstructing the structure and sequence of arguments in the Arabic translation and its comparison with the structure of the Greek source. The resulting divisions frequently disagree with what we assume to be the argument and structure of the Greek text, exposing an important source of disagreements between the two versions.

The application of this approach to our sample serves several purposes. It allows us to retrace the argumentative steps Aristotle takes by isolating discrete arguments and determining their structure, clarifying which points Aristotle wants to make and how he goes about making them. Together with the findings of a similar analysis of the Arabic translation, the insight into the logical structure of both versions form an important step in translation analysis and assessment. They signal structural differences and divide the sample into smaller units for an in-depth analysis of semantical and syntactical disparities between source and target text. Evidence collected during this comparative step points towards strengths and weaknesses of the translator's methods. It provides information about his motivation, the cultural and intellectual background and linguistic abilities he brought to bear on the *Rhetoric*. Lastly, it suggests the influence of external factors such as stylistic expectations of his audience and political and theological considerations on his work. This cultural contextualization must, however, remain tentative due to factors such as potential scribal interventions and the vagaries of textual transmission.

Hatim's and Mason's model is explicitly geared towards the analysis of translations and their comparison with source texts.

SOME QUALIFICATIONS

Before we focus our attention on the Greek and Arabic texts, we would like to point out some of the factors influencing and sometimes impeding the extraction of a coherent set of arguments from the Arabic translation.

Firstly, as we will see below, the translator deals with a work that often overstrains his linguistic abilities. In many places, an obscure subject matter and the abundance of references to an unfamiliar literary background seriously undermine his understanding of the text.⁶ His degree of comprehension of certain passages often corresponds to the size of his basic translation unit.⁷ Where he encounters problems, he translates isolated phrases and even words, imitating the Greek word order as closely as possible. Yet, we find instances of perfectly straightforward passages which do not seem to accord with the halting literalness of its Arabic translation.⁸ Placed under these constraints, the overall argument of the Greek text is the least of the translator's concerns. It is mostly this factor which effectively prevents him from accurately reconstructing the source text's reasoning and reproducing it in his translation.

Secondly, his manuscript(s) posed their own problems—scribal mistakes, the state of repair of the material, the quality of other translations (if any) he consulted to establish and/or verify his source text. Taken together with the translation issues and oversights we find in the Arabic version, they complicate his and our task even further. It is therefore not surprising that the translation frequently fails to reproduce Aristotle's line of thought. On the contrary, the true surprise is the amount of information our translator is able to relay under these difficult circumstances.

Thirdly, how could he be expected to make sense of the purported "logical" content of the *Rhetoric*? Not only does the textual tradition and its specific problems stand in his way, he has to contend with philosoph-

⁶ Renate Würsch (1991, p. 6f) notes the changing focus of education in late antiquity away from literature and rhetoric towards the more practically minded *Bildungsideal* of the *ιατροσοφιστής*, the philosophically educated physician. Owing to the scholarly concerns of late antiquity and probably due to the existence of a highly developed Arabic literary tradition, classical Greek literary genres such as drama or poetry did not figure on the translator's list of priorities.

⁷ A translation unit is the smallest translated textual unit of a text, e.g. the single word in so-called "literal" translation or sentences or even larger-scale divisions in "meaning-based" translation. The applicability of categories such as "word-by-word" or "literal" versus "meaning-based" or "free" translation in the case of languages as structurally different from each other as Arabic and Greek will be discussed below.

⁸ A good example of literalism forced on the translator by his unfamiliarity with the subject under discussion would be Section 4 of Text II, cf. below p. 89.

ical problems beyond his reach. This becomes more apparent when we consider the later Islamic reception of the work: as we will see in the next chapter, brilliant philosophical minds such as al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd grappled with the relation between the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* and the remaining writings of the *Organon*.

In what follows, we present the Greek text according to the edition prepared by Rudolf Kassel,⁹ followed by the Arabic translation edited by Malcolm Lyons¹⁰ and my English translation of the Arabic text.¹¹ The English rendering reflects the wording and structure of the Arabic as closely as possible. All three versions are divided into parallel smaller, numbered passages. The system we have employed is similar to the arrangement John Mattock devised for his comparison of samples from different translations of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* α.¹²

TEXT COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS

Text I: Aspects of speech

The first text contains the introduction to the subsequent discussion of specific aspects of speech in Texts II and III. In Section I, we find a list of aspects of speech: *πίσταις* (*al-taṣḍīqāt*), *λέξεις* (*al-'alfāz*) and *πῶς χρῆ τὰ ἔξι/τὰ ἔξις* (*naẓm 'aw nasaq*) are named in turn. Section 2 reminds the reader of previous discussions of the aforementioned aspects, concentrating on *πίσταις* (*al-taṣḍīqāt*). It is treated in more detail in Elements 2.1f. Somewhat abruptly, 2.3 introduces *ἐνθυμήματα* (*al-tafkīrāt*), a category not mentioned in the preceding list.

Section 3 proposes *λέξεις* (*al-lafẓ wa-l-maqālah*) as the subject of the following passage. After a remark on the insufficient attention previously paid to *λέξεις* in Element 3.1, its importance is explained in 3.2.

Throughout Text I, the Greek and Arabic versions remain close to each other, down to the very word order. The translator obviously had no problem translating the passage, even if he seems to have been less than consistent with his terminology (e.g. in translating *περὶ τὴν λέξιν* first as *allātī tusta'mal fī al-'alfāz* and then as *fī al-lafẓ wa-l-maqālah*).

⁹ Kassel (1976).

¹⁰ Lyons (1982). The punctuation marks have been reproduced as they appear in both editions.

¹¹ In the footnotes, I have added Lyon's translation of problematic passages.

¹² (Mattock, 1989). Here and in the glossaries, variant readings refer to Badawī (1959), Margoliouth (1897) and Sālim (1967).

Section 1: Three central factors of speech

1403b6ff
171/1-4

(1) Ἐπειδὴ τρία ἐστὶν ἃ δεῖ πραγματευθῆναι περὶ τὸν λόγον, (2) ἐν μὲν ἐκ τίνων αἱ πίστεις ἔσονται, (3) δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὴν λέξιν, (4) τρίτον δὲ πῶς χρὴ τάξαι τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου,

(١) قال ارسطوطاليس انّ الاتي ينبغي ان يكون القول فيهنّ على مجرى الصناعة وثلاث، (٢) احدهن الإخبارات¹³ من ايّ الأشياء تكون التصديقات، (٣) والثانية ذكر الاتي تستعمل في الألفاظ، (٤) والثالثة ان كيف ينبغي أن ننظم او ننسق اجزاء القول .

(i) Aristotle said: that which we have to discuss according to the arrangement of the art¹⁴ [falls into] three [parts], (2) the first of which is the explanations about which things the confirmations derive from, (3) and the second is the account of the things that are utilized in expressions, (4) and the third: how we should organize or arrange the parts of speech.

(i)–(2) The referent for the plural enclitic *hunna* is the preceding relative pronoun *allātī*, which the translator uses strikingly often (in this case to translate the neuter plural) where one would expect the singular. As will be seen, the translator regularly uses feminine plural to render Greek neuter plural. Apart from some amplifications, probably necessitated by Aristotle's terseness (e.g. the substitution of *περὶ τὴν λέξιν* with *dikr allātī tusta'mal fi al-'alfāz*), and the placement of the nominal predicate at the end of the introductory main clause, the passage presents a literal and at the same time highly readable and stylistically apt translation.

Section 2: Previous discussion of these factors

*Element 2.1: Previous discussion of "confirmations"*1403b9f
171/5-7

(1) περὶ μὲν τῶν πίστεων εἴρηται, (2) καὶ ἐκ πόσων, (3) ὅτι ἐκ τριῶν εἰσι, (4) καὶ ταῦτα ποῖα, (5) καὶ διὰ τί τοσαῦτα μόνα.

(١) فامّا التصديقات فقد قيل فيها (٢) وبينّ [على]¹⁵ كم وجه تكون، (٣)

¹³ Sālim and Badawī: الاخبار; Badawī adds من.

¹⁴ Lyons: "(i) which should be discussed in accordance with art." The phrase *alā maḡrā al-ṣinā'ah* apparently corresponds to *περὶ τὸν λόγον*.

¹⁵ Lyons marks problematic readings with asterisks; his editorial markings have been adopted throughout the text.

وأنها تكون من ثلاثة اوجه، (٤) وايّ الوجوه تلك، (٥) ومن اجل ايّ شيء تكون كلّها، وهل هي هذه فقط،

(1) Concerning the confirmations, they have been discussed (2) and it has been clarified in how many forms they come, (3) (and) that they come in three forms, (4) (and) what forms these are, (5) and on account of which thing they all are, and whether they are these only,¹⁶

(5) The phrase *διὰ τί τοσαῦτα μόνα* has been expanded, perhaps to present both possible interpretations of the Greek passage: the (indirect) question why there are only three *ʾawḡub* (“forms”) of *taṣḍiqāt*, and an explanation that accounts for their existence.

1403b10–13
171/7–10

Element 2.2: Excursus on the sources of “confirmations”

(1) ἢ γὰρ τῶ αὐτοὶ τι πεπονθέναι οἱ κρίνοντες, (2) ἢ τῶ ποιούς τινὰς ὑπολαμβάνειν τοὺς λέγοντας, (3) ἢ τῶ ἀποδεδείχθαι πείθονται πάντες.

(١) فأنها تكون أمّا بان يعترى الحكماء هذا النحو من الألم (٢) وأمّا بان يظنّ بالمتكلمين أنّهم بهذه الحال، (٣) وأمّا بان تثبت بالثبوت المقنع لهم جميعاً.

(1) and they come [into being] either through this sort of suffering befalling those who decide [lit. “the judges”], (2) or through it being thought that the speakers are in that state, (3) or through them [sc. *al-taṣḍiqāt*] being confirmed in a manner which persuades them all.¹⁷

(1) Lyons suggests that the reading *ἢ γὰρ τοιοῦτο (τι) πεπονθέναι* might be behind the apparent amplification contained in the Arabic translation, which adds *bādā al-naḥw*.

(1)–(3) The translator misinterprets the subject, *πείθονται πάντες*, which occurs at the very end of this long period; he attaches it to the third clause, interpreting *οἱ κρίνοντες* as the subject of the first clause, *τοὺς λέγοντας* as the logical subject of the passive construction of the second and finally *πάντες* as the subject of the third.

1403b13ff
171/10ff

Element 2.3: Previous discussion of “considerations”

(1) εἴρηται δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα πόθεν δεῖ πορίζεσθαι. (2) ἔστι γὰρ τὰ μὲν εἶδη τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων, (3) τὰ δὲ τόποι.

¹⁶ Lyons: “(5) because of what they all are and whether they are these alone.”

¹⁷ Lyons: “(3) in a way which convinces them all.”

(١) ثم قيل ايضا من اين ينبغي ان تلتمس التفكيرات (٢) وان منها انواعا للتفكيرات (٣) ومنها مواضع.

(1) Furthermore, it has also been discussed from where the considerations should be derived; (2) and that there are species of thoughts (3) and topics (conventions? occasions?).

(1) The translation of ἐνθυμήματα with *al-tafkīrāt* might aim for its root meaning “thought” or “argument”.¹⁸ As a technical term in Aristotelian logic, it denoted a non-demonstrative argument drawn from probable premises, something that could be called “consideration”.¹⁹ Conveniently, *al-tafkīr* covers both meanings of “thought” and “consideration”. One of the scribes and collators of the manuscript added the unhappy gloss *al-ustuqussāt* (“the elements”) in the margin on the occasion of an earlier occurrence of the term (146/6).

Section 3: The discussion of “expression”

Element 3.1: “Expression” still to be discussed...

(1) περὶ δὲ τῆς λέξεως ἐχόμενον ἔστιν εἰπεῖν.

(١) وقد [حضر]²⁰ موضع القول في اللفظ والمقالة،

(1) This is the place to discuss expression and speech;

(1) Aristotle’s application of the term λέξις is not entirely unproblematic. In general, it denotes *how* something is expressed in contrast to λόγος, *what* is expressed. George Kennedy notes the use of the word in the Greek text to express the general notion of how thought is put into words or the more specific concept of word choice. He adds that translation has to vary

1403b15
171/13

¹⁸ The use of the II. form to denote a logical procedure is, as Würsch (1991, p. 24) explains, a common phenomenon. Examples in our text are e.g. *tasdiqāt* for *πίστευεις, ταῖν* for *ἀποδείξαι* or *δηλώσαι* or *al-tahqīq ‘aw al-tafhīm* for *σημεία*.

¹⁹ Aouad and Rashed (1997, p. 71, n. 49) note that *damir* became the “standard” translation in the later philosophical tradition, e.g. Ibn Sīnā.

M. F. Burnyeat (1996, p. 91, 96) has persuasively argued that *συλλογισμός* as a technical term should be understood as “valid argument” instead of “syllogism”, which necessarily evokes the technical apparatus of syllogistics; hence, Aristotle’s linking *ἐνθυμήματα* with *συλλογισμός* should not be read as a syllogistic category, e.g. an abbreviated syllogism or one based on probable instead of necessary premises.

²⁰ Badawī: ونظر instead of [حضر]. In Hermannus Alemannus’ Latin translation, we find *instat locus dicendi* (“[there] follows the place of speaking”), translating *mawḍi‘* literally. *Instat* suggests that Lyons’ reading is more probable than Badawī’s.

with the context; in his own translation, he prefers to retain the Greek term and leave its interpretation to the reader.²¹

In our text sample, we find that *maqālah* and *lafẓ* seem to be used interchangeably. Interestingly, synonymic expressions such as *al-lafẓ wa-l-maqālah* in this passage invariably contain the singular *lafẓ*, whereas single-word renderings of λέξις are framed as either *maqālah* or the plural *ʿalfāz*, never the singular *lafẓ*.²²

1403b15–18
171/13–16

Element 3.2: ...because speech varies in effect according to its “expression”

(1) οὐ γὰρ ἀπόχρη τὸ ἔχειν ἂν δεῖ λέγειν, (2) ἀλλ’ ἀνάγκη καὶ ταῦτα ὡς δεῖ εἰπεῖν, (3) καὶ συμβάλλεται πολλὰ πρὸς τὸ φανῆναι ποιόν τινα τὸν λόγον.

(1) فإنه ليس يكفي بان يكون الذي ينبغي ان يقال عتيداً، (2) بل (3) يحتاج باضطرار الى ان يقال ذلك على ما ينبغي، (3) ومما يشاكل التثبيت ان يكون بهذا²⁴ النحو من الكلام دون هذا.

(1) for it is not sufficient that that which is to be spoken be at hand, (2) but it is absolutely necessary that this is spoken according to what should be, (3) and [of the things in] which proof shares [is] that it should be from one kind of speech and not another.²⁵

(1)–(3) In the Greek text, the reasoning behind Aristotle’s stress on the importance of λέξις appears to fall into two distinct arguments with the second subordinate to the first: 1.) one has to know how to say something and 2.) all this (the Greek πολλὰ either refers to the entire previous clause ταῦτα ὡς δεῖ εἰπεῖν or is adverbial) contributes to give the speech a certain appearance or effect. The translator might have noticed the residual ambiguity and dissolved it (and subtly changed the text’s meaning) by subordinating both arguments to the main clause: *yaḥtāğ’ ... ʿilā ʿan yuqāl dālīka ʿalā mā yanbağī, wa-mimmā yuṣākīl...* His paraphrase of this

²¹ Kennedy (1991, p. 216).

²² Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. xxx) quotes *maqūlah*, *maqūl* and *maqūl wa-kalām* as the corresponding renderings of λέξις in Abū Biṣr Mattā’s translation of the *Poetics*, illustrating the fact that the two translations belong to different stages in the terminological development of the translation phenomenon.

²³ Margoliouth, Sālim: بل.

²⁴ Badawī: om. ب.

²⁵ Lyons: “(3) and it accords with demonstration that it should follow this manner of speech rather than that.” The status of this passage is somewhat ambiguous: it might introduce λέξις as the subject of the following remarks or list it as one more necessary element of the art of rhetoric.

not entirely unproblematic passage nevertheless manages to convey its meaning fairly well.

(3) The main clause introduced by *mimmā* can be read in two different ways, depending on the vocalization of *al-tatbīt*. Reading it as nominative (as we have done above), the sentence invites the following comments: the middle *συμβάλλεται* is read as passive, whereas the subject *πόλλα* seems to have been dropped; to make up for the missing subject, the translator introduces *al-tatbīt*, which he takes to be the topic of the passage, continuing on from Element 2.3. The pronominal suffix referring back to the subject one would expect after the conjunction *'anna* was apparently suppressed.

Reading *al-tatbīt* as an accusative, *mā* becomes the sentence's subject and renders *πολλά*, *al-tatbīt* translates *τὸν λόγον* and *al-naḥw min al-kalām* has to be interpreted as an explanatory amplification of *ποιὸν τινα*. The only drawback of this interpretation is the awkward position of *al-tatbīt*, which in my opinion strongly suggests the first explanation; it would have felt more in tune with the second version if *al-tatbīt* would have been placed inside the conjunctive clause. In this case, we would end up with a slight modification in the passage's meaning: the Greek version notes in general terms the influence of how something is said on the way it is being understood, whereas the Arabic version claims that some ways of speaking are more appropriate for proof (*al-tatbīt*) than others. Lyons' assumption that *al-tatbīt* is somehow derived from *πρὸς τὸ φανῆναι* (a passive aorist infinitive of *φαίνομαι*) is not entirely convincing; it would be more plausible if the Greek text contained an active infinitive. Moreover, *φαίνομαι* has been translated with any number of Arabic equivalents such as *qīla*, *ru'īya*, *zabara*, *zunna* or *imtaḥana*; *tabbata* is not one of them and, surprisingly and in spite of his own suggestion, did not even merit inclusion into Lyons' own glossary under the entry *φαίνομαι*.

Text II: The subject of "delivery"

Compared to the relatively clear-cut structure of Text I, it is much harder to impose any conceptual unity on Text II apart from the fact that, for the most part, it deals with the subject of *al-'ahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, the meaning of which will be discussed below on p. 78. Part of the confusion can be traced to mistranslations in key passages and a thorough re-structuring of the Aristotelian text through conjunctions and connectors. It will become obvious that our translator had only an imperfect grasp of the text's meaning and resorted to word-for-word translation in many places.

According to my reconstruction, Text II falls into six separate sections. At the beginning, we find a second list of three aspects of speech: the sources of persuasion in Element 1.1, λέξις in 1.2 and a third, unnamed aspect in 1.3.

In Section 2, we are introduced to the subject of *al-'aḥd bi-l-wuḡūh*, an “art” or “craft” which was only developed recently (2.1) and first used by poets (2.2). The text then explains the importance of the subject for rhetoric and poetry in Element 2.3 and mentions Glaukon of Teos as an authority in 2.4.

After this excursus on the historical background of *al-'aḥd bi-l-wuḡūh*, we learn about one of its important practical aspects, the voice, in Section 3. The passage explains its connection to emotions (Element 3.1) and lists several factors of vocal practice (3.2).

The following section, no. 4, suffers from the translator’s misunderstanding of the term τὰ ἄθλα (“contests”, “prizes”). Both in the Greek and the Arabic version, it concludes the first part of the text’s treatment of *al-'aḥd bi-l-wuḡūh*.

In the next section, the references to the subject we are dealing with are sometimes oblique enough to undermine its thematic unity. At the beginning (Element 5.1), we read that a “craft” of *al-'aḥd bi-l-wuḡūh* has not yet been developed. The reason, as 5.2 explains, is the late invention of λέξις, *maqālah*. Moreover, 5.3 adds, the subject is “burdensome”. What looks like a straightforward, if somewhat obscure argument is cut short in Element 5.4 with a series of apparently disjointed observations, starting with the relation between rhetoric and “opinion”. Element 5.5 states that delivery (the Greek term λέξις covered this sense as well) requires care. The following three elements (5.6ff) introduce an argument for the rejection of emotional appeals in speech, enjoining the reader to contend about things themselves and, puzzlingly, “stratagems” (*ḥīlah*). The passage closes with the conclusion that emotional appeals and rhetorical tricks “corrupt” the listener.

The final section is somewhat easier to follow. Its subject is λέξις (*maqālah*), which here means both “expression” and “delivery”. It is, we read in Element 6.1, a necessary part of all teaching and influences the clarity of speech (6.2). A mistranslation in Element 6.3 causes the translator to claim that *maqālah* should be used to appeal to listeners’ “imagination”. After noting in 6.4 that serious subjects such as geometry are not practised with the help of *maqālah*, the text states that it employs “acting” to achieve its aims (6.5). The topic of acting re-occurs after a

short digression on the theoretical treatment of *maqālah* (6.6): it is contrasted with the “stratagem” of *maqālah*. The former is classified as “natural”, the latter as “artificial”. What purports to be an argument for this claim—a master of *maqālah* becomes a “contestant” (6.8)—is again due to a mistranslation of the Greek term τὰ ἄθλα. The confusion sown in the preceding sections ruptures the connection between this and the last element (6.9), which argues that speeches derive their efficacy from *maqālah* rather than thought.

Section I: A second list of central factors of speech

Text II starts with a second introductory passage that again lists three topics which have already been or are still to be discussed. While functionally covering the same ground as Text I, the list of issues it introduces is not identical to the first one. The Greek source was the main culprit for some of the problems of the Arabic text.²⁶ One of the main reasons for the apparent rift between Books One and Two on the one hand and Book Three on the other is the history of the work: the *Rhetoric* was put together from two formerly independent works, i.e. a “manual” of rhetoric (τέχνη ῥητορικὴ) comprising the first two books of the *Rhetoric* and an independent treatise on style (περὶ λέξεως). It probably took place during Andronicus of Rhodes’ redaction of Aristotle’s writings in the first century BCE.²⁷

In Element 1.1, we read about the sources of persuasion as the first element of our list. The second subject mentioned in 1.2, still to be discussed, is its (perhaps referring to the ἰσῆνᾶ of the previous section) stylistic arrangement. Element 1.3 should contain the third item on Aristotle’s list; due to our translator’s decision to interpret the adverb οὕτω as the starting point of the next section, however, it slips off the list.

Element 1.1: The first factor—the “sources of persuasion”

- (1) τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ἐζητήθη κατὰ φύσιν, (2) ὅπερ πέφυκε πρῶτον, (3) αὐτὰ τὰ πρᾶγματα (4) ἐκ τίνων ἔχει τὸ πιθανόν.

1403b18ff
171/17–19

²⁶ This is not the only example of the text’s somewhat lax dealings with triadic lists, which are frequent in the *Rhetoric*. Brunshwig (1996, p. 47f) cites among others the lack of congruence between the tripartite division of πίστεις contained in Chapters 2 and 3 of Book One.

²⁷ Cf. Würsch (1991, p. 8) and Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 451f). For a recent, thorough discussion of the link between the parts of the *Rhetoric*, their history and dating, see Rapp (2002, vol. 1, p. 178–193).

(١) فأمّا تلك الأولى فقدّمنا النظر فيها على مجرى الطبيعة، (٢) لأنها متهيّأة في الطبع لأن تكون أوّلاً، (٣) اعني ان ننظر في الأمور أنفسها، (٤) من اين يكون الإقناع فيها،

(1) Concerning those first [matters], we have already put forward our investigation of them according to the order of nature (in the context of nature), (2) because it [sc. *tilka al-'ūlā*] is shaped by nature to come [into existence] first, (3) I mean that we investigate things themselves, (4) from whence their persuasive force derives,

(1) The adverb *πρῶτον* is translated as a substantive, disregarding the impersonal passive verb *ἐξηγήθη*. The entire passage has been rendered personal (*qaddamnā*, *nanzur*).

(2) Taking *τό* in (1) to be the article of the aforementioned *πρῶτον*, the translator loses the referent of the following relative pronoun *ὅπερ*. Its translation as *li-'anna* suggests that he might have had its absolute use (equivalent to *διόπερ*) in mind.

(3) The redesignation of *τό* keeps interfering with the translator's rendering of the text. Deprived of the subject of the sentence, he fails to identify *τὰ πράγματα* as the nominal predicate belonging to *τό*. While the structure of the Greek sentence is lost, he manages to salvage some of its sense by amplifying it to an appositive clause which seemingly refers to the entire preceding passage. In spite of the confusion engendered by the unclear referent of the *'a'nī*-clause, it becomes clear that the subject of investigation at this point is the source of persuasive force.

(1)–(4) Unsurprisingly, our translator operates on the assumption that his text is a stringent whole. His attempt to coordinate the tacked-on transition between Books Two and Three and subsequent arguments by referring to *tilka al-'ūlā* leaves the following structure unconnected; it is not at all clear what *tilka al-'ūlā* refers to. He might try to connect it to the previous clauses (*'alā mā ... wa-mimmā*). On the other hand, he might go straight back to the first list (1403b6ff = 171/1–4). In this case, *tilka al-'ūlā* would be equivalent to the first element of that list, viz. *min 'ayy al-'ašyā' takūn al-tašdīqāt*. This point will be discussed in greater detail below.

1403b20
171/19f

Element 1.2: The second factor—“expression”

(1) δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ταῦτα τῆ λέξει διαθέσθαι.

(١) وأمّا الثانية، فوضع ذلك في اللفظ او المقالة،

(i) and concerning the second [matter], the place of that is in expression or speech,

(i) To clarify the connection between this passage and the contents of the rest of the *Rhetoric*, one of the readers or copyists of the manuscript (possibly Ibn al-Samḥ himself) saw fit to insert a longer marginal note on *al-tāniyah* referring to issues discussed in the first two books. It reads:

ينبغي ان تعلم انه اخبر عن الوجه الاول في المقاليتين الاوليتين اعني من اين تؤخذ التصديقات وانه يخبر عن الوجهين الاخرين في هذه المقالة وهما حيلة الالفاظ والنظام اي النسق في التاليف

You should know that he [sc. Aristotle] discussed the first kind [sc. *min 'ayy al-'ašyā' takūnu al-taṣḍiqāt*, cf. Section I.1 on p. 67] in the first two books, I mean from where the confirmations are taken, and that he discusses the two other kinds [sc. *allātī tusta'mal fi al-'alfāz* and *kayfa yanbaġi 'an nanẓim 'aw nansuq 'aġzā' al-qawl*, cf. text I.1 on p. 67] in this book, I mean the stratagem of expressions/style and the structure, i.e. the arrangement in composition

The note refers to the first list of issues appearing in Text I. Its author perceived the apparent rift between Text I and Text II as keenly as our translator and might have felt compelled to help the translator bridge it. He adds a twist to the discussion of the two triads of rhetorical issues by relating them to the triad of books making up the *Rhetoric*.

Element 1.3: The third factor (which remains unnamed)

(1) τρίτον δὲ τούτων, (2) ὃ δύναμιν μὲν ἔχει μεγίστην,

(١) وأما الثالثة فهي هذه، (٢) ولها قوة عظيمة،

(i) and concerning the third [matter], it is these (things), (2) and it has an immense power,

(i) According to Lyons, the Arabic translation suggests that the translator read τούτο instead of τούτων. This would explain the Arabic version, which interprets that pronoun as the predicate of the subject τρίτον. With subject and predicate thus identified, the translator did not need to look further for the rest of the clause, which happens to contain the true predicate ἐπιχειρήσεται and an apposition specifying the referent of the subject, τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν. For him, the sentence ends after the relative clause

ὁ δὴ δύναμιν μὲν ἔχει μεγίστην. This oversight caused numerous problems for his understanding and translation of the subsequent text.

After following the structure of the Greek text faithfully in the course of Text I and most of the first section of Text II, the versions begin to drift apart. The Greek text continues the list of important aspects of speech in the next passage, while on the Arabic side, the list is cut short before the translator reaches the third item on Aristotle's roster. In the Arabic version, the missing item becomes the starting point for the next section. (i) The pronoun *hādihī* remains without a referent. It does not appear helpful to interpret it as a cataphoric reference to the following *hīlah*, this would seem rather far-fetched in view of the intervening *ḡayr 'anna*. Alternatively, we would have to go back as far as Element 2.3 of Text I (on p. 68 above) for a suitable referent. In the margin of the folio, *fa-biya hādihī* was glossed as follows:

في هي [sic] هذه اي النظام، لان النظام ايضا من حيلة الالفاظ

This is that, i.e. the arrangement, because the arrangement also belongs to the stratagem of expressions/style

As with the previous note, its author attempts to reconcile the lists in Sections I.1 and II.2 by simply matching them. Unfortunately, the lists are not identical. Whereas it might be tempting to equate *ἐκ τίνων αἱ πίστεις ἔσονται* (“whence the proofs derive”) with *ἐκ τίνων ἔχει τὸ πιθανόν* (“from what their persuasive force derives”) and the difference between [τὸ] *περὶ τὴν λέξιν* (“what deals with style”) and *τὸ ταῦτα τῇ λέξει διαθέσθαι* (“what deals with arrangement by style”) seems to be one of degree rather than substance, it requires some ingenuity to identify *πῶς χρὴ τάξαι τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου* (“how one should arrange the parts of speech”) with *τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν* (“what deals with acting”). But the translator has already paved the way for his identification of those items with his translation of the last component of the second list—as we have seen, a simple scribal mistake such as substituting *τοῦτο* for *τούτων* might have allowed him to drop the crucial element *τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν*, which would have stood in the way of a synchronization of both lists.

Some of the translator's misunderstandings seem to be based on his belief in the identity of both lists, a belief he shares with the author of the marginal note. His attempt to merge the lists fails not only on account of the obvious problem he has with their respective third items. Equating the first items on both lists requires him to eradicate a distinction both

Aristotle and the translator are careful to maintain, that between *πίστις* and *πιθανόν*, reproduced in the Arabic text as *taṣḍīq* and *ʾiqnāʿ*.²⁸

(i) The list discussed above also illustrates some aspects of the translator's treatment of Greek particles. Aristotle structures his enumeration of issues with the particles *μὲν* as the introductory particle and *δέ* as marker for subsequent elements of the list. The translator replicates and emphasizes this structure with the use of *ʾammā ... fā*-constructions, introduced with *fā* for the first item and connected with *wa* for subsequent items.

Section 2: "Delivery" in speech

Apart from the structural mismatch caused by the translator's decision to detach *ὑπόκρῃσις* from its position at the end of the list above, the next passage does not particularly suffer from the problems introduced in the translation of Section 1. The straightforward Greek account has been closely matched in terms of word order, but is plagued by a number of lexical problems starting with our translator's puzzling rendering of *ὑπόκρῃσις* (*al-ʾahd bi-l-wuḡūh*). In Element 2.1, we learn about the late development of the "art" or "stratagem" of *al-ʾahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, explained in 2.2 with its recent appearance in literary genres such as tragedy and rhapsody. Its relevance for rhetoric and poetry is stressed in 2.3; Element 2.4 relates in a very general way previous theoretical treatments of the subject and refers to Glaukon of Teos.

Element 2.1: The discussion of "delivery" is a recent phenomenon

1403b21f
172/1f

(i) οὐπω δ' ἐπιχειρήσεται, τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρῃσιν.

(١) غير انّ الحيلة²⁹ في الأخذ بالوجوه لم تبدى³⁰ ان تظهر بعد ،

(i) but the stratagem in the taking of faces had not begun to appear yet,

(i) Having concluded the previous section, i.e. the list of rhetorical issues, the translator now expects a structural hint pointing to the beginning of a new argument. He assumes *δέ* to be the marker he is looking for (it might indeed be read as marking a departure from the *μὲν ... δέ*-construction, referring back to *τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον* in 1403b18 = 171/17) and signals his readers in the strongest possible terms—*ḡayr ʾanna*—that a new stage

²⁸ For the meanings of and differences between the terms, cf. Würsch (1991, p. 14–20).

²⁹ Badawī: الجيلة ("natural disposition").

³⁰ Margoliouth, Sālim, Badawī: لمن يتبدى.

in the argument has been reached. Unfortunately, he disrupts the Greek text's structure by severing the passage quoted above from its place in the list and using it as an introduction to the following section on *al-'ahd bi-l-wuḡūh*. The Greek text lacks such an introductory passage; after presenting the list of speech aspects, it proceeds directly to an excursus on the subject of the third element of the list, *ὑπόκρισις*.

The appearance of *gayr 'anna* at this point strongly indicates the translator's reliance (lacking any structural elements such as punctuation or paragraphing in his manuscripts) on certain Greek particles to trace the text's logical structure—even where the Greek version does not support the resulting restructuring of the text's argument.³¹ The consequences of the modifications introduced by the translator are substantial: shortening the first section of Text II, the translator has to leave the third item on the list of speech aspects open. The passage excised from the first section is appended to the second section and serves as an introduction to the subject matter of the subsequent discussion. The smooth transition between both sections of the Greek text, which depends on the clear identification of the third list element as the subject of the following argumentation, is lost. After the incomplete list, the reader of the Arabic version is abruptly confronted with *al-'ahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, a topic seemingly unrelated to the preceding text.

(i) The insertion *οὕτω δ' ἐπικεχρίθηται* (Lyons gives *οὕτω δ' ἐπικεχρίθηται*, which is not attested in the variants listed in Kassel's edition) ends up as the beginning of a new period, whose subject is *τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν*. Lyons notes that *ἐπικεχρίθηται* in the Arabic translation comes out as a form of *ἐπιφαινομαι* rather than *ἐπιχειρέω*. The modification introduced by cutting off *οὕτω δ' ἐπικεχρίθηται, τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν* from the previous section makes itself felt: taking the passage as an independent main clause, the translator inadvertently shifts the focus from what has not yet been discussed in the *Rhetoric* to discussions going on in the field of rhetoric as a whole.

(i) This is the first encounter in this chapter with the expression *al-'ahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, used to render *ὑπόκρισις*. The problems of the Arabic expression and the ambiguous status of the Greek source term warrant a short digression.

³¹ Daiber (1980, p. 36f) mentions the opposite tendency in the translation of the *Placita philosophorum* and other texts: neglecting certain particles because of their marginal semantic content. Both the translator of the *Placita* and the *Rhetoric* often ascribe to particles a purely emphatic function.

Translating *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuǧūb* literally, as we have done throughout, as “the taking of faces”, it seems to imply both neutral aspects of “dressing up” and “masquerading” implicit in theatrical performances and negative aspects such as “mimicking” and “deception”. As such, it might only stress connotations already inherent in *ὑπόκρισις* interpreted as “acting”.

The verb *ὑποκρίνομαι* initially signified “explain” or “interpret” and “answer”; consequently, the derived substantive *ὑπόκρισις* could mean “answer” in the Ionian dialect.³² The *nomen agentis*, on the other hand, was almost exclusively used for “actor”. It is probably derived from the initial meaning “explain” instead of “answer”: the actor “explains” or “interprets” the work he performs. An actor’s most important activity was the “declamation” of a text. Unsurprisingly, the art of “delivery” also belongs to the field of rhetoric. Figuratively used, *ὑποκρίνομαι* was applied e.g. to describe human existence as “acting” on the stage of life. Negative connotations were not far: the stage is a dream world, the actor a swindler. In this context, the verb could also mean “pretend” and “feign”. Interestingly enough, in spite of its documented use in such a negative sense, *ὑποκρίνομαι* remained in classical usage a *vox media* without negative moral connotations. The negative sense acquired prominence only in Byzantine literature under the influence of Christian usage inspired by the New Testament.

In contrast to classical literary habits, *ὑποκρίνομαι* occurs in both the literature of the Jewish diaspora and the New Testament exclusively in its pejorative sense. In Jewish texts, it denotes “blasphemy” in the form of the renunciation of God and his laws. The *ὑποκριτής* is not the “hypocrite” who pretends to be someone other than he is, he is “godless” without any pretence to the contrary. The step from “actor” to “blasphemer” is not immediately obvious and cannot be conclusively traced in the available sources. On the basis of the scant evidence provided by Jewish, Zoroastrian and Greek texts, Ulrich Wilckens ventures the following explanation:

Wer böse ist, spielt die Rolle des Bösen. Er verstellt sich, indem er sich aus einem Gerechten, der er nach dem Gesetz Gottes sein sollte, zu einem Frevler macht. ... Diese Verstellung ist eo ipso böser Trug, Widerstreit gegen die Wahrheit Gottes. Wieso freilich dieser als *Schauspielerei* bezeichnet werden konnte, bleibt gleichwohl rätselhaft.³³

³² This and the following paragraphs draw extensively on the detailed and highly informative article on the term and its cognates in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Friedrich, 1969, vol. 8, p. 558–569).

³³ Friedrich (1969, vol. 8, p. 565).

Additionally, he assumes that the rejection of actors and acting by pious Jewish circles as blasphemous heathen institutions and the incorporation of that sentiment into early canon law could have played a role. Actors might have been perceived as prominent perpetrators of blasphemous acts tolerated by heathen authorities.

In the New Testament, the meaning “hypocrite” gains prominence. Whereas *ὑπόκρισις* and *ὑποκριτής* are still applied according to Jewish usage, they now frequently denote “insincerity” and “hypocrisy”. The new use of the word is a striking feature especially in the Gospel according to Matthew; it is evident most prominently in the speech against the Pharisees, in which they are repeatedly singled out for their insincerity: *Οὐαὶ [δέ] ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί* (Mat. 23/13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29).

“Hypocrisy” and perhaps even more generally “evildoing” might have been the meanings our translator had in mind when he read *ὑπόκρισις*. In addition to its apparent moral overtones, the Arabic phrase *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh* seems to reveal an awareness of the theatrical meaning of *ὑπόκρισις*, i.e. the “wearing of masks”. His negative view on “the taking of faces”, not only perceptible in the connotations we are tempted to impute to his puzzling translation, will become clearer in the course of this analysis. In view of the opprobrium reserved for actors and acting in pious Jewish and Christian circles, we should not expect to find a more casual attitude to such a disreputable activity in this translation.³⁴ It should be noted that, contrary to these medieval precedents, the expression *ʿahd waḡhan* nowadays means “to acquire a good reputation”.

On the margin of the manuscript, we find the following gloss pertaining to *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh*:

الحيلة بالوجه ما يكون من الحيلة في تصديق القول بالصوت والصمت والتمثل
بالاشكال المختلفة

The stratagem with the faces belongs to the stratagem in the confirmation/corroborator of speech with the voice, silence and the imitation of different forms

Undoubtedly, what the author of the note describes is acting. Assuming that he understood what our translator wanted to relay with the strange

³⁴ The *Poetics*, translated into Arabic by the Nestorian Abū Biṣr Mattā ibn Yūnus, offers a similar example of later Greek usage “contaminating” the Arabic translation: the translator’s choice of the term *munāfiq* reflects New Testament rather than Aristotelian usage.

expression *al-'abḏ bi-l-wuḡūb*, it is entirely possible that the translator himself and parts of his audience were able to draw the same conclusion. The fact that the need for a gloss was felt nevertheless indicates that some readers might have found the concept difficult to understand.³⁵

Element 2.2: "Delivery" was first applied by the poets

1403b22ff
172/2-5

(1) *καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν τραγικὴν καὶ ῥαψωδίαν ὀψὲ παρήλθεν. (2) ὑπεκρίνοντο γὰρ αὐτοὶ τὰς τραγωδίας οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸ πρῶτον.*

(1) *وَأَمَّا فَعَلُوا ذَلِكَ فِي الطَّرَاغُودِيَّاتِ وَالرَّفْسُودِيَّاتِ أَخِيرًا، (2) وَقَدْ كَانُوا يَسْتَعْمَلُونَ الْاِخْذَ بِالْوَجْهِ فِي الطَّرَاغُودِيَّاتِ، اعْنِي الْفِيوْثِي،³⁶ فِي تِلْكَ الْأُولَى .*

(1) and they did it in the tragedies and rhapsodies only recently, (2) and they used to employ the taking of faces in the tragedies, I mean the poets, in these first [matters].

(1) *Ṭrāḡūdiyāt* was (falsely) glossed as follows: *al-ṭrāḡūdiyāt šibh al-'arāḡiz li-l-Rūm wa-ka-dālika al-qūmūdiyāt* ("tragedies for the Rūm are similar to Raḡaz-poems, the same applies to comedies").³⁷

(1) The expression *ὀψὲ παρήλθεν* (subject: "it", i.e. *ὑπόκρισις*) has been changed to *fa-'inna-mā fa'alū ... 'ahīran* (subject: "they", i.e. the creators of *al-ṭrāḡūdiyāt wa-l-rafsūdiyāt*). The influence of this paraphrase on the meaning of the passage seems to be very slight.

(2) Again, the adverb *τὸ πρῶτον* has been misunderstood (cf. 1403b18 = 171/17); the addition of the preposition *fī* allows the translator to fit the phrase into his text.

(2) Both the singular form *al-fyū'itī* for the Greek plural *οἱ ποιηταί* and the fact that the word is transcribed instead of being translated (as done in the Arabic *Poetics*) comes as something of a surprise. There is no precedent for this and the other transcriptions for *οἱ ποιηταί* and related terms we

³⁵ To illustrate the various uses of *taṣḏiqāt* in our text, Würsch (1991, p. 24) proposes a number of renderings depending on its use from the perspective of the *speaker* on the one hand and the *hearer* on the other. The somewhat unwieldy German equivalent she arrives at, *Glaubhaftmachung*, i.e. "make something believed or believable", fits in perfectly well with the understanding the author of the note had of the effects of *al-'abḏ bi-l-wuḡūb*: to make something believed or believable with the help of acoustic or gesticular hints—in a word, to *act*.

³⁶ Hermannus translates *ipse poete* ("the poets themselves").

³⁷ For the *raḡaz*-metre and the often ironic and coarse poetry associated with it, the *'urḡuzab*, cf. Wolfhart Heinrich's article "Radjaz" in *EI*², vol. 8, p. 375–379. In his translation of the *Poetics*, Abū Bišr identifies it in a similar vein as *hiḡā'*, a genre of satirical poetry. For this and other misunderstandings caused by the translators' and philosophers' ignorance about drama and theater, cf. Heinrichs (1969, p. 108f).

find throughout the Arabic *Rhetoric*. They might echo Syriac terminology transcribed from the original Greek terms.³⁸

(1)–(2) The passage’s problems arise for the most part from our translator’s determination to imitate as closely as possible the surface structure of the Greek text. It could be argued that with his structural lapse in the preceding section and his inability to understand the meaning of ὑπόκρισις, he chose a literal translation as the safest course of action. Apart from his desire to retain the Greek word order (which he has to suspend anyway at the beginning of the clause to render the Greek verb παρῆλθεν), there seems to be no compelling reason for transforming the subject οἱ ποιηταί into an apposition to the implicit subject of fa’alū. The use of ’a’nī, however, suggests that he recognized οἱ ποιηταί as nominative.

1403b2.4ff
172/5f

Element 2.3: The relevance of “delivery” for rhetoric and poetry

(1) δῆλον οὖν ὅτι καὶ περὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἐστὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον (2) ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τὴν ποιητικὴν.

(1) فهو معلوم انّ هذا يكون في الرطورية ايضا (2) مثل ما هو في الفيوتية،³⁹

(1) It is known that this comes [about] in rhetoric too, (2) just as it occurs in poetics,

(1) The transcription *al-rīṭūrīyah* might be taken to indicate that the translator was uncertain about its meaning. Its first occurrence at the beginning of the first book of the *Rhetoric* (1/3) prompted the scribe or collator to add the gloss *ṣinā’at al-ḥaṭābah* on the margin of our manuscript. That our translator probably at least partly understood the term is amply illustrated by his choice of the term *balīḡ* for both ῥήτωρ and ῥητορικός in 85/20 = 1379a2 and 119/19 = 1388b18. The situation was similar at the time of Ibn al-Nadīm, who knew the term, but glossed it for a less widely-read audience: *al-kalām ‘alā rīṭūrīqā wa-ma’nā-hu al-ḥiṭābah*.⁴⁰

Renate Würsch maintains that the term *Rhetoric*, denoting Greek and more specifically Aristotelian rhetoric, was—on the basis of the Syriac

³⁸ I am indebted to Fritz Zimmermann for pointing out the oddity of the transcription and its possible Syriac roots.

³⁹ At the time of Abū Biṣr Mattā’s translation of Aristotle’s *Poetics*, transcriptions such as *ṣyū’īṭīyah* had been substituted with derivatives of the root ṣ-’-r.

⁴⁰ Flügel (1871–1872, p. 250). S. A. Bonebakker (1970, p. 75f) notes the distinction between the terms *balāḡah* and *ḥiṭābah* in Arabic literature. The former is derived from the verb *balāḡa*, “to reach”, and the term is interpreted as the art of “reaching a listener” in conveying one’s idea or “reaching perfection” in style and content of a text. The latter term, translated as “oratory”, exclusively denotes the “spoken word” in public addresses.

rendering—at first transcribed as *rīṭūrīqā*. This is indeed the term we find not only in the *Fihrist*'s note on the translation⁴¹ but also in the title of Ibn Sīnā's early treatise on the subject, *Kitāb al-mağmū' 'aw al-ḥikmah al-'arūḍīyah fī ma'ānī kitāb rīṭūrīqā*.⁴² But it is not the transcription we find thrice in the Arabic text of the *Rhetoric* itself, which gives us *rīṭūrīyah* (7/10, 172/6 and 172/22). This and her unquestioning acceptance of Lyons' stance on the question of a Syriac intermediary throws some doubt on her claims about the terminological development away from a purportedly Syriacized transcription towards the genuinely Arabic expression *ḥiṭābah*.⁴³ The regular use of the transcribed term might therefore be consistent with the assumption that its meaning was supposed to be known to a sufficiently well educated readership.

Element 2.4: Glaukon's contribution to the development of "delivery"

1403b26f
172/6ff

(1) ὅπερ ἕτεροὶ τινες ἐπραγματεύθησαν (2) καὶ Γλαύκων ὁ Τηϊός.

(١) فأنه وان كان اناس آخرون قد تكلفوا القول في هذا ، (٢) لكن غلوقون خاصة قد فعل ، لأنه كان أولى بذلك .

(1) and even though other people have taken on the burden of discussing this [matter], (2) (but) Glaukon in particular did so, because he was [a] more appropriate [person] for it.⁴⁴

(1) The combination *fā-'inna-hu wa-'in* provides an example of our translator's occasionally idiosyncratic use of connectors unmotivated by the Greek text.

(2) Instead of the more appropriate *wa*, the translator's *lākinna* highlights Glaukon's contribution in the field (which the translator in all likelihood did not know anything about). The same can be said about the amplifications he subsequently introduces (*ḥāṣṣatan fa'ala, li-'anna kān 'awlā bi-dālīka*). There is no basis in the Greek text for this intervention. Lyons proposes that ὁ Τηϊός has been corrupted to a form of ἄξιός. Another possible explanation would be to read *'awwalan* instead of *'awlā*; the resulting amplification would at least not sound as strong as the first reading, but it would raise the question why the translator dropped ὁ Τηϊός altogether.

Occasional deletions of Greek textual elements occur here and there in the Arabic *Rhetoric*. In addition to removing isolated words (e.g. 1410a22:

⁴¹ Flügel (1871–1872, p. 250).

⁴² Cf. the following chapter on Ibn Sīnā's (and others') commentaries on the *Rhetoric*.

⁴³ Cf. Würsch (1991, p. 9f).

⁴⁴ Lyons: "(2) for he had a better right to that."

ἔλεγχος), the text sometimes drops short phrases (e.g. 1407a19f: τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἐν πέντε) or even whole passages (e.g. 1409b2ff: καὶ ὅτι αἰεὶ τι οἶεται ἔχειν ὁ ἀκροατῆς τῷ αἰεὶ πεπεράσθαι τι αὐτῷ; τὸ δὲ μὴδὲν προνοεῖν εἶναι μὴδὲ ἀνύειν ἀηδῆς).

Section 3: The role of the voice in “delivery”

The text now embarks on an excursus on the role of the voice and aspects of its use in *al-ʿabḏ bi-l-wuḡūh*. Remarking on its importance and its connection to emotions in Element 3.1, it then lists three aspects of voice and its use in 3.2. Faced with a number of technical terms related to acoustical phenomena, the translator chose the field of music as his source for Arabic equivalents.

1403b27f
172/8ff

Element 3.1: The voice and emotions

(1) ἔστι δὲ αὐτὴ μὲν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ, (2) πῶς αὐτῇ δεῖ χρῆσθαι πρὸς ἕκαστον πάθος,

(١) فمن ذلك ما يكون بالصوت، (٢) وهذا مما ينبغي ان يستعمل عند كل واحد من الآلام،

(1) and among that [sc. *al-ʿabḏ bi-l-wuḡūh*] is that which comes [about] through the voice, (2) and this belongs to what should be used⁴⁵ with each one of the affections,

(2) An interesting feature of our translation is the unconventional application of the proposition *inda* to render *πρὸς*; it sometimes seems to take the place of *li* or *bi*. Here, it carries the intelligent implication of “on the occasion of”.

1403b28–32
172/10–14

Element 3.2: Musical aspects of voice

(1) οἷον πότε μεγάλη καὶ πότε μικρᾶ καὶ μέση, (2) καὶ πῶς τοῖς τόνοις, (3) οἷον ὀξεῖα καὶ βαρεῖα καὶ μέση, (4) καὶ ῥυθμοῖς τίσι πρὸς ἕκαστα. (5) τρία γὰρ ἐστὶ περὶ ἃ σκοποῦσιν. (6) ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ μέγεθος ἀρμονία ῥυθμός.

(١) واحيانا⁴⁶ ينبغي ان تستعمل⁴⁷ الكبرى واحيانا الصغرى والوسطى، (٢)

⁴⁵ Lyons: “(1) part of this is what comes about through the voice, (2) that being one of the things which should be used.”

⁴⁶ Sālim, Badawī: فاحيانا.

⁴⁷ Sālim, Badawī: يستعمل.

وكالذي يستعمل في الهاديّات،⁴⁸ (٣) اعني الحادّة⁴⁹ الثقيلة والوسطى (٤) وشيء من النغم او النبرات، (٥) فانّ الاتي فيها يهزلون او [يحد...ون ثلاث، (٦) وهنّ العظم والتوفيق والنبرة.

(1) and sometimes one should employ the loud and sometimes the soft and the medium, (2) and it is like that which is used in the camel-driver songs, (3) I mean the high-pitched, the deep and the medium,⁵⁰ (4) and some of the tones (sounds) and the stresses (intonations/cadence); (5) for those about which they speak lightly or ... [consist of] three [things], (6) and they are magnitude and adaptation and interval.

(2) The term *hādiyāt* is unclear; it might be derived from the verb *hadā*, the “driving of camels with songs”. The semantically related root *ḥ-d-w* might offer some help: according to Fadlou Shehadi, the humming or singing to camels matching the animal’s movement, called *ḥudā’* (derived from the verb *ḥadā*, “to lead” or “drive on camels”), was connected to the discovery that animals respond to vocal music.⁵¹ Amnon Shiloah places the genre at the very beginning of the history of Arabic music.⁵² Sālim’s and Badawī’s reading *al-hādimāt* (“the destroying”) seems to make even less sense.

(1)–(6) We encounter numerous musical terms in this passage (e.g. *naḡm*, *nabrah*, *ḥādd*, *taqīl*). This observation is shared by the author of a gloss to *al-ṣuḡrā wa-l-wustā*, who comments on the margin of the text: *kull hādā min ’asmā’ al-naḡm fī al-mūsīqā* (“all of these are terms for [kinds of] melodies in music”).

A second gloss comments on *ṣay’ min al-naḡm*. It reads:

مثل الرحمة والغضب وكما يرفعه⁵³ يخفض الصوت ويغضبه يرفع الصوت وما اشبه ذلك

Such as compassion and anger just as it raises it (according to Lyons’ reading: “in compassion”) the voice is lowered and in anger the voice is raised and what is similar to that

⁴⁸ Sālim, Badawī: الهاديات.

⁴⁹ Badawī: الجادة [او] (“the serious [sc. voice] or”).

⁵⁰ Or, in view of the missing connector *wa* between *al-ḥāddab* and *al-taqīlab*: “the high-pitched and deep, and the medium”.

⁵¹ Shehadi (1995, p. 60).

⁵² Shiloah (1995, p. 5f).

⁵³ Lyons: برحمة.

The musical references in this short passage allow us some insight into our translator's handling of culturally problematic terms and warrants closer attention.

The central term and subject of this section of the text is ἡ φωνή from the preceding passage, the "tone" or "sound", especially the sound of a voice. The translator chose an Arabic term with a very similar semiotic range, *ṣawt*, which also covers both vocal and more general acoustic phenomena: "sound", "voice", occasionally even "song".⁵⁴ Aristotle proceeds to list basic volume levels, using the neutral terms *μεγάλη*, *μικρά* and *μέση*. Each of these generic expressions signifies qualitative or quantitative degrees of size for both concrete and abstract objects. The same holds true for their Arabic counterparts, *al-kubrā*, *al-ṣuġrā* and *al-wuṣṭā*. The referent of the Greek adjectives is clearly ἡ φωνή; puzzlingly, the translator associates the masculine term *ṣawt* with feminine adjuncts.

The confusion is only partly dispelled by the first marginal gloss quoted above, it identifies two of the three expressions in question as technical terms belonging to the theoretical field of *mūsīqā*. While Shiloah insists on a clear differentiation between the fields of musical theory, labelled *mūsīqā* in adaptation of the Greek *μουσική*, and practised art music, *ġinā'*, Shehadi notes that at least as early as the *Iḥwān al-ṣafā'*,⁵⁵ the terms were used interchangeably. In addition, al-Kindī used it in several treatises on theoretical aspects of music.⁵⁶ It is in this sense that we encounter *mūsīqā* in Ġābir ibn Ḥayyān's writings.⁵⁷ He defines the term as follows:

الموسيقى إنما هو مساواة بين الصوت بالنغمة وقرع الوتر في زمانه وكيفية صوته جزئاً
جزئاً

al-mūsīqā is simply harmony between the voice, the melody and the plucking of the string in its time/rhythm and the quality of its sound, part after part

To learn it, one has to master a variety of fields:

⁵⁴ Shiloah (1995, p. 15).

⁵⁵ "Brethren of purity", a tenth- and eleventh-century group of philosophers of uncertain identity and origin. They left a body of writings on philosophy and the sciences that is known under the title *Rasā'il Iḥwān al-ṣafā'*, *Epistles of the Brethren of Purity* and was heavily influenced by Neoplatonism.

⁵⁶ Cf. Shiloah (1995, p. 59) and Shehadi (1995, p. 7).

⁵⁷ Most of the works ascribed to him probably date from the ninth and tenth century; even the dates of his life are unclear, he apparently flourished around the mid-eighth century. Cf. Paul Kraus' and Martin Plessner's article "Djābir b. Ḥayyān" in *EI*², vol. 2, p. 357ff.

ليس يمكن احد ان يعلم الموسيقى الا بعد علم العروض والتصريف، وعلم النغم والإيقاع، وعلم الشعر وصنعتة، والمعرفة بالاوزان الهوائية⁵⁸

One is only able to learn *al-mūsīqā* after [mastering] the science of prosody and correct grammatical expression and the science of the [musical] note[s] and rhythm and the sciences of poetry and its creation and the knowledge of (airy?) metres

Obviously, the author of the gloss understands the terms *al-kubrā*, *al-ṣuḡrā* and *al-wuṣṭā* in a technical sense; perhaps the translator also wanted them to be understood that way.

The next musical term in the passage is ὁ τόνος. The Greek expression denotes a voice's "pitch accent", which is then specified with three adjuncts again referring back to ἡ φωνή, i.e. ὀξεῖα (with an *acute* accent), βαρεῖα (with a *grave* accent) and μέση (with a *circumflex* accent). On the Arabic side, we find the word *al-hādiyāt* (discussed above) and the adjuncts *al-ḥāddah*, *al-taqīlah* and *al-wuṣṭā*, referring to *al-hādiyāt*. The status of these terms is unclear; for example, we encounter *al-ḥādd* as the name of the last and highest string of the 'ūd,⁵⁹ whereas the term *al-taqīl* is used in the names of several rhythmic modes listed by al-Kindī.⁶⁰ Given the problems we have in discovering the origins of these words as technical terms, it might be worthwhile to return to their non-technical meaning: classifying certain types of singing as "vivacious" (*ḥādd*), "serious" (*taqīl*) or "intermediate" (*'awsaṭ*) would make perfect sense.

The paraphrase *ṣay' min al-naḡm 'aw al-nabarāt* for the plural form of ἑυθμός, possibly caused by his omission of πρὸς ἕκαστα and his reading of τισι without an accent, sufficiently illustrates the translator's predicament. Introduced by the phrase *ṣay' min*, he throws together two terms which have—except for the fact that they are both musical terms—not much to do with each other.⁶¹ Today as well as in the time of the Umayyad caliphs, *al-nabrah* denotes musical *intervals*. In his *Kitāb al-'aḡānī* (*Book of Songs*), Abū al-Faraḡ al-Iṣfahānī (d. 967) employed the term in this sense and quoted Ibn Surayḡ (d. 726), who used the word in a similar way.⁶² Farmer traces the historical development of the terms *naḡmah* and *naḡam*, which are alternately used with the meaning "note", e.g. by authors mentioned

⁵⁸ Both passages quoted by Jéhamy (1999, vol. 2, p. 1469).

⁵⁹ A pear-shaped string instrument similar to a lute.

⁶⁰ Cf. Shiloah (1995, p. 111, 120) and Farmer (1929, p. 111).

⁶¹ In his translation of the *Poetics*, Abū Biṣr Mattā chooses a different "musical" term, *lahn* (Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. xxx).

⁶² Farmer (1929, p. 70, 73).

in the *Fihrist* such as al-Ḥalīl ibn Aḥmad (d. 791) and al-Kindī, or with the meaning “mode” or with both meanings, e.g. by Abū al-Faraǧ in the *Kitāb al-ʿaǧānī*, by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhi (d. 940) in the *Kitāb al-ʿiqd al-farīd* (*Book of the Unique Necklace*) or in the *Risālat Iḥwān al-ṣafāʾ* (*Treatise of the Brethren of Purity*). The *Kitāb al-ʿaǧānī* also lists its use in the sense of “melody” in the title of a book by Yūnus al-Kātib (d. 765).⁶³ Its modern use covers the more general notions of “melody” or “sound”.

In spite of its apparent greater semantic flexibility, the translator settles for the less suitable *nabrah* to render the second occurrence of *ἔνθμός* in this passage. The remaining Greek expressions, *μέγεθος* and *ἁρμονία*,⁶⁴ have been translated literally as *ʿizam* and *tawfiq*. To the best of my knowledge, neither belongs specifically to the field of musical theory.

In sum, both versions profess to discuss the use of voice, but the Greek text discusses pronunciation in *speech*, the Arabic text qualities of *vocal music*. The speech-related concepts in the Greek version, e.g. accents and pitch, do not have suitable Arabic equivalents. They are part and parcel of Greek phonology and could not but be misunderstood or mistranslated. The peculiar translation of the above passage testifies therefore either to the lack of understanding on the part of the translator or his attempt to transpose the subject matter into categories accessible to his readers. Given the terminological overlap between descriptions of voice in speech and singing, music must have suggested itself as the natural choice for terms in this rather unsuccessful attempt at acculturation.

Frequently, our translator’s treatment of *realia*, terms and concepts specific to the source culture (excluding proper names), betrays a lack of background knowledge. This is a problem that frequently affects his translation. Encountering such technical terms, he more often than not resorts to transliteration or synonymic transposition, i.e. the employment of doublets intended to cover as much semantic ground as possible.⁶⁵ His translation of *ἔνθμός* and *ἁρμονία* are cases in point: *ἔνθμός* is rendered with the doublet *al-naǧm wa-l-nabarāt*, musical terms which fail to reproduce the semantic scope of the Greek term; this also applies to the second occurrence of *ἔνθμός*, translated with the shorthand *al-nabrah*.

⁶³ Cf. Farmer (1929, p. 51, 70–75, 105, 127, 148, 205).

⁶⁴ It could be argued that the poetic harmony treated in the *Poetics* stresses a slightly different aspect of this concept than the *Rhetoric*, explaining the terminological differences between the texts. Abū Bišr Mattā uses *naẓm*, *ʿiqāʿ* and, most often, *taʿlīf*, perhaps in order to underline the formal and structural slant of Aristotle’s usage. For *μέγεθος*, the *Poetics* uses the more specific term *ἤλι* (Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. xxviii, xxx).

⁶⁵ On the interesting phenomenon of doublets and their interpretation, cf. p. 147.

(5) To explain the puzzling occurrence of *yabzilūn* where one would expect *yanzurūn* or some such expression, Lyons suggests that the translator might have read *σκοπτουσιν* instead of *σκοπούσιν*. In spite of various reconstruction attempts, the missing word indicated by the lacuna (...) has not been conclusively identified. It is tempting to fill it with the term *yağiddūn*, evoking the polarity of *ğidd* (“earnest”) and *hazl* (“jest”).

Section 4: Competent delivery helps winning “contests”

1403b32–35
172/14–18

After the translator’s slip at the beginning of Section 2, both versions remain in step with each other, at least up to this point. Section 4 starts off with a serious mistranslation, apparently caused by a lack of cultural background knowledge. Aware of his problem, the translator proceeds with extreme caution for the rest of the section, resorting to as literal a rendering as he could possibly produce. The result is a sequence of disjointed clauses that must have been more or less incomprehensible to contemporary readers.

(1) τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄθλα σχεδὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀγῶνων οὗτοι λαμβάνουσι, (2) καὶ καθάπερ ἐκεῖ μείζον δύνανται νῦν τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ὑποκριταί, (3) καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πολιτικούς ἀγῶνας (4) διὰ τὴν μοχθηρίαν τῶν πολιτειῶν.

(١) فامًا ذوو المنازعة فيأخذون ذلك من المنازعات والمزاوالات، (٢) فمهما كانوا هنالك اقوى واقدر، كذلك يكونون هاهنا، اعني ذوو الأخذ بالوجه من الفيوتطيين، (٣) وكالذي يكون في المنازعات الفيوليطية (٤) لصعوبة تلك الفيوليطية،

(1) and concerning those that engage in dispute, they use this in disputes and contests; (2) and as they were more potent and powerful there, so they are the same [sc. *ʿaqwā wa-ʿaqdar*] here, I mean such poets as take faces,⁶⁶ (3) and it is like that which occurs in political disputes (4) because of the difficulty of these politics,⁶⁷

(1) The term *ἄθλα* has been wrongly understood as “contestants”. According to Lyons, τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄθλα has apparently been read by the translator as οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀθληταί; cf. also 1404a17 below. Ignoring the Greek

⁶⁶ Lyons: “(2) and whenever they are stronger and more powerful there, the same is true of them here, I mean the actors from amongst the poets.”

⁶⁷ Many basic terms such as *πολιτικός* and *πολιτεία*—for which later translations use genuine Arabic equivalents—are transcribed in our text. They could be interpreted as indicators for an early translation date, preserving a state of translation technique antedating the establishment of a stable terminology and the composition of translation tools such as word lists and glossaries.

subject *οὗτοι*, the translator uses the phrase as the subject of the first clause. Aware of the difficulty of this passage, the translator modeled his translation of its remainder as closely as possible on the Greek word order, compounding the confusion engendered by the mistranslation of *τὰ ἄθλα*. In spite of his efforts, he fails to make any sense of this section.

(2) As before, the author attempts to emulate the Greek word order and, in order to accommodate the position of the subject *οἱ ὑποκριταί* at the end of the clause beginning with *καὶ καθάπερ*, paraphrases it in an ἰαῖ-*excursus*. The possibility that the clause's subject may be confused with the previous clause's *dawū al-munāzaʿah* forces him to insert the rather cryptic *ka-dālīka yakūnūn hāhunā*. Again, the author feels compelled to imitate the original as closely as possible in places where he cannot grasp its meaning.

(2) The comparative sense of the expression *μεῖζον δύνανται νῦν τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ὑποκριταί* is lost with the translator linking *τῶν πολιτειῶν* to the subject *οἱ ὑποκριταί* as a genitive object.

(4) In his translation of the term *μοχθηρία* with *ῥιῦbah*, the word *μόχθος* ("labour", "pain") seems to have misled our translator.

(4) Lyons states that the Arabic transcription *al-fyūlīṭiyah* at the end of the passage points towards *πολιτειῶν* instead of *πολιτῶν* (as he and Spengel assume) as the translator's reading of his manuscript. Kassel and Freese, the editor of the Loeb edition of the *Rhetoric*, opt for *πολιτειῶν*.⁶⁸ This would mean that the general abstract *al-fyūlīṭiyah* mistranslates the more specific Greek term, further confirmation for the problems the translator had in understanding the text.

Section 5: The "craft" of the "taking of faces"

One of the conspicuous features of this long and complicated passage is the fact that its subject is at no point explicitly spelled out. Before we can start to sum up the passage's content, we have to pause for a moment to establish that subject.

The Greek text presents the reader with exclusively pronominal references to the elusive theme; in Arabic, operating with only two grammatical genders instead of three, the reader has to deal with an even higher degree of ambiguity. Looking more closely at the pronominal references in Section 5, we find that the subject of the passage is referred to several times with the enclitic feminine singular *hā* and once, at the beginning of

⁶⁸ Freese (1994, p. 346).

the section, with *dālīka*. The enclitica cover instances in which the subject of the Greek clause is contained in the verbal expression but needs to be made explicit in the Arabic version. *Dālīka*, on the other hand, was used to render *αὐτῶν*. The situation is complicated by the conjunction *ḡayr ʿanna*, which indicates transitions between arguments and textual sections. Apart from the problems caused by the use of pronomina in the Arabic version, the following facts emerge: the subject of the passage remains unclear; after being referred to by *dālīka*, the translator switches his references to the expression *al-ṣināʿah ʿaw al-ḥīlah fi dālīka* (the anchor for the enclitica). We can only speculate that the topic of the preceding section, i.e. *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, is the referent of *dālīka* and, mediated by the circumscription *al-ṣināʿah ʿaw al-ḥīlah fi dālīka*, the enclitic pronouns.

Establishing the topic is, however, not the only problem in this section. In Element 5.1, we are informed that the “art” or “stratagem” (our translator refuses to resolve the ambiguity of the term *τέχνη* with its positive and negative connotations by rendering it into the doublet *al-ṣināʿah ʿaw al-ḥīlah*, reproducing both aspects of the Greek expression) of “that”, i.e. *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh*, was developed late due to the late invention of artifice in speech (5.2). The translator now switches to *al-ḥīlah*, emphasizing negative aspects such as “artifice” and “trickery”.

The next element (5.3) opens a string of arguments with a proposition that, due to our translator’s idiosyncratic use of connectors, is almost impossible to reconstruct. The puzzling occurrence of *ḥīna* in 5.4 cannot be reconciled with the Greek text and undermines any attempt to make sense of the passage. Without a major intervention in the Arabic text, we have to proceed on the assumption that the translator wanted to indicate that, firstly, “artifice”, correctly understood, constitutes a burdensome and negative aspect of speech and that, secondly, “artifice” is somehow geared towards *conjecture* and *opinion* (in contrast to established knowledge). Conjecture and opinion are then identified in Element 5.4 as the subject matter of rhetoric.

Elements 5.5–5.8 offer what purports to be arguments for this proposition, strung together by repeated occurrences of *li-ʿanna*: 5.5, a highly literal and garbled version of the lucid reasoning contained in the Greek text, states that “it”, possibly referring to speech (*maqālah*), not only has to be done correctly, but carefully as well—the connection to the preceding proposition is, to put it mildly, tenuous—while 5.6 maintains that one should employ only “speech” (*kalām*; the meaning of this prescription will be discussed below) and refrain from manipulation, qualified by

5.7, an exhortation to dispute only about the things themselves. In Element 5.8, he concludes his notes on the *ḥīlah* of *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh* with an appeal to disregard the apparent effectiveness of rhetorical trickery.

The whole argument seems to fail on account of two factors: unable to grasp the reasoning of his Greek source, probably due to both lexical and syntactical problems, our translator imitates the Greek word order of doubtful passages, obscuring rather than clarifying Aristotle's thinking; secondly, his hesitation to spell out the subject matter of the passage clearly illustrates his own failure to identify it. Part of the problem was the Greek terminology: the translator had to deal with terms such as *τέχνη*, *λέξις* and *λόγος* which even Aristotle sometimes failed to distinguish properly and whose meaning our translator obviously only partly understood.

1403b35f
172/18f

Element 5.1: A "craft" was not yet developed...

(1) οὐπω δὲ σύγκριται τέχνη περὶ αὐτῶν,

(1) غير انّ الصناعة او الحيلة في ذلك لم ترتّب بعد،

(1) but the art or stratagem in this had not yet been composed,

(1) As in 1403b21 = 172/1, the translator picks out *δέ* as a structural marker signalling the beginning of a new argument and translates it with the strong adversative conjunction *ḡayr ʿanna*. The opposition may be stronger than the Greek source warrants. The translator could have been misled by the appearance of *οὐπω*, which figures in the aforementioned passage as well.

(1) The translator does not seem to be aware that *τέχνη* also means a concrete written "manual" in addition to the abstract category of "craft". From this point onward, we sense a shift in the texts' attitude. The Greek text talks neutrally about an "art" or "treatise" dealing with "acting" (*ὑπόκρισις*). The use of the doublet *al-ṣināʿah ʿaw al-ḥīlah* points towards the translator's awareness of the multivalence of the Greek term. He nevertheless decides to put a potentially negative slant on the discussion by subsequently choosing the term *al-ḥīlah* ("stratagem").

The negative impression suggested by the choice of *al-ḥīlah* is strengthened by the translator's rendering of *ὑπόκρισις*, *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh*. The meaning and relevance of this expression have been discussed above. The terminological choices the translator has made at this point do not seem to have any influence on the argumentative structure of the text, but they exert considerable influence on other terminological and structural deci-

sions down the line. A handful of translation decisions early in the text, two of which we find in the passage above, give the discussion a flavour that inexorably pulls the translator away from Aristotle's text and tells us more about his own ideas and preconceptions than about Aristotle's intentions.

Element 5.2: ...because "delivery" only matured recently

1403b36
172/19f

(1) ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ περι τὴν λέξιν ὀψέ προήλθεν.

(١) لأنَّ الحيلة في المقالة ايضاً انما [بلغت] 69 اخيراً،

(1) because the stratagem in speech as well only matured recently,

Element 5.3: ... and because the subject is "burdensome"

1403b36f
172/20f

(1) καὶ δοκεῖ φορτικὸν εἶναι, (2) καλῶς ὑπολαμβάνομενον.

(١) و كأنها شيء من التثقيب (٢) اذا اجيد اخذها،

(1) and it is as if it [sc. *al-hīlah*] is something that overwhelms⁷⁰ (2) when taken (used?) correctly,⁷¹

(1) In the translator's opinion, the phrase *καὶ δοκεῖ* marks the start for a new argument in his current train of thought which ultimately leads to his rejection of rhetorical trickery. He notes the efficiency of rhetorical devices but maintains that, since delivery is directed towards mere "opinion" and "conjecture", its use is fraudulent and improper (cf. below p. 94f).

(1) Both expressions *min al-tatqīl* and its Greek counterpart *φορτικόν* stress the essentially negative character of delivery, but whereas Aristotle belittles it, the translator overemphasizes it by introducing the notion of "trouble" and "burden". The term *tatqīl* might also stress the moment of imposition of impressions and emotions on an audience implied by the expression *al-ʿahd bi-l-wuḡūh*. It is tempting to read the translation of *φορτικόν* as evidence for the shift in attitude between the Greek and Arabic versions. With a range of perhaps more appropriate single-word translations at his disposal, the translator still decides to use the somewhat unwieldy expression *šayʿ min al-tatqīl*. In the light of some more

⁶⁹ Badawī: صنعت.

⁷⁰ The term *φορτικόν* is the only occasion for Abū Bišr in the translation of the *Poetics* to transcribe instead of translate a word that has been straightforwardly rendered in our text (cf. Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. xxxi).

⁷¹ Lyons: "(2) when it is taken well/properly".

obvious examples for our translator's attitude in the text below, it is a distinct possibility that his choice at this point is already influenced by his own reading of the text's stance towards *ὑπόκρισις*.

(2) Translating *'idā 'uǧ'id 'ahdu-hā*, our author apparently misses the non-literal use of *ὑπολαμβάνω* at this point and opts for a more literal translation which is unfortunate from a stylistic point of view and further obscures the meaning of an already obscure clause.

1404a1f
172/21f

Element 5.4: Rhetoric is bound up with "opinion"

(1) ἀλλ' ὅλης οὔσης πρὸς δόξαν τῆς πραγματείας (2) τῆς περὶ τῆν ἑητορικὴν,

(١) ولكن حين تكون كلها مصروفة الى الظنون او الآراء (٢) التي هي من شأن
الريطورية

(1) but since all of it is directed at conjectures or [individual] views
(2) which are of the matter of rhetoric⁷²

(1) With his rendering of *ἀλλά* with *wa-lākin*, our translator schematically substitutes Greek conjunctions and particles in a way that obfuscates the relation between sentences and arguments.

(1) The unexpected appearance of the causal conjunction *hīna* suggests that the translator had problems reconstructing the flow of argument. According to his translation, the *hīna*-clause is causally and perhaps temporally linked to the previous clause. The Greek text does not indicate any such relation; on the contrary, the clause introduced by *ἀλλά* partly refutes the idea that the treatment of delivery is unimportant.

(1) The translator fails correctly to identify the elements of the Greek sentence and misunderstands their function. Following the Greek word order, he removes the genitive object *τῆς πραγματείας* from its referent *ὅλης οὔσης* and attaches it as a relative clause to *δόξαν*. In his version, not "the whole business of rhetoric"⁷³ is connected with "opinion" or "appearance" but "opinion" and "appearance" *become* the business of rhetoric. The translator's negative stance towards aspects of rhetoric such as "acting" taints his perception of the entire subject.

(2) The imitation of the Greek word order by placing the relative clause *allatī hiya min ša'n al-rīṭūriyah* at the end of the passage next to *al-ẓunūn 'aw al-'ārā'* introduces an ambiguity which could have been avoided by

⁷² Lyons: "(1) but since it is all turned to ideas or thoughts (2) which are the concern of rhetoric."

⁷³ Kennedy (1991, p. 218).

placing it nearer to the verb; as it is, *allatī* is read as referring to *al-zunūn 'aw al-'ārā'*. The epistemological pessimism our translator professes in regard to rhetoric becomes more prominent; the ambiguities in the Greek text mentioned above allow him to read his perspective into it and serve to strengthen his belief in the essentially negative verdict Aristotle returns on the merits of rhetoric and its capacity to access truth.

Element 5.5: "Delivery" requires diligence

1404a2f
172/22ff

(1) οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔχοντος (2) ἀλλ' ὡς ἀναγκαίου τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιητέον,

(1) ليس على أنه قد⁷⁴ يجب لها ان تفعل ذلك⁷⁵ مستقيما او بعدل، (2) ولكن كالذي قد يضطر اليه في العناية والجدّ،

(1) it is not the case that it [sc. *al-ṣinā'ah 'aw al-ḥīlah*] must do that correctly or justly, (2) but it is like that which one is obliged to do with carefulness and earnestness/serious effort,⁷⁶

(1) The first half of this passage illustrates the density of the Greek text: the Arabic rendering of the three words *οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔχοντος* comprises no less than twelve words.

Element 5.6: Appealing to emotions is inappropriate in speech...

1404a4f
172/24-
173/2

(1) ἐπεὶ τό γε δίκαιον μηδὲν πλείω ζητεῖ περὶ τὸν λόγον (2) ἢ ὡς μήτε λυπεῖν μήτ' εὐφραίνειν.

(1) لأنّ من العدل ألا يفحص عن شيء اكثر من الكلام البتّة (2) والأ يستعمل التفريح ولا التحزين

(1) because justness requires that one seeks nothing more than speech alone (2) and that the evocation of joy or sorrow are not to be employed⁷⁷

(1) *Kalām* here apparently contrasts to *ḥīlah*, perhaps representing *true* words instead of *deceptive* speech; the second category appears in the next passage: *λυπεῖν* and *εὐφραίνειν*, i.e. the use of emotions.

⁷⁴ Omitted by Badawī.

⁷⁵ Badawī: ذلك.

⁷⁶ Lyons: "(1) not because it has to do that correctly or rightly, (2) but like one who is compelled to it (or: that which one is compelled to do) in respect of concern and seriousness."

⁷⁷ Lyons: "(1) since it is right that one should not investigate anything more than speech at all, (2) and that one should not employ what causes joy or sorrow."

(2) In spite of his usual careful attention to the Greek word order, our translator here switches the positions of *λυπεῖν* and *εὐφραίνειν*.

(1)–(2) The phrase *περὶ τὸν λόγον* has been construed as *ἐκ τοῦ λόγου*; according to the Arabic text, *al-tahzīn* and *al-tafrīḥ* belong to the devices employed in speech. Aristotle on the other hand warns against entertainment or offence as purpose or prominent feature of speech, the end of which should always be to present an argument.

Reflecting on the treatment of emotional appeals in speech in the *Rhetoric* as a whole, it does not come as a surprise that the translator should feel obliged to clarify his understanding of this slightly ambiguous passage. As Jacques Brunschwig has pointed out, Aristotle accepted such an appeal only as long as it was based on the speech itself—i.e. by certain arguments—instead of extraneous means—e.g. by producing weeping children, gesturing, crying etc.⁷⁸ What stuck with the Arabic translator was the general impression that emotional appeals were placed beyond the pale of legitimate rhetorical procedures.

1404a5ff
173/2ff

Element 5.7: ...because it should be confine to the things themselves

(1) *δίκαιον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀγωνίζεσθαι τοῖς πράγμασιν*, (2) *ὥστε τᾶλλα ἕξω τοῦ ἀποδείξαι περιεργά ἐστιν.*

(١) لأنه إنما ينبغي لهم ان يتنازعو في الأمور انفسها والحيل ، (٢) وكلّ ما كان خارجا من التشبيت فهو من ذوات المؤاربة ،

(1) because they should only dispute about the things themselves⁷⁹ and the stratagems, (2) whereas all that is extraneous to proof belongs to deceptive things,

(1) Lyons explains the double rendering of *αὐτοῖς* as both *la-hum* and *'anfusi-hā* with the assumption that the translator either found the word twice in his text or imputed to it a double sense, i.e. he might have wished to resolve the syntactical ambiguity of the pronoun by offering both possible constructions.

(1) The term *al-ḥiyal* is not found in the Greek text; it was perhaps intended as an explanatory amplification of *τᾶλλα*. Alternatively, the translator may want to suggest that rhetorical devices belong to the subject matter of rhetorical disputes (*tanāzu*⁸⁰). In this case, the term *al-ḥiyal* might be read as an amplification of *τοῖς πράγμασιν*: to argue about

⁷⁸ Brunschwig (1996, p. 46).

⁷⁹ Lyons: "(1) it is proper for them ... in the affairs themselves."

πράγματα might, in his view, include contending “over” or “with” *hiyal*. This reading would oblige us to accept that the translator substantially modified Aristotle’s proposition by either allowing the use of both “facts” and “stratagems” in an argument or by naming both as the *subject matter* of disputes—in a dispute, both facts and rhetorical procedures can become bones of contention—while Aristotle only wanted facts to count. In spite of its apparent far-fetchedness, the reading has several factors in its favor: in addition to the position of the term in the sentence and Lyons’ punctuation, which groups *al-hiyal* with *al-ʿumūr ʿanfusi-hā*, it is clear that, according to our translator, *al-hiyal* are not “extraneous to proof”: as Elements 5.1 and 5.2 state, a *hīlah* of “acting” and of “speech”, both important factors in argumentation, have been late to develop.

(2) The phrase *dawāt al-muʿarabah* stresses the note of moral disapproval which plays a less prominent role in the more neutral Greek term. Περὶεργα can mean “elaborate” as well as “superfluous” (neutral) or even “meddling” (negative). The translator’s choice for an Arabic term seems to have been influenced by his negative judgement on rhetorical manipulation. The Greek text facilitates the introduction of such interpretations with its wealth of ambiguous and semantically rich terms. Our translator again renders the neuter plural *περὶεργα* as feminine plural; his lack of consistency in the translation of neuter plural terms can be seen in his handling of τᾶλλα, which he renders as *kull mā*.

Element 5.8: Rhetorical devices corrupt the audience

1404a7f
173/4ff

(1) ἀλλ’ ὁμῶς μέγα δύναται, (2) καθάπερ εἴρηται, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ μοχθηρίαν.

(١) غير أنه قد يقدر بهنّ على⁸⁰ العظام، (٢) كالذي قد تفعل⁸¹ تلك الخزانات⁸² في تخييب⁸³ السامع،

(1) although it is often possible to [achieve] great things with them, (2) such as the effect which these distressing things often have of dissatisfying/deceiving [better: “corrupting”] the listener;⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Margoliouth, Sālim, Badawī: عن.

⁸¹ Badawī: يفعل.

⁸² Lyons ventures the conjecture الخبرات (“these experiences”). Together with his suspicion that the translator read a form of *ἐμπειρία* instead of *εἴρηται*, this could explain the disappearance of Aristotle’s interjection *καθάπερ εἴρηται*.

⁸³ Lyons suggests the plausible emendation تخييب (“corruption”).

⁸⁴ Lyons: “(1) but because of these one is able to do great things, (2) like what is done by those distressing things in disappointing the hearer.”

(1) Since ἀλλά is normally translated as *wa-lākin(na)*, the occurrence of *ḡayr ʿanna-hu* seems surprising. How unusual it really is can only be answered on the basis of a larger text sample.⁸⁵

(1) The use of feminine plural pronouns to render neuter plural is a recurring feature of our translation. The referent here is *dawāt al-muʿarabah*. For the translator’s use of feminine plural pronouns, cf. above p. 67.

(2) To make sense of a sentence he misunderstood, our author added *qad tafal al-muḥazzināt* as an explanatory amplification. His reading turns Aristotle’s reasoning upside down: he suggests that the use of rhetorical devices “corrupts” an audience whereas Aristotle clearly places the responsibility for the effectiveness of rhetorical trickery on the *pre-existing* corruption of the audience.

The essentially negative character of rhetorical means of persuasion has now been firmly established. In spite of the degree of misunderstanding the Arabic version betrays at this point, the translator follows the direction he has taken early on and stresses the negative consequences of devices which fall outside the scope of rational argument. They are, as we have read in the preceding passage, *dawāt al-muʿarabah*, the use of which leads to “corruption” (*tabḥīt*) of the listener.⁸⁶

On the basis of our reading of the preceding passage, we seem to be confronted with two categories of rhetorical devices, i.e. the “stratagems” (*ḥiyal*) on the one hand, which form an important part of rhetoric and which can become the objects of a dispute (together with the facts of a given case) and on the other hand those devices which do not belong to rhetorical argumentation. Their use is, in spite of their effectiveness, strongly discouraged. The distinction the translator introduces here is not derived from the Greek text, but a result of a combination of translation problems and his interpretation of the Greek text. While the second category of devices does not figure again in our sample, the translator does not conceal his suspicions about the first category, the *ḥiyal*. Whether legitimate or not, he continues to view rhetorical devices with a wary eye.

(2) The edited Greek text helps us to avoid the trap our translator has fallen into by placing a comma between εἴηται and δῶ. In the translation, the insertion καθάπερ εἴηται is not recognized (according to my reading of the text, it is used to mark the beginning of the following section) and the verb apparently read as ἐργάζεταιται, explaining the appearance of *tafal*.

⁸⁵ In our sample, *ḡayr ʿanna* occurs twice more, each time translating an adversative δέ: 1403b21 = 172/1 (p. 77) and 1403b35 = 172/18 (p. 92). Cf. below p. 135.

⁸⁶ Our reading is based on Lyons’ emendation *tabḥīt*.

It is then used as the predicate of the clause resulting from the conflation of *καθάπερ εἴρηται* and *διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ μοχθηρίαν*.

Section 6: “Expression” and “delivery”

The terminological confusion caused by the Greek text carries over into this section. Aristotle discusses *λέξις*, which here includes not only *style* of speech, but its *delivery* as well. The translator continues to refer to *λέξις* as *maqālah*. After the first element which connects his subsequent remarks on the subject with his previous notes on *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuḡūh*, he refrains from explicitly repeating it in Elements 6.2ff.

Starting in 6.1 by subsuming the “taking of faces” under *maqālah*, the text claims that some small but necessary aspect of speech is in “all teaching”; this could mean that either the teaching of any subject employs speech to a certain degree—a truism—or that, more specifically, *maqālah* should play a role in the teaching of rhetoric. It then states in Element 6.2 that the shape of proof (*tabīṭ*) has an influence on its clarity. Depending on the reading imposed on the damaged place indicated by asterisks, the text proceeds to argue that speech (*al-qawl*) should be moulded in a way that is advantageous to *dālīka al-šayʿ*, possibly proof, to address the listeners’ “imagination”. The mistranslation of ἀλλά leads to a statement which stands in marked contrast to the Greek text: it advises the reader to fashion speech in order that either the speech (interpreting *ka-ʿanna-hu* as referring to *al-qawl*) or the intended proof (with *ka-ʿanna-hu* denoting *al-tabīṭ*) appeal directly to the listeners’ “imagination” (*mutaḥayyāl ʿaw mutawabham*), adding in Element 6.4 that nobody would practice geometry in this way.

The following element (6.5) claims that this stratagem, whenever it occurs, works by *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuḡūh*. It does not dispel the mounting sense of confusion, equally felt by the translator who keeps stringing on word after word, burying the overall argument he seems unable to grasp.

With the “historical” sketch in Element 6.6, we reach firmer ground. The translator, still stepping gingerly through a minefield of unfamiliar terms, correctly identifies the passage as a short reference to previous theoretical treatments of his subject. It is unclear whether he was able to understand the title of Thrasymachos’ work as a metatextual reference to another text or interpreted it simply as his area of expertise.

The following change of topic appears as abrupt in the Arabic translation as it does in the Greek source. Now that Aristotle explicitly lists the concepts he wants to attend to, the translator has to follow suit and name

his subjects. In Element 6.7, he calls *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuḡūb* a “natural” (*ṭabīʿī*) and “non-artificial” (*ḡayr šināʿī*) activity. Artifice in speech, on the other hand, is “artificial” (*šināʿī*). From this premise, he concludes in 6.8 that those mastering this *ḥilāh* are—again mistranslating ἄθλα—“contestants” (*munāziʿīn ʿaw muḡābidīn*) and similar to rhetoricians who are obliged to employ *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuḡūb*. Viewed in isolation, this deduction does not make any sense—if we are not prepared to assume that *munāziʿī* and *muḡābid* evoked some meaning in this context.

Before it embarks on an account of the history of style (*maqālah*) in Text III, the Arabic text appends a note (Element 6.9) that has, thanks to the confusion of the preceding paragraphs, lost its connection to the previous discussion of delivery and *al-ʿabd bi-l-wuḡūb*. Whereas Aristotle argued that written speeches (when read out) derive their effectiveness from style rather than argumentative consistency and validity in order to support his main argument about the importance of style in speech, the remark has lost that relevance in the translation. Without the main line of thought it is intended to support, it stands isolated at the end of a rather confused and confusing text.

Element 6.1: “Expression” and “delivery” are necessary in teaching

1404a8f
173/6f

(1) τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς λέξεως ὁμῶς ἔχει τι μικρὸν ἀναγκαῖον ἐν πάσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ.

(1) فهذا مما قد يكون بالمقالة. (2) وفي المقالة شيء يسير اضطراري⁸⁷ في كل تعليم.

(1) this, then, belongs to what often comes about through speech,
(2) and in speech there is something small [and] necessary in all teaching.⁸⁸

(1) The clause *fā-hādā mimmā qad yakūn bi-l-maqālah* is another addition not found in the Greek text. Lyons proposes the reading τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς λέξεως οὕτως, ἔχει τε μικρὸν ἀναγκαῖον (τε) as a possible way out. The passage marks the transition from Aristotle’s previous discussion of delivery (*ὑποκριτικὴ*) to a short note on λέξις, here including delivery as well.

(2) The cataphoric position of the prepositional object *fī al-maqālah* before the sentence’s subject imitates the Greek text.

⁸⁷ Badawī: اضطراره. With his reading, the passage would translate “(2) And in speech, there is something that is small in necessity [i.e. unimportant] in all teaching.”

⁸⁸ Lyons: “(1) this is one of the things that happen through speech (2) and in speech there is something small and necessary.”

*Element 6.2: Clarity varies with “expression” and “delivery”*1404a9f
173/7f

(i) διαφέρει γὰρ τι πρὸς τὸ δηλῶσαι ὡδὲ ἢ ὡδὲ εἰπεῖν.

(١) وقد يختلف التثبیت فيما بين⁸⁹ ان يكون كذا او كذا،

(i) And proof often differs as has been made clear that it is like this or like that;

(i) The translator specifies the Greek infinitive εἰπεῖν as only meaning proof (*taḥbīt*). With *taḥbīt* as the referent of the conjunctive clause after *ʿan yakūn*, it becomes obvious that he has modified the meaning of the whole sentence: according to his version, it is not the way of speaking which makes a difference in terms of clarity, but the way of demonstration, i.e. the arrangement of arguments instead of the arrangement and choice of words and sentences as intended by Aristotle.

*Element 6.3: “Expression”, “delivery” and the “imagination”*1404a10ff
173/8f

(i) οὐ μέντοι τοσοῦτον, ἀλλ’ ἅπαντα φαντασία ταῦτ’ ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀκροάτην.

(١) فقد ينبغي ان يقال⁹⁰ القول بنحو [افاد]⁹¹ ذلك الشيء كأنه متخيل او متوهم عند السامع،

(i) furthermore, that which is spoken should be said in a way that expresses this matter as if it were something processed by the fantasy or imagination of [lit. “in”] the listener,

(i) The puzzling addition *bi-naḥw [ʾafāda] dālīka al-šayʿ* might be intended to amplify the previous, more specific statement. The qualification inserted by Aristotle (οὐ μέντοι τοσοῦτον) seems to have been dropped. Lyons assumes the translator reading *τοῦτο* instead of *οὐ*.

(i) Perhaps triggered by the appearance of *φαντασία* in this and *γεωμετρεῖν* in the next section and the complex syntactic structure of the passage, the translator leaves the tracks of Aristotle’s text and, by ignoring the intervening *καί* and conflating the two predicates *φαντασία ... ἐστὶ* and *πρὸς τὸν ἀκροάτην [ἐστὶν]*, presents us with an argument all of his own. While

⁸⁹ Lyons’ reading *bayn* would force us to accept *taḥbīt* as translation of *δηλῶσαι*, an unconvincing suggestion. The latter was used to cover a number of Greek terms, mostly those derived from different forms of *δείκνυμι/δείξω* or *πεῖθω*. Conversely, forms of the verb *δηλόω* were rendered in our sample with the verbs *bayyana*, *ʾawḏaḥa*, *dalla* and *ʾanāra*.

⁹⁰ Sālim, Badawī: om. ان يقال.

⁹¹ Sālim, Badawī: من.

Aristotle concludes his short note on λέξις in the sense of “expression” by claiming that its purpose is to affect an audience and that it is consequently not suited for subjects as self-evident and incontrovertible as geometry, the translator advises the reader to appeal to his listeners’ imaginative faculty; the information given in the sort of speeches he envisages are non-intuitive and have therefore to be processed by the listeners’ imagination. The connection between this statement and the following section on the teaching of geometry is as smooth as in his source text: in both versions, geometry is not taught with the help of “expression” because the latter appeals to φαντασία. Geometrical knowledge does not need to be channeled through people’s imagination: it is already self-evident.

The translator’s choice to render φαντασία gives us some hints about the text’s chronological relation to other translations. As Rüdiger Arnzen points out, later translations (after Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq) introduce a distinction between φαντασία as a process of simple reproductive imagination (“bloß reproduzierender Vorstellung”), translated as *ḥayāl*, and one of imagination that abstracts through visualization (“durch mentale Visualisierung abstrahierender Vorstellung”), translated as *wahm*, i.e. a mental faculty that actively operates on mental images.⁹² The terminology of the Kindī-circle was less subtle: most texts use *wahm* or *tawabhum* for φαντασία or φάντασμα in spite of the connotations those terms carried (“speculative” or “false opinion”, “deceptive imagination” or “hallucination”). Al-Kindī himself preferred (perhaps for this reason) the transcription *fanṭāsiyā*, also found in Uṣṭāṭ’s translation of the *Metaphysics*. With and after Ḥunayn, the translators settled for *ṭahyīl* or *ṭahayyul* instead of *wahm* or *tawabhum*.⁹³ The *Rhetoric* chose what Arnzen calls a “Mittelweg”, the doublet *mutaḥayyāl ’aw mutawabham*.

Several explanations come to mind: conscious choice, which situated him at the terminological crossroads between the Kindī-circle and Ḥunayn’s group; on the other hand, it would be equally possible to interpret it as the result of a revision by a later translator or perhaps a gloss that has made its way into the text at some point. In that case, we would probably expect the gloss to be added *after* the term to be glossed rather than before it. Without wanting to make too much out of a detail that could

⁹² Arnzen (1998, p. 75).

⁹³ Arnzen (1998, p. 113). Heinrichs (1978, p. 261f) adds that from early translations to the Ḥunayn tradition and afterwards, *ḥ-y-l* was commonly employed to translate φαντάζομαι with *ṭahayyul* becoming the stock translation for φαντασία. The root *w-b-m* on the other hand was often used in pre-Ḥunayn translations and later transformed into a purely psychological term.

have been caused by any number of random factors, it is tempting use this and other phenomena we will discuss below to classify the translation as belonging to the output of the Kindī-circle.

(i) *Inda* relays only a part of the meaning of *πρός* here. It does not convey the affective meaning (“intended to affect”) but brings out the consequences of the affect “in” the listener’s mind by suggesting a physical relation between *mutabayyal ‘aw mutawabham* and *al-sāmi‘*.

Element 6.4: Nobody practices geometry in this way

(1) διὸ οὐδεὶς οὕτω γεωμετρῆν διδάσκει.

(١) وليس من احد يهندس او [...] بهذا النحو،

(i) and there is nobody who engages in geometry or ... in this manner,

(i) Badawī’s suggestion *yafal* for the gap after *yubandis* is probably out of place in what seems to be one of our translators numerous double expressions connected with *‘aw*. Lyons opines that the translator read *γεωμετρῆ ἢ διδάσκει* instead of *γεωμετρῆν διδάσκει*, which would let us expect *tu‘allim*. A near-synonym of *yubandis* may be more likely.

The distinction between knowledge that has to be taught by appealing to the imaginative faculty and immediately self-evident knowledge is a shared motif in both philosophical traditions.⁹⁴ The importance of “geometrical” knowledge comes to the fore in al-Fārābī’s dictum on the merits of various forms of knowledge, contained in his *Faḍīlat al-‘ulūm wa-l-ṣinā‘āt* (*Excellence of the sciences and crafts*). He distinguishes between three criteria which are, separately or in combination, characteristic for “supreme” knowledge (*faḍīlat al-‘ulūm wa-l-ṣinā‘āt*): an exalted subject matter, incontrovertible proofs or the extent of benefits it provides. Geometry falls into the second category: *wa-‘ammā mā yafḍul ‘alā ḡayri-hi li-stiqṣā’ al-barābīn fi-hi fa-ka-l-handasah* (Jéhamy, 1998, p. 943).

Element 6.5: “Expression” and “delivery” employ “acting”

(1) ἐκείνη μὲν οὖν ὅταν ἔλθῃ (2) ταύτῳ ποιήσει τῆ ὑποκριτικῆ,

(١) لكن تلك الحيلة اذا وردت (٢) فانها ستفعل هذا بالأخذ بالوجوه،

(i) but this [sc. “stratagem”], when it occurs, (2) will have such an effect through the taking of faces.

⁹⁴ Barnes (1995, p. 25) stresses the role geometry played for Aristotle as a model for other fields of knowledge.

(1) Throughout our sample, the Greek *οὖν* is translated as *'ammā ... fa* or just *fa*. *Lākinna* seems out of place, the more so since *οὖν* here only marks the next stage of argument without implying any adversative relationship. (1) The fronting position of *tilka al-hīlah* is again due to our author's preference for closely matching word order between Greek and Arabic. (2) In his translation, Kennedy gives the dative *τῇ ὑποκριτικῇ* (somewhat unusually) a comparative sense. More natural would be the option our translator chose, a straightforward instrumental or sociative dative. Lyons adds that the translator apparently read *τοῦτο* instead of *ταυτό* and interpreted *τῇ ὑποκριτικῇ* as an instrumental dative qualifying *ποιήσει*.

1404a13ff
173/12ff

Element 6.6: Previous discussions of "expression" and "delivery"

(1) ἐγκεχειρήκασι δὲ ἐπ' ὀλίγον περὶ αὐτῆς εἰπεῖν τινες, (2) οἷον
Θρασύμαχος ἐν τοῖς ἐλέοις.

(١) وقد يبدأ⁹⁵ اناس بان يقولوا فيها شيئاً بعد شيء، (٢) كمثل قول ثرسوماخوس
في ذوات الهم.

(1) and people would begin to say this and that about it [sc. *al-hīlah*],
(2) like the treatise of Thrasymachos on what causes anxiety (what makes one concerned).

(1) The adverbial *ἐπ' ὀλίγον* seems to have been wrongly translated as *šay' ba'd šay'*.

(2) Here as in other cases when Aristotle quotes another work, it is not entirely clear if the translator understood the phrase *ἐν τοῖς ἐλέοις* correctly as a metatextual reference to a concrete work (and only translates the title to give his readers an idea of the treatise's content) or if he merely interpreted it as a more general reference to a subject Thrasymachos wrote about.

1404a15f
173/14f

Element 6.7: "Acting" is natural, "expression" and "delivery" artificial...

(1) καὶ ἔστι φύσεως τὸ ὑποκριτικὸν εἶναι, (2) καὶ ἀτεχνότερον, (3) περὶ
δὲ τὴν λέξιν ἔντεχρον.

(١) ثمّ الأخذ بالوجه طبعي، (٢) وهو بزيادة غير صناعي،⁹⁶ (٣) فأمّا الحيلة
في المقالة فصناعية،

⁹⁵ Margoliouth, Sālim: يبدي. The translation would then be "(1) and people expressed [it] by saying this and that about it".

⁹⁶ Margoliouth, Sālim, Badawī: طبعي ("natural"); this does not seem to be in line with the sense of the passage.

(1) Furthermore, the taking of faces is natural, (2) and it is in addition non-artificial; (3) as for stratagem in speech, it is artificial,⁹⁷

Element 6.8: ...because their master becomes a “contestant”

1404a16ff
173/15–18

(1) διὸ καὶ τοῖς τοῦτο δυναμένοις γίγνεται πάλιν ἄθλα, (2) καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ῥήτορσιν.

(١) ولذلك ما صار الذين يقدرون على هذا يكونون أتمًا⁹⁸ منازعين او مجاهدين،
(٢) كالذي يوجد عليه هؤلاء الرطوريون الذين يستعملون الأخذ بالوجه .

(1) and therefore those who are able to [do] this could not but become contestants or contenders,⁹⁹ (2) just as that which is found to happen to these rhetoricians who employ the taking of faces.

(1) As in Section 4, the translator misunderstood the term ἄθλα, a mistake we already noticed in 1403b32 on p. 89. I doubt his translation made much sense to his audience. Unfortunately, the logical connection between this and the following passage depends on a correct understanding of the term and its relation to γίγνεται ... τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ῥήτορσιν: prizes are won in contests, in which speeches are normally delivered orally on the basis of a written manuscript—whereas the listener might have found it difficult and tedious to follow an intricate argument he may have been able to comprehend in reading, he appreciated stylistic competence in oral presentation.

Without the clues provided by the Greek text, the next passage appears to be isolated and unconnected to the preceding discussion; moreover, the reader of the Greek text readily understands Aristotle as talking about written speeches which are orally delivered. The Arabic text might have suggested that written speeches as such (i.e. even when privately read) worked on the basis of style rather than argument, a claim diametrically opposed to Aristotle’s proposition.

Element 6.9: ...and because speech is effective through them

1404a18f
173/18f

(1) οἱ γὰρ γραφόμενοι λόγοι μείζον ἰσχύουσι (2) διὰ τὴν λέξιν ἢ διὰ τὴν διάνοιαν.

⁹⁷ Lyons: “(1) as for the device used in speech, it is artificial.” The somewhat awkward term “artificial” (*sinā’ī*) refers to something that is brought about by a “craft”, a learned and trained ability instead of a “natural talent” (termed *ἰαβι’ī* by the translator), which can be utilized without prior training.

⁹⁸ Badawī: لامل.

⁹⁹ Lyons: “(1) those who are able to do this are competitors or contestants.”

(١) فَإِنَّ الْكَلَامَ الَّذِي يَكْتَبُ قَدْ يَكُونُ أَقْوَى (٢) مِنْ أَجْلِ الْمَقَالَةِ لَا مِنْ أَجْلِ الْمَعْنَى .

(i) Furthermore, speech which is written down is often more powerful (2) on account of the style (or “what is said”/“the words”), not on account of the meaning.¹⁰⁰

Text III: The subject of “style”

With Text III, our task becomes somewhat easier. Dealing with the history and development of style (*maqālah*), it presents an account first of the beginnings of poetic style in Section 1 and proceeds to outline the changing stylistic preferences of contemporary tragedians and poets in Section 2, wrapping up the chapter with a mention of relevant material in the *Poetics* in Section 3. The number and severity of lexical and syntactical problems decrease sharply. Relatively straightforward exposition as that contained in Text III poses less of a challenge to our translator than the involved theoretical argumentation pursued in the preceding text.

Section 1: The development of “style”

The first section deals with the invention of style (*maqālah*). In Element 1.1, the contribution of poets as pioneers of style, more specifically poetic style, is noted. The text then (1.2) identifies the “mimetic” (*mumattil ’aw mušabbih*) properties of words and the voice as sources for the development of arts concerned with style such as rhapsody and rhetoric, listed in Element 1.3.

Element 1.1: Poets were the first to create their own “style”...

(i) ἤρξαντο μὲν οὖν κινῆσαι τὸ πρῶτον, ὥσπερ πέφυκεν, οἱ ποιηταί.

140419f
173/2of

¹⁰⁰ The term *ma’na* was adopted early on to denote various forms of mental phenomena and activities such as *σημαίνω* (Uṣṭāt, *Metaphysics*), *λόγος* and *νόημα* (Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn, *De anima*), *πεῖσμα* (Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn, *De Interpretatione*) or *θέωρημα* (Abū ‘Uṣmān al-Dimašqī, *Topics*). Interestingly, it was not normally used to render *διάνοια*: the term of choice from Uṣṭāt onward was a form of *’aql* (Afnan, 1964, p. 112, 115). In his translation of the *Poetics*, Abū Bišr departs from the majority usage in favor of *dihn* (Lyons, 1982, vol. 1, p. xxviii).

In his study of the use of *ma’na* in Arabic grammatical literature, Richard Frank (1981, p. 314–319) identifies four meanings of *ma’na*: firstly, the “intent of the sentence”; secondly, the “referent” of a noun or verb; thirdly, the “semiotic equivalent” of a word, phrase or sentence, i.e. its “interpretative rephrasing or analysis (*al-ta’wīl*)”; and fourthly, the “content or conceptual significate” of a word, phrase or sentence. The translator’s use falls under the first category.

(١) وكان الذين ابتدؤوا¹⁰¹ بتحريك تلك التي الأولى على مجرى الطبيعة الفيوتطيين،¹⁰²

(1) And those who began with moving those [things] which are first in natural order¹⁰³ were the poets,

(1) The translator's rendering of the metaphorical *κινῆσαι* with *tabrik* drops the metaphorical meaning of the Greek term and probably did not much to help his readers understand what Aristotle was getting at.

(1) To retain the Greek word order, the translator paraphrased the Greek verb with *kāna* and two interlocking relative clauses. He then attempted to accommodate both Arabic grammar and Greek word order by transforming the subject *οἱ ποιηταί* into a nominal predicate after *kāna* and added a relative pronoun to fill the subject slot. The position of the phrase *'alā mağrā al-ṭabī'ah* invites two interpretations: it could either be an adjunct to *al-fyū'iṭiyīn*—"they, according to nature, began to move those things which were first"—or, as Lyons suggests, it modifies *tilka allatī al-'ulā*: "they began to move those things which were, according to nature, first."

Assigning *'alā mağrā al-ṭabī'ah* to *al-fyū'iṭiyīn* suggests that the poets were somehow "naturally endowed" to "move" this first matter; in the second case, this matter would be first "by nature". It is not clear at all what this "first matter" could be. Without any conclusive identification of the phrase's referent, it seems prudent to follow Lyons' lead and connect *'alā mağrā al-ṭabī'ah* to *tilka allatī al-'ulā*.

(1) As before (1403b18 = 171/17, 1403b24 = 172/5), the adverb *τὸ πρῶτον* has been translated as an object to *κινῆσαι*. It is tempting to interpret this and the other occurrences of *tilka al-'ulā* as references to the first element of the two lists at the beginning of our sample (e.g. Section I.1 on p. 67 and Element II.1.1 on p. 73): the sources of persuasion. That would mean that the translator did not regard the distinction between *taṣḍīq* and *'iqnā'* as sufficiently important to warrant separate translations. In view of his consistency and diligence in reproducing variations in Aristotle's terminology, this would be surprising.

The problems with the adverbial *τὸ πρῶτον* are foreshadowed in Element II.1.1; in the sentence (1) *τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ἐζηθήθη κατὰ φύσιν*, (2) *ὅπερ πέφυκε πρῶτον*, (3) *αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα*, both readings (adverbial and objective) make sense. The similarities between this passage and

¹⁰¹ Margoliouth, Sālim: ابتدؤا, translating as "And those who expressed by moving".

¹⁰² Sālim, Badawī: الفيوتطيون.

¹⁰³ Lyons: "(1) to move those things that are first in accordance with nature."

subsequent occurrences of τὸ πρῶτον may have been a strong incentive to stick to the translational choice made at that point. In the course of his reinterpretation of τὸ πρῶτον, the translator apparently misreads ὅπερ for ὅσπερ and transforms the adverbial phrase ὅσπερ πέφυκεν into a relative clause dependent on τὸ πρῶτον.

An additional consequence of his consistent reinterpretation of τὸ πρῶτον as an object and a reference to the aforementioned list is the emergence of an independent network of references only loosely based on the Greek text. In conjunction with his consistently negative interpretation of rhetoric and its procedures, one can begin to consider the translation a quasi-independent work, based on motifs of the Greek source, expressing ideas that, inadvertently or not, seem to have originated with the translator rather than his source text.¹⁰⁴

Apart from outright mistranslations or problems of understanding, other factors may have played a role in the development of his understanding of the text.¹⁰⁵ As Peter Adamson has argued in the case of the *Theology of Aristotle*, whose adaptor worked in an intellectual environment suffused with a variety of philosophical ideas derived from Plotinus, Plato, Aristotle and their commentators,¹⁰⁶ the translator may have unconsciously or intentionally adapted the translation to different sources, e.g. the negative assessment of rhetoric and poetics expressed in several of Plato's dialogues.¹⁰⁷

1404a2.off
173/21-
174/1f

Element 1.2: ...because of the "mimetic" nature of words and voice

(1) τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα μιμήματὰ ἐστίν, (2) ὑπῆρξε δὲ καὶ ἡ φωνὴ πάντων μιμητικώτατον τῶν μορίων ἡμῖν.

¹⁰⁴ Aristotle's own attitude is, as Jonathan Barnes (1995, p. 260–263) remarks, more complex. On the one hand, he operates on the assumption that aspects of rhetoric can be neutrally treated as an "art" with its own set of technical precepts; on the other hand, he seems to envisage a "philosophical" rhetoric purified from less respectable ingredients such as emotional appeals.

¹⁰⁵ Pierre Hadot (1995, p. 75f) notes the role of misunderstandings and mistranslations not only as a source for sometimes very elaborate exegetical work in an attempt to bring a text into line with the commentator's expectations. They can and often enough were the occasion for "important evolutions in the history of philosophy. In particular, they have caused new ideas to appear."

¹⁰⁶ Adamson (2001, p. 212f).

¹⁰⁷ His views are most forcefully expressed in the *Gorgias* (e.g. Socrates' unflattering definitions, 462b8–463c7) and the *Phaidros* (e.g. the claim that contemporary rhetoric dealt in appearances instead of truth, 272d2–273c5). For an analysis of the passage and a good summary of Plato's criticism of contemporary rhetoric, cf. Rapp (2002, vol. 1, p. 212–223).

(١) فإنّ الأسماء قد تكون ممثلة¹⁰⁸ (٢) والصوت ايضا قد يكون مشبها¹⁰⁹ او
مثلا عندنا لكلّ جزء من الأجزاء،

(1) for the words [lit. “nouns” or “names”]¹¹⁰ are often representative¹¹¹ (2) and the voice as well creates likenesses and representations for us for each of the parts,

(2) The comparative meaning conveyed by ὑπῆρξε ... πάντων μιμητικώτατον τῶν μορίων seems to have been lost in translation. The translator interprets πάντων ... τῶν μορίων as genitive object to μιμητικώτατον, as well as misunderstanding the term τῶν μορίων. *Mušabbib* ... *li-kull ḡuz’ min al-’aḡzā’* might be misconstrued as “representing” or “representative for all the limbs”. Moreover, the superlative sense of μιμητικώτατον is lost.

(2) The ambiguous status of *’inda-nā*—relating either to *mušabbib ’aw mumattil* (“for us”) or to the following *li-kull ḡuz’* (“our”)—might have been avoided by appending the personal pronoun to *’aḡzā’*. The position of *’inda-nā* strongly suggest that it belongs to *mušabbib ’aw mumattil*.

Element 1.3: Thus, the arts were born

(1) διὸ καὶ αἱ τέχναι συνέστησαν, (2) ἢ τε ῥαψῳδία καὶ ἡ ὑποκριτικὴ καὶ ἄλλαι γε.

(١) وعن ذلك حدثنا الصناعات، (٢) اعني الرفسودية والابقرائية وسائر الاخر،

(1) and in consequence the arts came to be, (2) I mean rhapsody and acting and all of the others,

(2) *Ibūqrātīyah* as a transcription of ὑπόκρισις occurs only once in the whole translation. Why the translator should have felt the need to transcribe a term he on other occasions confidently translates as *al-’aḡd bi-l-wuḡūh* remains to be explained, particularly since contemporaries would probably have read it as “Hippocratic”, a reference to the Greek physician Hippocrates of Cos (d. ca. 370 BCE). Perhaps the translator desired to mark rhetoric in the context of this list of τέχναι as a discipline specific to Greek culture.

¹⁰⁸ Margoliouth, Sālim, Badawī: المنقل (“the annoying”).

¹⁰⁹ Badawī: مشتهي (“desiring”/“longing”).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Frank (1981, esp. p. 277–286) on the terminology of grammatical literature.

¹¹¹ Abū Bišr Mattā translates *μίμησις* (i.e. the Syriac equivalent *meddamyānūtā*) in most cases with the doublet *tašbīh wa-mubākāt* (cf. Heinrichs, 1978, p. 256). The connection between *μίμησις* and its derivatives and the Arabic root *š-b-h* seems to have been commonplace from the very beginning of the translation movement.

Transliterations and synonymic transposition seems to be the translator's favorite strategy when in doubt about a term's meaning. Interpreted in a more favorable light, the use of transliterations could point towards our author's cautious approach: rather than taking the risk of unwittingly modifying the meaning of the text through indiscriminate translation of technical terms into doubtful Arabic equivalents, he might have consciously chosen to retain transliterated Greek terms—perhaps to emulate the high degree of literality of late Syriac translations or to give his translation a “scientific” flavour in keeping with the elevated subject matter.

Section 2: Poetic “style”

Poetic style is the subject of the following section, starting with an appreciation of its effect. Earning their reputation through its application, poets are credited with the invention of a specifically “poetic”, i.e. “adorned” (*muzayyan 'aw muzabraf*), style in Element 2.1; Gorgias' influence is explicitly mentioned. The impact of that style on the undiscerning is outlined in 2.2. In the following element, riddled with problems, the text seems to state that the audience's approval is misplaced and that the aforementioned stylistic adornments would be more appropriate for other genres. The terseness of Aristotle's wording and especially the interjection *δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ συμβαῖνον* perplexed our translator sufficiently to render this section almost unreadable.

The following elements (2.4f) read deceptively easily. Unfortunately, our translator stumbles over a preposition and translates Aristotle's statement into its complete opposite: in his version, artists dropped colloquial elements from their works. Aristotle on the other hand means to say that everything that went *against* the grain of colloquial expression was discarded. Reaching the end of the chapter, the translator is back on track again and adds in Element 2.6 that the imitation of poetic style now looks ridiculous. Finally, as Section 3 states, the matter does not have to be discussed any further; the reader should turn to the relevant portions of the *Poetics* for a more detailed treatment.

1404a24ff
174/3–6

Element 2.1: Poets and “style”

(1) ἐπεὶ δ' οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγοντες εὐήθη (2) διὰ τὴν λέξιν ἐδόκουν πορίσασθαι τὴν [δὲ] δόξαν, (3) διὰ τοῦτο ποιητικὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο λέξις, (4) οἷον ἡ Γοργίου.

(١) فإنّ الفيوئطين¹¹² قد كانوا يتكلّمون باليسطة او العاميّة (٢) ويظنّون أنّهم يكتسبون المدح من قبل المقالة. (٣) وبهذا كانت تكون تلك الألفاظ الأولى فيوئطيّة، (٤) كمثل كلام جرجياس.

(1) for the poets used to talk in simple or common [expressions]¹¹³
 (2) and they thought that they earned acclaim on account of their speech. (3) And through this, those first words became poetic, (4) such as the speech of Gorgias.

(3) Without modifying the general meaning of the clause, the translator paraphrases the apparently unambiguous phrase *διὰ τοῦτο ποιητικὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο λέξις*; Aristotle talks about the emergence of poetical style, our translator about the fact that “those” (*tilka*) first words became poetic. Lyons suggests inserting a *ἢ* between *ποιητικὴ* and *πρῶτη* to bring Greek and Arabic into line again.

Element 2.2: Poetic “style” still valued

1404a2.6f
 174/6ff

(١) καὶ νῦν ἔτι οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν (2) τοὺς τοιούτους οἴονται διαλέγεσθαι κάλλιστα.

(١) ثمّ الآن أيضا قد يظنّ كثير من الذين لا أدب لهم (٢) أنّهم مصيبون حين ينطقون بهذا النحو من الكلام مزينا او مزخرفا.

(1) Furthermore, even now many of those who have no education¹¹⁴ often assume (2) that they hit the mark when they speak with this kind [of speech] in an ornamented or adorned way.¹¹⁵

(2) The enclitic pronoun *hum* could refer both to *alladīna lā ‘adab la-hum* or the poets discussed before.

(2) The pronominal reference at the end of the passage seems to have been read as *τὸν τοιούτον* instead of *τοὺς τοιούτους*, referring to “speech” instead of “speakers”. Furthermore, the translator expands the terse pronominal expression by reminding his readers of the kind of speech the speakers referred to use: *muzayyan ‘aw muzabraf*.

¹¹² This is probably a scribal mistake; Lyons proposes the emendation فيوئطين.

¹¹³ Lyons: “(1) talking in simple or common language.”

¹¹⁴ According to Afnan (1964, p. 91), *‘adab* and its derivatives came into use at an early date to denote various forms of *παιδείω*; Uṣṭāṭ already translates *ἀπαιδευσία* as *qillat ‘adab* and *ἀπαιδευτοί* as *‘alā ḡayr ‘arīqat al-‘adab*. Introduced by early *kuttāb*, the term *‘adab* was virtually ignored by al-Kindi but later taken up by al-Fārābī and became an established philosophical term.

¹¹⁵ Lyons: “(1) they think (2) that they achieve their aim when they use this type of speech, ornamented or adorned.”

(1) To appreciate the disagreement between Greek and Arabic caused by the adverbial phrase *muzayyanan 'aw muzabrafan*, we have to look back to the preceding section for the referent of *bādā al-naḥw min al-kalām*. There, we are told that the poets used to employ “simple” or “common” expressions. Here, we learn that poets can apply those very expressions in an “ornamented” and “adorned” way—a surprising transformation. Aristotle, on the other hand, only informs us that a florid style such as that of Gorgias is still widely admired by the uneducated.

1404a27ff
174/8ff

Element 2.3: Its trappings are more appropriate for other “styles”

(1) τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἔστιν, (2) ἀλλ' ἑτέρα λόγου καὶ ποιήσεως λέξις ἐστίν. (3) δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ συμβαῖνον.

(١) وليس يجوز هذا (٢) إلا لأصناف آخر من الكلام سوى الفيئطية، (٣) اعني ان يكون الوصف بألفاظ كائنة ما كانت،

(1) and this is not permissible (2) except for other types of speech apart from the poetic, (3) I mean that the description takes place with whatever words occur.¹¹⁶

(1)–(2) After a stretch of structurally matching passages from Element 1.2 to 2.2, we have reached another serious divergence. The substantial modifications found in this and the following passages begin with the translator misreading the double genitive *λόγου καὶ ποιήσεως* belonging to *λέξις*, perhaps, as Lyons suggests, on the basis of a reading such as *ἑτέρου λόγου*.

(3) The translator compounds his error by misunderstanding the phrase *δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ συμβαῖνον*, which he attaches as a comment to the previous passage. He consequently overlooks the fact that Aristotle at this point introduces his reason for the claim that the style of speech and poetry are not the same and misses the context in which the following notes on conversational and poetic style are placed. As we can see, the translator ends up with a substantially different text structure and—as we will find out below—a conclusion which directly contradicts Aristotle’s reasoning.

1404a29–32
174/10–13

Element 2.4: Poetic “style” should not be applied

(1) οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ τὰς τραγωδίας ποιῶντες (2) ἔτι χρώνται τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, (3) ἀλλ' ὥσπερ καὶ ἐκ τῶν τετραμέτρων εἰς τὸ ἰαμβεῖον

¹¹⁶ Lyons: “(1) this is not permissible (2) except for other branches of speech apart from poetry, (3) I mean that a description should be given in whatever words occur.”

μετέβησαν (4) διὰ τὸ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦτο τῶν μέτρων ὁμοιότατον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων,

(١) ولا هم اذا صنعوا الطراغوديات ايضا (٢) يستعملون هذا النحو بعينه، (٣) وكما صنعوا في الوزن المربع (٤) ليكون شبيها بتلك الأوزان الأخر، كذلك صنعوا في الطراغوديات ايضا،

(i) When they compose tragedies also, (2) they do not (should not) use this sort [of speech] itself. (3) As they composed in tetrameters [lit. “the quartered meter”], (4) so that it can be similar to those other meters, so they composed in tragedies as well;¹¹⁷

(1) The causal connection established by the Greek γάρ in the next clause disappears in the Arabic version, perhaps due to the problems the translator had with the previous phrase which expressly introduces the following passage as an argument for Aristotle’s previous claim.

(3) The next passage beginning with *wa-ka-mā šana’ū* presents several problems. Ἀλλά is not expressed in the Arabic version, thereby distorting the relationship between this and the previous clause. The phrase εἰς τὸ ἰαμβεῖον disappears and the intransitive verb μετέβησαν is mistakenly translated as *šana’ū*.

(4) The problems caused by the previous clause become obvious in the phrase *li-yakūn šabiḥan bi-tilka al-’awzān al-’uḥar*. To force some sense into the otherwise meaningless clause, our translator resorts to drastic measures. The key element τῷ λόγῳ is discarded; to make up for his excisions, our translator adds the explanation *ka-dālika šana’ū fi al-trāgūdiyāt ’ayḍan*, which leads him further away from the Greek text. In the process, the superlative ὁμοιότατον is reduced to the positive *šabiḥ*. According to Lyons, the apparent disappearance of εἰς τὸ ἰαμβεῖον could be due to its substitution by *ka-dālika šana’ū fi al-trāgūdiyāt ’ayḍan*.

The resulting translation falls into disjointed pieces of argument, strung together by the generic connector *wa* which the translator substitutes for the more specific Greek particles.

Element 2.5: Poets have dropped conversational speech

(1) οὕτω καὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων [ἀφείκασιν] (2) ὅσα παρὰ τὴν διάλεκτον ἐστίν, (3) οἷς δ’ οἱ πρῶτον ἐκόσμουν, (4) καὶ ἔτι νῦν οἱ τὰ ἑξάμετρα ποιοῦντες, ἀφείκασιν.

¹¹⁷ Lyons: “(3) as they composed in tetrameters, (4) in order that this should be like those other meters, so they composed in tragedies also.”

(١) فأنهم تركوا من الأسماء أو الألفاظ (٢) مهما كان من الكلام الجاري (٣) [مما] قد كان الأوائل يزيّنونه ويزخرفونه . (٤) ثم الذين يصنعون¹¹⁸ الأوزان المسدّسة الآن ايضاً قد¹¹⁹ تركوا مثل ذلك .

(1) for they have abandoned of nouns and expressions (2) whatever belonged to current speech¹²⁰ (3) such as that which their predecessors used as ornament and adornment. (4) Moreover, those who compose hexameters now also have dropped [what is] like that.

(1) The new start indicated by *fa-ʿinna-hum* does not correspond to the Greek *οὕτω* which merely continues the previous argument.

(2) By mistranslating the preposition *παρά*, which means “from” only in conjunction with a genitive, the translator reverses the meaning of the passage. Aristotle credits later composers of tragedies with dropping whatever did *not* belong to colloquial speech.

(3) *Πρῶτον* continues to cause trouble. To interpret *al-ʿawāʿil* as an adverb would correspond better to the Greek text, even though one would expect *ʿawwalan*; it might on the other hand represent an idiosyncratic use of the plural (instead of *al-ʿawwalūn*, which would be the appropriate form to denote people). Lyons refers to the emendation *οἱ πρῶτοι*, proposed by Roemer,¹²¹ to support this reading. The translator, determined *not* to read *πρῶτον* as an adverb, might have chosen to read a nominative plural instead of having to contend with an object he could not fit in.

(3) Of the two roots our translator uses for *ἐκόσμου*, *z-y-n* has made its way into the Arabic *Poetics*: Abū Bišr uses *zīnah* for *κοσμός* in the narrow sense of “literary ornament”. Another occurrence of *κοσμός*, denoting “harmonious order” or “arrangement”, is translated as *ḡamāl wa-ḥusn*, a doublet which conveys the æsthetic component of the term.¹²²

(1)–(3) The translator has found a firm footing again. Unfortunately, the fresh start after *fa-ʿinna-hum*, which translates *οὕτω*, interrupts the flow of argument.

1404a35f
174/16ff

Element 2.6: Conclusion—poetic “style” risible

(1) διὸ γελοῖον μιμεῖσθαι τούτους (2) οἱ αὐτοὶ οὐκέτι χρεῶνται ἐκείνῃ τῷ τρόπῳ.

¹¹⁸ Badawī: يستعملون (“they employ”).

¹¹⁹ Badawī: om. قد.

¹²⁰ Lyons: “(2) whatever is derived from common speech.”

¹²¹ Cf. Kassel (1976, p. 148).

¹²² Lyons (1982, vol. 1, p. xxix).

(١) فالافتداء اذا بهؤلاء مما يستحقّ ان يضحك منه (٢) اذا كانوا هم انفسهم قد¹²³ لا يستعملون هذا النحو

(1) Further, therefore the imitation of these [poets] belongs to that which deserves to be laughed at (2) since they themselves did not use this type [of speech]

(1) *Mimmā yastabīqq 'an yudḥak min-bu*: an elaborate paraphrase for γελοῖον which correctly expresses the word's meaning. The *fā ... 'idan*-construction might have been chosen to capture the sense of διό.

(2) The following relative clause of the Greek text has been transformed into a conditional *'idā*-clause in order to explain the causal relation to *mimmā yastabīqq 'an yudḥak min-bu*.

Section 3: This has been dealt with in the *Poetics*

1404a36-39
174/18-21

(١) ὥστε φανερόν (2) ὅτι οὐχ ἅπαντα ὅσα περὶ λέξεως ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, (3) ἀκριβολογητέον ἡμῖν, (4) ἀλλ' ὅσα περὶ τοιαύτης ὁίας λέγομεν. (5) περὶ δ' ἐκείνης εἴρηται ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς.

(١) كي يكون معلوما (٢) انه ليس جميع ما يمكن ان يقال في الألفاظ (٣) ينبغي لنا ان نتكلم فيه، (٤) ولكن قدر ما نتكلم فيه عن¹²⁴ ذلك. (٥) فامّا ذلك [الآخر]¹²⁵ فقد انبأنا عنه في الفيوثطية.

(1) so that it becomes clear (2) that not all that can be said concerning style (3) has to be discussed by us, (4) but [only] to the extent that we are speaking of it here.¹²⁶ (5) As to that other [matter], we have already discussed it in the *Poetics*.

(1) *Kay* renders the Greek ὥστε incorrectly; ὥστε here serves to conclude the whole preceding discussion of style. In the Greek text, there is no indication of causation suggested by the Arabic *kay*.

(5) The mention of the *Poetics* at the end of this section has apparently been correctly understood as a metatextual reference.

¹²³ Badawī: om. قد.

¹²⁴ Badawī: من.

¹²⁵ Badawī: النحو ("the type"/"sort").

¹²⁶ Lyons: "(4) but to the extent to which we are discussing that."

FINDINGS

Even in this relatively short sample of text, we find numerous instances of structural modifications. According to their impact, we can group them into two categories:

Firstly, modifications which have a direct and immediate influence on the structure of the passage they occur in and the following text; “local” changes, so to speak. The most prominent examples discussed above consists of either syntactical or lexical problems, i.e. the translator misinterprets syntactical features of the Greek text or misreads or mistranslates specific Greek words.

Secondly, modifications which do not necessarily lead to an immediate restructuring of the corresponding Arabic text, but affect the translator’s attitudes on issues dealt with in the *Rhetoric* and guide long-term structural decisions which only become obvious at a later point. The condemnation of rhetorical practices belongs to this category.

Both phenomena are equally instrumental in shaping the Arabic version: whereas the former group of modifications tends immediately to affect the sense of the text and is therefore readily identifiable, the latter leads not only to the introduction of an explicit stance only alluded to or even nonexistent in the source text (e.g. the translation’s views on rhetorical devices and acting), it subtly informs the process of reconstructing the Greek text’s arguments in a way which allows the translator to apply his preconceptions in the first place.

Before we turn to a discussion of formal aspects of the text, we will summarize the content of our text sample and determine where the translation diverges from the Greek text.

For Text I, our task is simple: the translator reproduces the list of aspects of speech Aristotle presents and follows him in explaining some points relating to two of them, “confirmations” and “thoughts” (or “considerations”). Both versions then introduce “expression” and argue for its importance for the present discussion.

On the subject of “delivery”, which is the focus of Text II, the texts start to disagree: we find the first two items of the second list of aspects of speech, “persuasion” and “expression”, in both texts. The Greek version, however, adds “delivery” as the third important factor; the translation, on the other hand, detaches this bit of information and assigns it to the following passage, leaving the third item unnamed.

Apart from disrupting the list, the disagreement does not have any

more serious immediate consequences: the Arabic text only starts its treatment of delivery slightly earlier than the Greek text, which passes on to its account of delivery in the following passage. Both texts agree that delivery was first used by poets and that it is relevant for both poetry and rhetoric, concluding the section with a reference to Glaukon of Teos.

Next, the role of “voice” in delivery is discussed. The translator follows Aristotle’s lead and relates the connection between voice and emotions and outlines technical aspects of the use of voice. A mistranslation leads him to change the subject to competence in delivery and its role in “contests”. The Greek text adds a note on the function of voice and delivery in contests.

The versions converge again in the next section, which deals with delivery. The Greek text, however, uses the neutral term “craft” in relation to delivery, whereas we find the negatively connoted term “stratagem” on the Arabic side. In what follows, the texts explain that the craft or stratagem of delivery has not yet been worked out owing to the late development of expression. Aristotle claims that this is due to the subject’s “vulgarity”, while the translator calls it “troubling” or “burdensome”. The use of different terms in this context strengthens the impression that the Greek and Arabic texts have a different attitude to this aspect of speech. Finally, both versions note the relation between rhetoric on the one hand and personal “opinion” on the other. The translator introduces a noticeable shift in meaning by making opinion the object, if not the aim, of rhetoric while Aristotle only points out the relation between them.

The translation again falls into line with the Greek text by reminding its readers of the need for diligence in delivery and by enjoining them to eschew emotional appeals in speech in favor of facts. In the following passage, the texts diverge once more: Aristotle explains that demonstration should be effected only through facts. The translator claims that one should argue about facts *and* rhetorical procedures.

Both texts conclude by stressing the negative side of fraudulent rhetorical means. A mistranslation leads to two very different thoughts: Aristotle finds the reason for the effectiveness of rhetorical tricks in the audience’s “corruption”. The translator on the other hand identifies rhetorical trickery as the very reason for the audience’s corruption.

Next, the texts shift the discussion to the subject of expression and delivery (which in our sample both versions fail clearly to distinguish). Its necessity for teaching is noted. Aristotle then records its influence on the clarity of speech, whereas the Arabic text slightly departs from

his reasoning and maintains that “demonstration”, not speech in general, varies in clarity according to differences in expression and delivery.

In the next passage, we encounter a more serious divergence: Aristotle categorizes expression and delivery as a form of outward show; the translator directs the reader to appeal to his listeners’ “imaginative faculty”, apparently motivated by the opposition between non-intuitive and self-evident knowledge. Why the translator decides to introduce these issues becomes clear in the following passage, which refers in both versions to “geometry” as not being taught by rhetorical means.

Both texts then establish the relation between delivery and “acting”. Mentioning together with Aristotle previous treatments of expression and delivery, the translator classifies acting as “natural” and expression and delivery (on the Greek side) or the “stratagem” of it (on the Arabic side) as “artificial”. The translator apparently refers to the distinction between *ṭabʿ* and *ṣināʿah* in Arabic literary theory discussed above (cf. the note on p. 105).

Another mistranslation causes some trouble in the following two passages. According to Aristotle, expression and delivery help winning “contests” owing to the fact that the oral presentation of written speeches is successful thanks to expression and delivery rather than the cogency of its reasoning. The translator claims that someone mastering it becomes a “contestant”. He then misinterprets the reference to written speeches and disrupts the logical connection between the two passages.

Text III, which discusses “style”, proves to be more manageable for the translator. He is able to replicate Aristotle’s reasoning much more closely than before. On the development of style, both texts credit poets with its invention, explaining their pioneering role with the “mimetic” character of words and the voice. This was, according to Aristotle and the translator, the basis for the birth and development of the arts.

After explaining that poets acquire fame through their specific style and that this style is valued among the uneducated, the versions drift apart again. Aristotle distinguishes between poetic and prose style, the translator states that “adornment” would be more appropriate for other styles than the poetic and adds that “description” in speech should be effected with expressions which are “at hand”, i.e. commonplace and not far-fetched.

What the translator interpreted as the continuation of the discussion of poetic style constitutes an independent passage in the Greek version which maintains that prose genres prefer “conversational” language to

poetic style. Having attached this stretch of text to the preceding passage, the Arabic version misses the logical connection between this and the previous passage and merely remarks that other styles are now preferred over the poetic.

While the Greek text continues its argument about the respective merits of prose and poetic style, the translator begins a new passage which explains that “conversational” speech, which poets allegedly used before to adorn their works, was subsequently dropped. Several misunderstandings lead him to a conclusion which contrasts sharply to Aristotle’s ideas.

Both texts converge again by concluding that poetic style cannot be taken serious. Finally, both refer to the more detailed discussion of style in Aristotle’s *Poetics*.

Studying the respective texts’ line of thought, we can conclude that, firstly, the translator seriously strives to capture and replicate Aristotle’s reasoning: he does not *intentionally* modify the source text’s content. Due to a number of problems he had with the text, he diverges at several points from the Greek version, only quickly to return to its train of thought. The resulting accumulation of mistranslations and misunderstandings, however, makes itself felt throughout as an additional factor in the translator’s interpretation of the text.

Secondly, neither the Greek nor the Arabic text present a fully structured and cogent “argument” in the strict sense: both alternate between purely explanatory passages analysing concepts or describing relations between them and short argumentative stretches setting out their reasons for adopting a certain idea or justifying their position on certain concepts. Argumentation is clearly a minor issue in both versions: the main thrust of Aristotle, followed as faithfully by the translator as his source text and his abilities allowed, was *didactic*. The role of style and delivery in speeches is to be expounded from a position of authority, not dialectically argued against some imaginary exponent.

While Aristotle formulates his account of the rhetorical craft from the position of a teacher who sets out to synthesize and improve on what he saw as flawed theories of rhetoric, the translator takes the authority of the text for granted *qua* Aristotle’s authorship. This leaves no room for arbitrary interventions on his part in the first place and supports our contention that any modification the translator happens to introduce cannot have been intentional: they must be the result of technical problems (the quality of his manuscripts, scribal mistakes etc.) or his apparent lack of experience in handling a text as demanding as the *Rhetoric*.

SOURCES FOR STRUCTURAL MISMATCHES

To illustrate the problems the translator had with Aristotle's style and his terse and difficult syntax, we will take a closer look at a few examples of syntactical and lexicological problems from the part of our text sample we have not analysed in detail above. We will start with an instance of misreading and mistranslation of single terms or expressions and then take a closer look at different types of syntactical problems.

Turning to the subject of "urbanities" (τὰ ἀστεῖα), Aristotle makes the following remark (1410b6f = 198/2of):

ἐπεὶ δὲ διώρισται περὶ τούτων, πόθεν λέγεται τὰ ἀστεῖα καὶ τὰ εὐδοκιμοῦντα λεπτεῖον.

ومن اجل أنا قد حددنا هذه وفصلناها فقد ينبغي ان نخبر من اين توجد المقالات الحسان المنجحات .

The intervening *καί* between τὰ ἀστεῖα and τὰ εὐδοκιμοῦντα has disappeared, the translator conflates both terms into the compound *al-maqālāt al-ḥisān al-munğīḥāt*. By combining two distinct topics into one, the translator causes some slight structural confusion; the reader could miss the switch from one topic to the next in the following discussion.

One frequent source for syntactical mismatches is the translator's problem with segmenting the text into sentences and clauses. Lacking graphical means for the division of the Greek text, he has to rely on certain particles and connectors and on his comprehension of the text.

On the subject of good prose style, Aristotle stresses the importance of ordinary language as a stylistic tool (1404b24f = 176/5ff):

κλέπτεται δ' εὖ, ἐάν τις ἐκ τῆς εἰωθυίας διαλέκτου ἐκλέγων συντιθῆ. ὅπερ Εὐριπίδης ποιεῖ

وهذا قد يغرّ ويخيّل امرؤ بلفظ من الكلام الجاري المتعود فيركّب ذلك كالذي فعل اوريفدس

The clause border modern editors have indicated between *συντιθῆ* and *ὅπερ* has slipped one word to the left. Misunderstanding Aristotle's metaphorical use of *κλέπτεται*, the translator ends up with a rather cryptic statement. One factor in his reading of *κλέπτεται*, as we have seen above, may have been his negative attitude to rhetorical procedures.

In his subsequent remarks on the character of metaphors and epithets, Aristotle observes (1405a10f = 177/11f):

δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα καὶ τὰς μεταφορὰς ἀρμολογούσας λέγειν. τοῦτο δ' ἔσται ἐκ τοῦ ἀνάλογον.

وَأَمَّا يَنْبَغِي أَنْ يُقَالَ أَيْضًا مِنَ الْمَوْضُوعَاتِ وَالتَّغْيِيرَاتِ مَا كَانَ مُشَاكِلًا، وَأَنْ يَكُونَ ذَلِكَ بِالْمُضَادَّاتِ

The new main clause after *τοῦτο* is subordinated to *yanbaḡī*, the *δεῖ* of the previous Greek clause. The missing connector in the Greek text, which should have alerted the translator to the beginning of a new sentence, is added.

In Aristotle's notes on the derivation of metaphorical expressions, we find the following sentence illustrating several translation problems (1405b15ff = 179/18–21):

ἄμφω μὲν γὰρ τὸ καλὸν ἢ τὸ αἰσχρὸν σημαίνουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἢ καλὸν ἢ οὐχ ἢ αἰσχρὸν. ἢ ταῦτα μὲν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον.

فقد يَنْبَغِي هَاهُنَا أَنْ يُضَعَّ ابْدَاءُ كِلَيْهِمَا، اعْنِي الَّذِي [يَدَلُّ] عَلَى الْحَسَنِ وَ عَلَى الْقَبِيحِ، وَأَنْ لَمْ يَكُنِ الْحَسَنُ وَالْقَبِيحُ، فَالَّذِي بِالْأَكْثَرِ وَالْأَقَلِّ.

The confusion apparent here is in part caused by translation problems encountered prior to this quotation. The translator reacts by paraphrasing: Aristotle's assertion about words used in the construction of metaphorical expressions is shaped into a directive for their construction; the antecedent of the elliptical conditional structure after *ἢ ταῦτα μὲν* is amplified and negated, perhaps on account of the repeated negation *οὐχ ἢ καλὸν ἢ οὐχ ἢ αἰσχρὸν*.

Elliptical expressions prove to be major stumbling blocks on more than one occasion. Failing to supply the element left out in the Greek version, the translator has a hard time making any sense of the sentence in question. In this example, contained in the chapter on the appropriateness of stylistic devices, Aristotle warns against deceiving the listener by emphasizing certain words with facial expressions and vocal clues (1408b5ff = 191/7ff):

λέγω δὲ οἷον ἐὰν τὰ ὀνόματα σκληρὰ ἢ, μὴ καὶ τῆ φωνῆ καὶ τῶ προσώπῳ [καὶ τοῖς] ἀρμολογούσιν.

وذلك فيما ازعم لا يستعمل الأسماء الشديدة وغير الشديدة، أو في مثل [ذاك] في الصوت والوجه على حسب ما يشاكل

The translator misses the conditional construction after *ἐὰν* and misreads the predicate *σκληρὰ* as an adjectival adjunct to *τὰ ὀνόματα*, making up

for the missing predicate by adding *yusta'mal*. Additionally, he puts the clause border between *μή* and *καί*. The negation is then read as an elliptical substitute for the opposite of *τὰ ὀνόματα σκληρά*. The second Greek clause, resting on the elliptical predicate *μή* [ἔσται], cannot be satisfactorily translated on the basis of the translator's reading; he appends its remainder to the previous clause with the connecting phrase *'aw fi miṭl* [dāka], perhaps an amplification of *καί* in the Greek text. The result is an extended paraphrase rather than a translation and fails to reproduce the sense of the Greek version.

One reason for the translator's tendency to redistribute the phrases he encounters into smaller syntactical units may have been Aristotle's occasionally complicated syntax style. One instructive example occurs at the end of a passage on the rhythm of speech (1409a21ff = 194/11–14):

ὅτι μὲν οὖν εὐρυθμον δεῖ εἶναι τὴν λέξιν καὶ μὴ ἄρρυθμον, καὶ τίνες εὐρυθμον ποιῶσι ῥυθμοὶ καὶ πῶς ἔχοντες, εἴρηται.

وقد ينبغي ان يستعمل في الوزن مقال حسن النبرات وليس ذاك السخيف . فاما اناس فيجعلون الوزن كله حسن النبرات . اما النبرات وبأية حال تكون في الأوزان ، فقد قيل .

The long and complex conjunctive clause framed by *ὅτι* and *εἴρηται* has been split into three independent sentences introduced by *wa-qad*, *fa-'ammā* and *'ammā* respectively. What should have been a unified reminder of issues already treated in previous chapters of the *Rhetoric* becomes a string of coordinate propositions. According to the Arabic version, only the last part, i.e. *al-nabarāt wa-bi-'ayyat ḥāl takūn fi al-'awzān*, has been discussed before.

In the following example, both clause border and connector pose a problem. At the start of Aristotle's discussion of "urbanities" and "popular sayings" (*τὰ ἀστεῖα καὶ τὰ εὐδοκίμοῦντα*), we find the following reasoning (1410b9–12 = 198/23–199/3):

ἀρχὴ δ' ἔστω ἡμῖν αὕτη. τὸ γὰρ μαθάνειν ῥαδίως ἢδὺ φύσει πᾶσιν ἐστὶν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα σημαίνει τι, ὥστε ὅσα τῶν ὀνομάτων ποιεῖ ἡμῖν μάθησιν, ἥδιστα.

ويكون البدو فيه هذا ان يسر التعليم لذيذ عند كل احد والأسماء فقد تبين عن شيء، فمهما كان من الأسماء يفعل التعليم فهو لذيذ .

The translator misses the pause after *αὕτη*, remodelling the following passage into a subordinate conjunctive clause. Apart from the struc-

turally irrelevant disappearance of the adverbial *φύσει*, he furthermore “downgrades” the coherence of Aristotle’s syllogistic argument by translating the strongly resultative connector *ὥστε* with the weaker *ἄ*.

Insertions and comments interspersed in the text are another source of confusion. Without graphical hints as to the relation of comments to the surrounding text such as the *καθάπερ εἴρηται πρότερον* of the next example, it can become extremely difficult to identify the appropriate syntactical relations. We are in the middle of Aristotle’s treatment of similes (1410b17f = 199/7ff):

ἔστι γὰρ ἡ εἰκὼν, καθάπερ εἴρηται πρότερον, μεταφορὰ διαφέρουσα προθέσει. διὸ ἥττον ἡδύ, ὅτι μακροτέρως.

والمثال على ما قد وصفنا من قبل . فأمّا التغييرات التي تختلف في الفرو تاسيس فهي لذلك اقلّ لذاذة، لأنّه تكون اطول

Here, the comment *καθάπερ εἴρηται πρότερον* has been applied only to the portion of the clause occurring before it; the rest (*μεταφορὰ διαφέρουσα προθέσει*) now becomes an independent main clause. The consequence of the statement punctuated by our comment, which Aristotle applies to the entire proposition from *ἔστι* to *προθέσει*, only relates to the second portion in the Arabic text after *fa-’ammā al-taḡyīrāt*.

The next two examples are part of a passage listing reasons for the popularity of rhetorical devices. The first instance deals with style (1410b28f = 199/21f):

κατὰ δὲ τὴν λέξιν τῶ μὲν σχήματι, ἐὰν ἀντικειμένως λέγηται

وأمّا اللفظ والمقالة فإنّ شكله ان يكون بالخلاف

The second instance treats word choice (1410b31f = 199/24):

τοῖς δ’ ὀνόμασιν, ἐὰν ἔχη μεταφορὰν

وفي الأسماء ايضاً تغيير

Both examples depend on the antecedent providing the predicate of each list member, *τὰ τοιαῦτα εὐδοκίμει*. Again, the translator is stumped by the Greek text’s elliptical style. Without an appropriate predicate, he has to work with what he finds in both passages. In both cases, he additionally drops the conditional particle *ἐάν*. He conflates the two clauses of the first example into an *’ammā ... fa-*construction and, in the second example, reads the optative *ἔχη* as indicative and uses it as the missing predicate for the clauses.

It is obvious that the translator has expended a lot of energy to understand and transfer Aristotle's reasoning as faithfully as possible. In spite of the high level of linguistic competence he demonstrates in many places in the text, several stylistic and syntactic phenomena he encounters overstrain his abilities. In a number of cases, Aristotle's terseness and his tendency to make full use of the syntactic flexibility of the Greek language are the most likely explanation for the translation failures we find in the Arabic version. A second factor is ambiguities and even outright mistakes caused by the Greek manuscript tradition, e.g. the lack of graphical markers to delimit sentences or larger textual units and of course scribal lapses. It is equally obvious that the translator sometimes does not let grammatical and syntactical obstacles stand in the way of the interpretation he has placed on the source text once he has made up his mind about the syntactical makeup and meaning of the passage he is translating.

THE USE OF CONNECTORS AND PARTICLES

Comparing the argument structure of the Greek and Arabic versions and highlighting translation issues the translator had to cope with, we found that he relied on a relatively small number of connectors and particles to comprehend and reconstruct Aristotle's thinking. Considering the importance of argument-structuring particles such as *γάρ*, *μέν* and *δέ* for the translation process and their role in clarifying logical relations between clauses, sentences and larger textual units, it is time to have a closer look at Greek particles and the way the translator employed the resources of the Arabic system of connectors and particles to replicate them.

The task of re-creating the argumentative subtleties achievable through competent use of Greek particles in Arabic is by no means an easy one. We will have to investigate whether the translator was aware of and able to deal with their semantical and functional flexibility. They can be used in a variety of contexts to express a wide range of logical and syntactic relationships. Handling them calls for a thorough understanding of both the Greek and Arabic system of connectors and particles and a high degree of flexibility and translational variation—unlike semantically less varied items such as nominal and verbal phrases, particles and connectors are not suited for schematic approaches such as word-by-word translation or the constant substitution with one and the same Arabic term.

Structural particles

Structural particles¹²⁷ are an ubiquitous feature of the Greek language. Almost every sentence in a Greek text is connected to the previous sentence by means of such a particle. They share one basic feature that sets them apart from most other particles: in grammatical terms, they are *post-positives*, i.e. they cannot occur as the first word of a sentence or phrase.¹²⁸ There are of course more structural particles than the four we chose for closer scrutiny, *γάρ*, *δέ*, *μέν* and *οὐν*. Taken together, however, they cover a majority of occurrences of structural particles in our text and provide us with a representative sample of Greek particles and their treatment by the translator.

In functional terms, they serve two basic purposes. Firstly, they connect grammatical and textual elements of equal weight, i.e. phrase to phrase, clause to clause or even argument to argument. Secondly, they introduce nuances of tone and emphasis affecting those elements. As such, they verbalize and underline logical connections between elements which in other languages sometimes may only be indicated by variations of tone and voice (in declamation), hence their significance for the translation process.¹²⁹

Not the most frequent but certainly the most prominent and one of the most important structural particles for translation purposes is *γάρ*. It expresses what Denniston terms the “confirmative” aspect of connection. Out of the eight distinct uses of *γάρ* (which, as he points out, are sometimes closely related), we are interested mainly in the following:

1. “confirmatory” and “causal”, giving the ground for belief or the motive for action;
2. “explanatory”, explaining a preceding clause:¹³⁰ this use of structural particles could be interpreted as a more general form of the causal type;

¹²⁷ This category is equivalent to what Denniston (1954, p. xliii–l) calls “connecting particles”.

¹²⁸ As with many phenomena of Greek grammar, this rule is not without exceptions, cf. Denniston (1954, p. lviii–lxi).

¹²⁹ Denniston (1954, p. xxxix) notes that this emphasis often “cannot be appropriately translated into a modern language”. As we will see below, this often applies to our translation as well. To illustrate the emphatic function of particles, Denniston points to parallels in musical notation: “the particles may be compared to the marks of expression in a musical score, which suggest interpretation rather than dictate it.”

¹³⁰ Denniston (1954, p. 58).

3. “anticipatory”, the order of arguments is reversed and the *γάρ*-clause precedes instead of follows the clause it explains:¹³¹ a positional variation of the explanatory type;
4. “progressive”, mainly in answers, marking the transition to a new point in an argument with the speaker either suggesting a new hypothesis after discarding the one previously discussed or concluding one topic and progressing to another.¹³²

Except in combination with *μέν* or *τε* for intensification, *γάρ* invariably occurs as the second word in a sentence.¹³³

Compared to other particles, the translational variation for *γάρ* in the Arabic *Rhetoric* is relatively small. Out of nearly 137 occurrences on the Greek side of our sample, 34 (not counting mistranslations, deletions and paraphrases) are translated with a combination of *'inna* with or without pronominal enclitics, mostly preceded by *fā* (27 times), rarely *wa* (3 times). The translation thus corresponds closely to the first three uses of *γάρ* listed above, the presentation of a *reason* for a preceding clause or argument, e.g. as in 1404b18ff = 175/18–176/1:

καὶ μὴ δοκεῖν λέγειν πεπλασμένως ἀλλὰ πεφυκότως. τοῦτο γὰρ πιθανόν
ولا يظنّ أنّهم يقولون بالفيوطيّة ولكنّ بالموافقة، فإنّ ذلك مقنع

Less frequently, we find *γάρ* translated as simple *fā* (20 times) or *wa* (17 times). The causal use of the particle in the first example and its explanatory character in the second have been somewhat reduced in translation by the use of *fā* and *wa*, respectively; whereas *fā* captures part of the causal relation expressed by the first *γάρ* in the following example, the second has been rendered as what Reckendorf terms an “erläuternde Beiordnung” (1406a5f = 181/3f):¹³⁴

καὶ «κυανόχρων τὸ τῆς θαλάττης ἔδαφος». πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ποιητικὰ
διὰ τὴν δίπλωσιν φαίνεται.

ويسمّي قعر البحر قاني اللون، فكلّ هذه فيوطنيّة لأنّهنّ مضاعفات.

In 18 cases, the causal component of *γάρ* seems prominent enough to the translator to warrant the strong translation *li-'anna*. Its use in this case

¹³¹ Denniston (1954, p. 68).

¹³² Denniston (1954, p. 81).

¹³³ Cf. Denniston (1954, p. 95).

¹³⁴ Reckendorf (1977, p. 316, 324).

is purely causal and not much different from other examples in which it has been rendered as *fa*-/*wa*-*'inna*; the translator might have considered the argument important enough to add some emphasis (1408b3of = 192/17–193/1):

διὸ ῥυθμὸν δεῖ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον, μέτρον δὲ μή. ποιήμα γὰρ ἔσται.

فقد ينبغي لذلك ان يكون الكلام [بـ]نبرات واما بوزن فلا، لأن الوزن فيوئطي

Another frequent translation is *qad* (15 times) with the *muḍāri*^c (imperfect/present tense) in combination with either *fa* (8 times) or *wa* (7 times). The following two examples can be found at 1407b5 = 187/8ff and 1410b21ff = 199/13ff.¹³⁵

τέταρτον, ὡς Πρωταγόρας τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνομάτων διήρει, ἄρρηνα καὶ θήλεα καὶ σκεύη. δεῖ γὰρ ἀποδιδόναι καὶ ταῦτα ῥηθῶς.

فعلى نحو ما قسم فروطاغوراس اجناس الأسماء [ذكرًا ومؤنثًا] ووسطا بين ذلك. فقد يحتاج ايضا الى استعمال تلك المقولات ...

διὸ οὔτε τὰ ἐπιπόλαια τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων εὐδοκιμεῖ (ἐπιπόλαια γὰρ λέγομεν τὰ παντὶ δῆλα, ...)

ولذلك ما لا ينجح ايضا الذين يقولون التفكيرات السخيفة، وقد اعني بالسخيفة تلك التي هي مكشوفة بيّنة لكل احد

A comparison of these two examples with the two instances of *γὰρ* translated only with *fa* or *wa* above reveals distinct parallels: in the first case, we find *fa* as the vehicle for the explanatory function of *γὰρ*; in the second, *wa* introduces a parenthetical explanation for a term, explicitly marked by the use of the verb *'aḥī*. It is very difficult to decide which purpose *qad* fulfils in our examples above apart from mere emphasis.

Usually, the particle *qad* has two main functions: together with *perfect* forms of the verb, it reinforces the conclusiveness of an action completed in the past. It moreover stresses the “factuality” of that action in accordance with or against previously held expectations. Together with *imperfect* forms of the verb, it either limits the scope of a proposition, e.g. *qad yaṣduq* = “he (sometimes or often) tells the truth” or simply emphasizes the verb.¹³⁶ Additionally, Georg Graf quotes several examples of a “facti-

¹³⁵ On the meaning of this construction, cf. Reckendorf (1977, p. 301f).

¹³⁶ Cf. Reckendorf (1977, p. 301f). Wright (1967, p. 286) lists “sometimes” or “perhaps” as possible English equivalents, noting its use to indicate rarity or paucity on the one hand (*li-l-taqīl*), but on the other hand also frequency (*li-l-takīr*).

tive” use of *qad* with imperfect verbal forms from early Christian Arabic literature.¹³⁷

The translator uses *qad* very frequently. Interestingly enough, the main use, i.e. *qad* with the perfect, occurs only in about a quarter of cases: out of 128 instances of *qad* followed by a verb, only 34 appear in conjunction with a perfect form. 15 of these instances occur in the context of literary quotes Aristotle uses for illustration, most of which have been translated as literally as possible. There remains a surprising 94 instances of *qad* in conjunction with imperfect verbal forms. As we will see below, *qad* plays an important role in the translation of other Greek particles as well.

Less frequent translations for $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ in our sample are *wa-fa-’ammā* ... *fa* (5 times), *wa-dālika ’anna* (4 times) and *wa-fa-’inna-mā* (twice). In addition, we find isolated renderings such as *tumma* and *lākinna*. Compared to other particles, the number of instances in which $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ has been left untranslated is comparably small (5 times).

So far, we can draw the following conclusions: the importance of the particle $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ is borne out by the small range of lexical variation in the Arabic version. Except for a small number of isolated translation variants, most cases are covered by just five Arabic equivalents. In addition, non-translation happens so rarely that it seems, unlike other particles we will treat below, to be regarded as too important by the translator to be ignored. He moreover pays special attention to the particle’s causal connotations: in a number of cases, they are stressed with the strong Arabic connector *li-’anna*. Looking at the distribution of *fa* and *wa*, either as isolated translation of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ or used in combination with the other Arabic renderings, we notice a strong tendency to use *fa* (58 cases) instead of *wa* (30 cases); while not exclusively causal in character, *fa* provides added stress on progression in temporal, spatial or logical relations.

Greek complements to $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ such as $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ (7 instances) and $\tau\epsilon$ (4 instances) seem to have a negligible influence on the translator’s procedure. In combination with $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, appositional $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ retains its explanatory character but ceases to function as a conjunction.¹³⁸ Since the phrase’s semantic content remains the same, the grammatical difference between single $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ and the collocation $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ does not prompt the translator to differentiate between the two.

With $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$ at one end of the semantic and functional spectrum of particles insofar as it fulfils a function that has to be made explicit in the

¹³⁷ Graf (1905, p. 34).

¹³⁸ Denniston (1954, p. 67).

translation and cannot be ignored, *μέν* belongs to the other end of the spectrum. In isolation, it serves to emphasize and affirm an idea or focus attention on it. This function is especially prominent in the combination *μέν οὖν*.¹³⁹ Occurring mostly in conjunction with a following *δέ*, its main purpose is to introduce the first element in a list of balanced or contrasted items.¹⁴⁰ These items always have to be structurally parallel; the terms, phrases or larger units connected by a *μέν ... δέ*-construction also have to be of equal grammatical weight. As a consequence, *μέν* in such a construction does not connect the element it relates to to any preceding grammatical or syntactical item: it looks forward to the next instance of *δέ* as its necessary complement. As Denniston points out, the strength of the contrast indicated by a *μέν ... δέ*-construction can vary substantially between the poles of mere coordination and strong antithesis.¹⁴¹

Both *μέν* and *δέ* can occur with or, more frequently, without article. In spite of slightly differing translations, the construction's function remains the same: to present disjunctively parallel or contrasting items of equal (grammatical) weight.¹⁴² In addition, *μέν* can be complemented by other particles. We have already seen that, in combination with *γάρ*, any independent semantic or functional role *μέν* might play in isolation is, apart from general emphasis, absorbed by the semantically and functionally more potent *γάρ*. Accordingly, Arabic translations of the cluster *μέν γάρ* do not show any difference to translations of solitary instances of *γάρ*.

Out of 83 instances of *μέν* in our sample, 10 appear in combination with an article; they will be treated below. Of the remaining 73, 8 occur in conjunction with *γάρ*, 19 in conjunction with *οὖν*. The most frequent translation for the remaining instances of *μέν* is, interestingly enough, omission: 16 times, the particle has been ignored altogether. The following example taken from the beginning of our sample shows how the translation of the corresponding instances of *δέ* has been toned down accordingly. Here, the *μέν ... δέ*-set expresses coordination instead of an antithetical relationship between clauses. *Μέν* is dropped, the two instances of *δέ* rendered as *wa* (1403b7f = 171/2ff):

ἐν μὲν ἐκ τίνων αἱ πίστεις ἔσονται, δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὴν λέξιν, τρίτον δὲ πῶς χρὴ τάξαι τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου

¹³⁹ Denniston (1954, p. 359).

¹⁴⁰ This use is called "preparatory" by Denniston (1954, p. 369).

¹⁴¹ Denniston (1954, p. 370).

¹⁴² Denniston (1954, p. 370f).

احدها من الاخبارات من ايّ الأشياء تكون التصديقات، والثانية ذكر الاتي تستعمل في الألفاظ، والثالثة ان كيف ينبغي ان ننظم او ننسق اجزاء القول .

Combinations of *'inna* follow in second place (7 times), preceded equally frequently by *wa* or *fa*. The translator has been at pains to explicate the logical structure by supplying particles and amplifications where the Greek version prefers a more succinct phrasing. The example shows the translator using *fa-'inna* to separate the preceding point from the coordinated list Aristotle presents in this passage. In this and other cases, it would probably be more appropriate to interpret *fa-'inna* as a device introduced by the translator to distinguish the entire *μέν ... δέ*-construction; this would mean that he does in fact omit *μέν* and, correctly recognizing the coordination expressed by the construction, render *δέ* as *wa* (1407b29ff = 188/15f):

ἐὰν μὲν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἢ αἰσχρόν, τοῦνομα λέγειν, ἐὰν δ' ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, τὸν λόγον.

فأنه ان كان قبيحا في الصفة فينبغي ان يستعمل الاسم وان كان قبيح الاسم ان يذكر الصفة

Next is the translation *wa* with 5 instances. Similar to ignoring the particle, *wa* sheds any specific structural content *μέν* might impart and narrows its meaning to its connective function. In this example, recurrent and interlocking *μέν ... δέ*-constructions have caused some slight confusion: the translator marks a new argumentative step between *μέν* and the following *δέ*, which is emphasized and rendered as *wa-'ammā*. One possible interpretation for the apparent rift between *μέν* and *δέ* in this example could be the translator's expectation that a reader would supply the missing *'ammā* at the beginning of the passage and thereby reinstate the coordinative sense it has in the Greek version (1410a26f = 198/3f):

καὶ ἀρχὴ μὲν αἰεὶ τὰ ὀνόματα, ἢ δὲ τελευτῇ τὰς ἐσχάτας συλλαβὰς

والمبادئ فيها تكون ابدا [بالأسماء] وأما النهايات فتكون بالمقاطع

Independent instances of *μέν* have been translated with *'ammā ... fa*-constructions only three times. Its relatively infrequent use for isolated *μέν* contrasts with its more prominent role in translating *μέν* in conjunction with *γάρ* or *οὖν*, which we will examine below (1403b9f = 171/5f):

περὶ μὲν τῶν πίστσεων εἴρηται, καὶ ἐκ πόσων, ὅτι ἐκ τριῶν εἰσι

فأمّا التصديقات فقد قيل فيها وبين [على] كم وجه تكون وإنّها تكون من ثلاثة
أوجه

Less frequent are translations such as solitary *fa* and combinations of *qad* and *tumma* (3 instances each) or *'inna-mā* (1 case). Cases of *μέν* in conjunction with *γάρ* have already been discussed; we now turn to the cluster *μέν οὖν*.

In isolation, *οὖν* as a structural particle has several functions: it emphasizes an action or thought, it indicates temporal or argumentative progression or introduces the result of a preceding argument.¹⁴³ In our sample, isolated instances of *οὖν* are rare; out of 28 examples, 18 take the form of the cluster *μέν οὖν*. In combination with *μέν*, the particle sheds its resultative meaning and functions as a transitional connector, stresses a prospective *μέν* or underlines an affirmative *μέν*.¹⁴⁴ In translation, it is substituted remarkably often with *'ammā*-phrases (9 times). In this example, the progression to a new stage signalled by the phrase is replicated with an *'ammā ... fa*-construction (1403b32f = 172/14f):

τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄθλα σχεδὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων οὔτοι λαμβάνουσιν

وأما ذوو المنازعة فيأخذون ذلك من المنازعات والمزاولات

Decidedly less common are translations with *wa* (twice) and singular instances of e.g. *lākinna* or *wa-dālika 'anna*. Without *μέν*, *οὖν* has been variously translated as *fa* (5 times) and combinations of *'inna* (3 times) and *'ammā* (twice); the translator's renderings reflect the transitional and progressive sense of the isolated particle (1404b1 = 174/22):

ἔστω οὖν ἐκεῖνα τεθεωρημένα,

فلنجعل القول هاهنا في الاتي هن في تعلّم هذه الحيلة

Only once in our sample does *οὖν* take on its second function as an adverb of time. The translator rises to the occasion (1410b9 = 198/23):

εἴπωμεν οὖν καὶ διαριθμησώμεθα.

فلنذكر الآن هذا ونقول فيه

As with combinations of *μέν* and *γάρ*, the particle *οὖν* seems to have next to no influence on the way the translator works with *μέν*. In semantic and functional terms, he probably regards *οὖν* as even weaker than *μέν*, its

¹⁴³ Denniston (1954, p. 418, 425f).

¹⁴⁴ Denniston (1954, p. 470–478).

function reduced to a general form of (weak) emphasis he could not or does not see fit to replicate in Arabic.¹⁴⁵

The remaining group of instances of *μέν* are occurrences of *ὁ μὲν* followed by *ὁ δέ*. Functionally, *ὁ μὲν* and its complement are similar to their use without articles: they structure lists of equivalent items, this time by taking on the role of pro-forms denoting the items themselves.¹⁴⁶ Out of 10 occurrences, 4 are covered by the isolated translations *tilka*, *min-hu*, *dālika al-nahw* and *wa-ʿammā ʿanna*. The rest is accounted for by combinations of *baʿd* and the use of *dāka* (1406a13 = 181/12f):

ἐν δὲ λόγῳ τὰ μὲν ἀπρεπέστερα, τὰ δὲ, ἂν ἦ κατακορηῆ, ἐξελέγχει

وَأَمَّا فِي الْكَلَامِ فَبَعْضُهُنَّ لَا تَحْسُنُ الْبَيِّنَةُ وَبَعْضُهُنَّ إِنْ كُنَّ مَعْلُومَةً يَقَيِّدَنَّ

The translator is able to distinguish between the particles in the sentence and to identify and translate their different use (1405a24f = 178/8f):

ταῦτα δ' ἄμφω μεταφορά, ἡ μὲν ῥυπαινόντων ἢ δὲ τοῦναντίον.

فهذاني كلاهما [تغيير]، فأما ذاك فللمستدّنين بالمدّمومات، وأما هذا ففضدّ ذلك.

As we can see above, the translator regards *μέν* mostly as a marker for a generic step or a transition in an argument or, in combination with other particles, an indicator of emphasis. Arabic equivalents are varied, it is even left untranslated in a number of cases. In conjunction with other particles, it is mostly ignored in favor of the semantically stronger complement. Together with *οὖν*, it seems to constitute part of a group of particles signaling temporal and/or argumentative transition and progression. They are without a fixed Arabic equivalent and can be rendered into almost every Arabic particle which marks an argumentative step without specifying the nature—e.g. causal, temporal, adversative—of the connection between two elements. Unfortunately, the translator loses sight of one important function of *μέν* in the process: while in itself not connecting backwards, it in most cases signals the beginning of a new cluster of elements hinging on *μέν* and subsequent instances of *δέ*.

Both in terms of its frequency and its functional variety, *δέ* is by far the most important structural particle. Apart from its role in *μέν ... δέ*-constructions discussed above, it can be used as a “copulative” particle

¹⁴⁵ According to Denniston (1954, p. 472), it could be argued that *μέν* is no more “essentially connected” with *οὖν* than it is in the former combination with *γάρ* and that, for *μέν οὖν*, “the transitional force ... resides in *οὖν* alone”.

¹⁴⁶ Denniston (1954, p. 370f).

connecting clauses and sentences (“and”/“also”) (Denniston’s “continuative” function); as an “adversative” connector (“but”) or, in apodoses, as “affirmative” particle (“therefore”/“in fact”). The first two uses are what interests us most. In the words of Denniston, “[a]s a connective, δέ denotes either pure connexion ... or contrast ... with all that lies between”.¹⁴⁷

Owing to its importance and functional variety, δέ occurs very often in our sample. Even though the particle has, like μέν, been translated with 10 different Arabic terms and phrases—not counting its nominalized form and omitting mistranslations, paraphrases and deletions—, most appearances can be accounted for with just a small number of Arabic equivalents. Out of 185 instances, roughly one third (60 occurrences) has been substituted with simple *wa*. In this example, both instances of δέ serve a purely coordinating function between clauses and are accordingly rendered as *wa* (1405a10ff = 177/11ff):

δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα καὶ τὰς μεταφορὰς ἀρμοστούσας λέγειν. τοῦτο δ' ἔσται ἐκ τοῦ ἀνάλογον. εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπρεπὲς φανῆται.

وَأَمَّا يَنْبَغِي أَنْ يُقَالَ أَيْضًا مِنَ الْمَوْضُوعَاتِ وَالتَّغْيِيرَاتِ مَا كَانَ مُشَاكِلًا، وَأَنْ يَكُونَ ذَلِكَ بِالْمُضَادَّاتِ، وَالْأَفَاءَةِ يَرَى غَيْرَ جَمِيلٍ

In the next example, the μέν ... δέ-structure has been slightly flattened to *fa* followed by two instances of *wa* (1405b30ff = 180/14f):

ἀντὶ μὲν χρυσίου χρυσιδάριον, ἀντὶ δ' ἱματίου ἱματιδάριον, ἀντὶ δὲ λαιδοργίας λαιδορημάτιον

فيقول مكان الذهب ذهيبا ومكان الثوب ثوبيا ومكان الشتيمة شتيما

The emphasis on a sequence or list of items called for in many instances of μέν ... δέ-constructions is provided by the second most important translation covering the second third of instances of δέ (59 occurrences), i.e. combinations of *'ammā*, especially *'ammā ... fa*-structures (49 cases). The second enumeration of aspects of speech in the first chapter of our sample provides a good example for the translator’s treatment of such lists. The introductory μέν is accentuated by *fa*, the following parallel *'ammā ... fa*-structures are added with connecting *wa* (1403b18–21 = 171/17–172/1):

τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ἐζητήθη κατὰ φύσιν, ὅπερ πέφυκε πρῶτον, αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα ἐκ τίνων ἔχει τὸ πιθανόν. δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ταῦτα τῇ λέξει διαθέσθαι. τρίτον δὲ τούτων

¹⁴⁷ Denniston (1954, p. 162).

فأمّا تلك الأولى فقدّمنا النظر فيها على مجرى الطبيعة، لأنّها متهيّأة في الطبع لأن تكون أوّلاً، اعني ان ننظر في الأمور انفسها، من اين يكون الإقناع فيها، وأمّا الثانية، فوضع ذلك في اللفظ او المقالة، وأمّا الثالثة فههي هذه

Added emphasis, here at the beginning of a chapter introducing a new subject, is achieved through addition of *inna*. The translator takes his clue not exclusively from the Greek sentence, which would suggest a less pronounced transition than the structure he employs. It seems as if he wants to stress the thematic progression beyond what Aristotle himself saw fit (1408a10f = 189/13f):

τὸ δὲ πρέπον ἔξει ἢ λέξις, ἐὰν ᾗ παθητικὴ τε καὶ ἠθικὴ

فأمّا اللفظ او المقالة فإنّها تكون جميلة اذا كانت مضلّلة خلقية

In third place follows *qad* (24 times), preceded almost exclusively by *wa* (21 times) rather than *fa* (twice). As we have seen on p. 127, *qad* with the *muḍāriʿ* can both qualify an action expressed with the verb or emphasize it. It does not directly translate the particle but conveys its emphatic component and works in combination with the preceding connector and the following verb. The following quote not only illustrates the use of *qad* related to *δέ*, it also contains all the occurrences of *ʾimmā ... fa*-constructions standing in for *δέ* in our sample (1408a16–19 = 189/20–23):

παθητικὴ δέ, ἐὰν μὲν ᾗ ὕβρις, ὀργιζομένου λέξις, ἐὰν δὲ ἀσεβῆ καὶ αἰσχροῦ, δυσχεραίνοντος καὶ εὐλαβομένου καὶ λέγειν, ἐὰν δὲ ἐπαινετὰ, ἀγαμέωνος, ἐὰν δὲ ἐλεεινά, ταπεινῶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ὁμοίως.

وقد ينتفع بالمقالة أمّا اذا كانت بالعار والمنقصة فللغضب وأمّا بالإثم والشنعة فللتوقّي والتعسير وأمّا بالمدائح فللاستدراج وأمّا بالمضادّ فللهمّ او الجزع، وكذلك سائر الآخر

Solitary *fa* plays only a minimal role in translating *δέ* (14 times). Adding up occurrences of *wa* and *fa* in isolation or in combination with other terms translating *δέ*, we arrive at a proportion of ca. 3:1 in favor of *wa* (*wa* 124 times, *fa* 45 times). The translator seems to regard the purely connective function of *δέ* as its most important feature. This does not, however, automatically mislead him into ignoring other aspects of *δέ* altogether. In the following example, he detects the affirmative and causative connotations of *δέ* and translates accordingly. Explaining the characteristics of periodical style, the text concludes (1409b1f = 195/7f):

ἠδεῖα δ' ἢ ποιούτη καὶ εὐμαθής,

فالذي هو بهذه الحال قد يكون لذيذا يسير التعليم

Outright non-translation is an option the translator chooses comparatively rarely. The majority of cases occur in contexts which prove to be problematic to the translator and which he chooses to treat by way of paraphrase rather than word-by-word translation.

As we have seen above, the copulative aspect of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, which is most prominently displayed in the combination $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ *καί*, is in a small number of cases reproduced with *tumma*. This example is drawn from the first chapter; Aristotle lists the aspects of speech already discussed elsewhere (1403b13f = 171/10f):

εἴρηται δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα, πόθεν δεῖ πορίζεσθαι.

ثم قيل ايضا من اين ينبغي ان تلتمس التفكيرات

Of the remaining translations of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ —*'inna* (7 times), *lākinna* (5 times), *'immā* (4 times), *'inna-mā* (3 times) and *ḡayr 'anna* (twice)—*lākinna* and *ḡayr 'anna* merit some attention. Both strongly reflect the adversative sense of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and substantiate our claim that the translator is well aware of the multifunctional nature of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and the need to modulate his translation according the context. The first example again illustrates the high level of grammatical competence our translator brings to bear on the text. The second $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and the following *γάρ* are translated with semantically strong terms to bring out their respective strong adversative and causal overtones (1406b24f = 183/23-184/1):

χρήσιμον δὲ ἢ εἰκὼν καὶ ἐν λόγῳ, ὀλιγάκις δέ. ποιητικὸν γάρ.

وما نافع المثال في الكلام ايضا ولكن ينبغي ان نقل استعماله لانه [فيوئطي]

The connector *ḡayr 'anna* has been discussed before in the structural analysis of the first chapter of Book Three (cf. p. 77); except for the two appearances in the first chapter, it does not occur again in the entire sample. We have already noted that in both cases, *ḡayr 'anna* disrupts the argumentative structure of the Greek version. Its coincidence with the negative adverbial particle *οὐπω* followed by $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, both times correctly rendered as *lam ... ba'd*, might be accidental; nevertheless, this might have played a role in prompting the translator to introduce *ḡayr 'anna* in spite of its negative impact (1403b21f = 172/1f and 1403b35f = 172/18f):

οὐπω δ' ἐπικεχέρηται, τὰ περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν.

غير ان الحيلة في الأخذ بالوجه لم تبدئ ان تظهر بعد

οὐπω δὲ σύγκειται τέχνη περὶ αὐτῶν

غير انّ الصناعة او الحيلة في ذلك لم تركب بعد

In the case of nominalized δέ, the situation is similar to that of nominalized μέν. The translator's preferences on its 8 occurrences are again for combinations of *ba'ḍ* (3 times), followed by *hādā* and *kadā* (twice each) and a single instance of *hiya*. The following example is especially intriguing and deserves to be quoted in full: Aristotle discusses the complementary character of connecting particles in general and μέν and δέ in particular, something the translator comprehends well enough in his practical work but which he fails to grasp when he finds it explained in his source. As we can see, he does not realize that Aristotle discusses the alternation of μέν and δέ (1407a20-23 = 185/16-186/2):

πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τοῖς συνδέσμοις, ἂν ἀποδιδῶ τις ὡς πεφύκασι πρότεροι καὶ ὕστεροι γίγνεσθαι ἀλλήλων, οἷον ἔνιοι ἀπαιτοῦσιν, ὥσπερ ὁ μὲν καὶ ὁ ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπαιτεῖ τὸν δέ καὶ τὸν ὁ δέ.

وأولّ الوجه في ذلك ما قد استعمل في رباطات المنطقية، اذا المتكلم جاد بها على ما هي متهيأة ان تكون عليه في التقدّم والتأخّر، [بعضها من] بعض، فانّ منها ما بعده، كقولك امّا ذاك واما انا، فهذا يقتضي كذا وكذا.

In general, the particle δέ is less frequently omitted than μέν and seems to show a slightly smaller range of variation in terms of its Arabic equivalents. Nevertheless, the translator seems to regard it as part of a class of generic particles which in many cases leave the exact relation between the connected elements unspecified.

With few exceptions, δέ remains without Greek complements (or is at least translated as an isolate) and only rarely undergoes translational modifications due to its being combined with semantically stronger particles. The slight degree of variation away from standardized renderings, i.e. combinations of *wa*, *fa*, *'inna*, *'ammā* and *'immā*, can be explained by the translator's correct identification of overtones inherent in the specific context of the particle in the source text. He is in most cases able to detect the particle's adversative or conjunctive aspect (e.g. in lists as opposed to adversative arguments) and chooses his Arabic counterpart accordingly.

Some of the stronger equivalents (most prominently *ḡayr 'anna*) underline the importance of structural particles such as *γάρ*, *μέν* and *δέ* for the translator in his attempt to understand the argumentative flow of the

source text and adequately to reproduce the relations between Aristotle's arguments.

The frequency of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ -structures and their evident importance for Aristotle's argumentative procedure might hold the key to the confusing case of *ḡayr 'anna*: in a highly structured text such as the *Rhetoric*, replete with instances of independent $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and frequent $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ -constructions, the translator was probably extremely tempted to interpret adjacent instances of both particles as belonging to such a construct, especially where he had problems grasping a passage's meaning which, properly understood, would have enabled him to interpret the particles correctly. Thus, he may have related both occurrences of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ he puzzlingly translated with *ḡayr 'anna* to previous instances of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ as part of what he saw as an expansive $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$... $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ -construction.

MORPHOLOGY AND TERMINOLOGY

In this subchapter, we will switch to a comparative perspective and study how a number of Greek terminological and morphological features have been handled across different Greek-Arabic translations. The issue we will discuss illustrates particularly well a recurrent translational problem of the Greek-Arabic translation movement: the treatment of affixes and compounds in a language that does not offer comparable morphological mechanisms. The substantially different morphological systems of Greek and Arabic represent just one of a class of "systemic" dissimilarities affecting translations between Greek, Arabic and Syriac. In the case of compounds and affixes, their frequency in Greek texts irrespective of subject matter and their independence of specific terminologies make them particularly suitable for a comparison across translated texts on a wide variety of topics. Apart from their relevance for the creation of Arabic terminologies in different fields, a closer examination of this and related phenomena improves our understanding of translation methods, their differences and development over time in various texts.

A (relatively modest) sample of five Arabic translations of Greek scientific and philosophical texts covering different stages of the Greek-Arabic translation activities will serve to supplement the information we have gathered from the *Rhetoric* and to contextualize our findings with the help of evidence from other texts. The texts in question are as follows:

The Arabic translations of three of Aristotle's zoological works, i.e. the *History of Animals*, *Generation of Animals* and *Parts of Animals*, formed part

of a collection usually called *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* (*Book of Animals*). It was the work of a single translator which Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* identifies as Yaḥyā (or Yuḥannā) ibn al-Biṭrīq. We have already encountered this translator, a close contemporary and collaborator of the philosopher al-Kindī.¹⁴⁸ While Ibn al-Nadīm's identification has been discredited, the editors of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* have been unable to come up with an alternative name.

Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman, who consider the available bio- and bibliographical information insufficient to identify the translator, quote Gerhard Endress on the similarities between the language of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and translations by Uṣṭāṭ.¹⁴⁹ Citing the diligence the latter usually applied to his task, they dismiss the idea that he was the translator of a text characterized by numerous deviations from the Greek source and frequent instances of literalism, amplification, deletion and paraphrase.¹⁵⁰ On the basis of a more detailed comparison of the textual evidence, they rate the translation as the work of a beginner compared to Uṣṭāṭ's mastery. Taken together with the striking similarities between the translations, they venture two hypotheses: the translation was either the work of an inexperienced Uṣṭāṭ at the beginning of his career or of a member of the same group of translators, applying that group's set of shared characteristics and formulae.¹⁵¹

Remke Kruk suggests a third possibility: while perhaps not member of the same group of translators, the author of the translation shares a similar background and received his training in the same surroundings. Its primitive style and conspicuous Syriacisms point to a Syriac-speaking Christian living in the first half of the ninth century. She rejects his identification with Ibn Nā'imah al-Ḥimṣī, another member of the Kindī-circle; in spite of some resemblances between the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and a translation of Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations* ascribed to Ibn Nā'imah, the differences between the two translations are too glaring to be ignored. She also disagrees with the ascription of the text to a much later translator and member of the Baghdad Aristotelians, Ibn Zur'ah, made on the basis of a note in the *Fihrist*. Ibn Zur'ah's substantial competence as a translator is inconsistent with the numerous problems posed by the *Kitāb*

¹⁴⁸ The parts corresponding to the *Generation* and the *Parts of Animals* have been edited by Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman (1971) and Kruk (1979). The latter edition was reviewed by Mattock (1980).

¹⁴⁹ Endress (1966, p. 133ff).

¹⁵⁰ Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman (1971, p. 2ff).

¹⁵¹ Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman (1971, p. 10).

al-ḥayawān.¹⁵² Finally, she questions the necessity of a Syriac intermediary which Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman had taken for granted: apart from a strong influence of Syriac on the language of the translator, the apparent Syriacisms of the text do not help in identifying the translator. Her conclusion is negative: the question of authorship remains unresolved.¹⁵³ The analysis of the translation's language, however, does not leave us completely empty-handed: its undeveloped technical vocabulary, inconsistent rendering of basic Aristotelian philosophical terms and the prominence of grammatical features belonging to Middle Arabic prompt her to place the text in the first half of the ninth century.¹⁵⁴

The second text, the *Placita philosophorum*, was translated slightly later. It is a doxographical compendium on the Presocratics falsely ascribed to the historian and philosopher Plutarchus of Chaeroneia.¹⁵⁵ Again, the *Fibrist* is our first source of information. It credits Qusṭā ibn Lūqā, a Syrian Christian of Greek extraction and contemporary of al-Kindī and Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq, with the work and commends his translation competence and excellent command of the Arabic language.¹⁵⁶ Daiber cites a number of reasons why the testimony of Ibn al-Nadīm can be trusted: in addition to similarities to other translations ascribed to Qusṭā ibn Lūqā, the text's terminology suggests a high degree of proximity to Ibn al-Bitrīq and his colleagues and to al-Kindī, putting him close to the the Kindī-circle.¹⁵⁷ The resulting dating of the translation towards the mid-ninth century fits in well with Qusṭā's authorship.¹⁵⁸ Additionally, some of his terminology is easy to explain with his Christian background while the recurring Syriacisms of the text tally well with his knowledge of Syriac.¹⁵⁹

The third text is the translation of twenty propositions from Proclus Diadochus' *Institutio* or *Elementatio theologica*.¹⁶⁰ While anonymous and in

¹⁵² Kruk (1979, p. 19).

¹⁵³ Kruk (1979, p. 22f).

¹⁵⁴ Kruk (1979, p. 30).

¹⁵⁵ The authorship of the source text for this translation is discussed in Mansfeld and Runia (1997, p. 121–125). On the value of the translation (and its edition and translation into German by Daiber 1980) for the reconstruction of the ancient doxographical tradition, cf. p. 152–161. Daiber's edition was favorably reviewed by Kunitzsch (1982), Jolivet (1983) and Strohmaier (1983).

¹⁵⁶ Daiber (1980, p. 3f).

¹⁵⁷ On the members, motivations and products of this group, cf. Endress (1997).

¹⁵⁸ Daiber (1980, p. 5, 7ff).

¹⁵⁹ Daiber (1980, p. 10ff, 14).

¹⁶⁰ Endress (1973) with a handful of additions and corrections suggested by Browne (1984).

parts ascribed to the much younger translator Abū ‘Uṭmān al-Dimašqī (d. ca. 900), it has been associated with an older colleague of Qusṭā ibn Lūqā who also authored the translations of the zoological texts listed above, Ibn al-Biṭrīq. On the basis of a thorough analysis of the secondary sources and the text itself, Gerhard Endress tentatively assigns the translation to Ibn al-Biṭrīq; as with all such ascriptions, the evidence is not conclusive, but the text can at least safely be included among the output of the Kindī-circle.¹⁶¹

The fourth text, Themistius’ commentary on Aristotle’s *De anima*, poses less of a problem in terms of its authorship. According to the manuscript heading, the version edited by Malcolm Lyons represents the second translation of the Greek text produced by Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. 910).¹⁶² The testimony of the *Fihrist*, while ambiguous, seems to point in the same direction. It credits Ḥunayn with a Syriac translation of Aristotle’s *De anima* and his son Ishāq with the subsequent Arabic translation of the Syriac text and apparently that of Themistius’ commentary as well.¹⁶³ Strong resemblances between Ishāq’s translation of *De anima* and the language of the commentary confirm this theory; in addition, Lyons notes the text’s high translation standards and its clarity.¹⁶⁴

Finally, another translation usually ascribed to Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn is the Arabic version of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*.¹⁶⁵ Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrist* is our most important witness for his authorship. In his entry on Aristotle’s ethical works, he refers to a “Book of Ethics” (*Kitāb al-‘aḥlāq*) and a commentary by Porphyry, translated by Ishāq.¹⁶⁶ The parallel report by the later historian Ibn al-Qiftī (d. 1248), while largely agreeing with Ibn al-Nadīm, credits Ishāq’s father Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq with the translation. The author of the recent edition of the text, Douglas Dunlop, sides with Ibn al-Nadīm, arguing that he is the earlier and better authority and that Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn is known for his translations of philosophical texts whereas his father made his name mostly with translations of medical

¹⁶¹ Cf. Endress (1973, p. 190ff).

¹⁶² Lyons (1973). In his review, Manfred Ullmann (1977b, p. 133) cautiously endorses Lyons’ ascription.

¹⁶³ Lyons (1973, p. viiff).

¹⁶⁴ Lyons (1973, p. x, xii). For additional background information on the commentary and the reception of Aristotle’s *De anima* in general, see Frank (1958–1959) and Gätje (1971).

¹⁶⁵ Dunlop et al. (2005).

¹⁶⁶ The *Fihrist* passage (Flügel, 1871–1872, vol. 1, p. 252) is ambiguous and could be read to mean that Ishāq was the translator either of the commentary or the “Book of Ethics”—or both.

works.¹⁶⁷ Irrespective of the association of this text with father or son, there is a consensus that it is the product of the mature phase of the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

In sum, our sample consists of five translations, three of them emanating from the circle of al-Kindī during the early decades of the ninth century and two produced toward the end of the century by one of the most prominent members of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq's so-called "school" of translators, Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn. In comparing the handling of specific aspects of these texts, the following qualifications apply:

Except for the relevant part of the *Rhetoric*, for which we have compiled an exhaustive index, we rely on the thoroughness of the respective editors. Regarding the amount of references, both Daiber and Drossaart-Lulofs/Brugman and to a smaller extent Kruk offer ample material for comparison. The zoological translations edited by Drossaart Lulofs and Brugman and by Kruk form part of a collection of Aristotelian zoological works collectively translated by the same person or group of persons, enabling us to examine their terminology in conjunction. Endress' edition of the *Institutio theologica* comes with a detailed Greek-Arabic glossary which also often provides information about the context of key terms.

In spite of the sharp criticisms leveled against it by its reviewer Manfred Ullmann,¹⁶⁸ the—admittedly incomplete—index for Lyons' edition of the Themistius-paraphrase still seems to be substantial enough to warrant its inclusion. The glossary of Dunlop's edition of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is, as the author freely admits, very selective and only covers key philosophical terms. Unfortunately, its selectivity greatly reduces its value for the sort of statistical analysis of the texts' terminology attempted below.

Likewise, the editors had different ideas about the shape of their indices, resulting in different degrees of normalization and standardization of index items. Fortunately, this poses not much of a problem for us: those aspects of terminology and morphology we survey are independent of technical terminology employed and subjects treated in our texts and remain unaffected by normalization. Additionally, even if the sample of terms supplied by the indices does not cover the entire terminology of given texts, it constitutes a representative terminological cross section large enough to yield pertinent data.

¹⁶⁷ Dunlop et al. (2005, p. 26f).

¹⁶⁸ Ullmann (1977b, p. 134) questions the usefulness of a glossary that is incomplete and operates exclusively with unvocalized Arabic roots; worse, Lyons ignored the context of lemmata and did not include information about the phraseology of the text.

In spite of our efforts to collect as large a terminological sample as possible, the amount of data on which we base the discussion of this and other textual aspects remains comparably small. Both the size of the sample and the way we operate with it certainly do not qualify as proper statistical procedure. On the other hand, what we intend to present are readily perceptible tendencies and trends, not precise statistical facts.

On a more general note, terminological comparisons between translations such as ours will always be beset by substantial problems. Remke Kruk warns of the hazards of identifying a text's translator on the basis of an analysis of its vocabulary and explains that a text's wording was often changed by copyists in line with their personal preferences.¹⁶⁹ This also applies to a certain extent to less specific characteristics such as a text's assignment to certain periods of translation activity. While Kruk was able to verify some of the characteristics of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* with the help of a second manuscript, her note of caution is even more appropriate for our study of the Arabic *Rhetoric*, extant in only a single manuscript.¹⁷⁰

Negative composites

A *privativum* or the Greek negative composite is a pervasive morphological phenomenon frequently occurring in Greek prose irrespective of its formal character and its subject matter. As a prefix of nominal, verbal and adjectival forms, it expresses opposition or negation.

To translate *α privativum*, Arabic offers a considerable number of lexical and syntactic instruments. They can be roughly classified as follows:

- Terms denoting the direct opposite of the negated word or a semantically loosely related term expressing the absence or deficiency of a given property, thus dispensing with the need for a particle to indicate negation.

¹⁶⁹ Kruk (1979, p. 23).

¹⁷⁰ Kruk echoes the cautionary remarks by Helmut Gätje (1971, p. 32), who lists a number of important issues that affect analyses of a text's terminology as a basis for ascriptions. Conscious or unconscious linguistic variation on the part of a translator, developments in his translation technique and terminological practice and variations in the character of a translator's source texts leading to changes in his language can cause substantial problems. In addition to these "personal" causes for linguistic variation, technical factors can influence the terminological configuration of a text: modifications introduced by later translators, problems related to false ascriptions in secondary literature and other issues can make the identification of a text's translator difficult, if not impossible. More often than not, the evidence only allows negative verdicts: we can only exclude candidates rather than name an author.

- The negation particles *lā* and *laysa*. According to their combination with either nouns, verbs or adjectives, they fall into several subclasses, the most prominent of which are *lā* with indicative verbs and *lam* with verbs in the apocopate; *lā* in absolute negation; *lā* or *laysa* with the preposition *bi* and *lā* or *laysa* with adjectives or participles.
- Periphrastic expressions with *ḡayr* and nouns, adjectives or, most prominently, participles.
- Periphrastic expressions with terms other than *ḡayr*, e.g. nouns such as *‘adam* or participles such as *mufāriq*.

As we have seen above in the case of the *Rhetoric*, doublets¹⁷¹ are a regular occurrence. This also applies to the other translations in our sample.¹⁷² Unsurprisingly, they occur in the context of negated terms, too. It is not, however, the case that negation particles are shared between elements of doublets, they can be mixed or even dropped from the second element. Since we are interested in the frequency of certain particles and translation methods, each single element of a doublet is counted separately according to the negation method employed.

Our text sample from Book Three of the *Rhetoric* contains 28 unique Greek negative composites, translated with 45 unique Arabic renderings. We thus arrive at a term:translation ratio of ca. 1:1.6. Compared to the term:translation ratio of the entire terminological sample, which has 200 terms translated into 433 unique Arabic equivalents, the *Rhetoric*'s ratio is substantially lower than the average of ca. 1:2.2.

Taking negated doublets into account, we arrive at 50 negated terms, distributed over the four basic types of negation as follows: 16 occurrences or 32% for *lā*, 5 occurrences or 10% for *laysa*, 13 occurrences or 26% for *ḡayr* and 16 occurrences or 32% for opposites. The *lā* group in turn consists mainly of *lā* and *lam*+verb (7 times), *lā*+adjective or participle (3 times), two absolute negations, two *bi-lā* constructs and, interestingly, the only true “compound” we find in our terminological sample:

¹⁷¹ Or *Synonymhäufungen* (“synonym clusters”), a somewhat more precise term coined by Gerhard Endress (1973, p. 155): the translation of a Greek term with two or more semantically related Arabic terms. The phenomenon has recently been discussed by Thillet (1997), who has assembled a wide range of examples from different stages of the translation movement.

¹⁷² With the apparent exception of Dunlop et al. (2005); this does not mean that the translation contained no double renderings at all, only that the key terms Dunlop chose to include were not translated with such doublets.

al-lāzamanīyāt.¹⁷³ There is not a single case of periphrastic expressions constructed with terms other than *lā*.¹⁷⁴

We now have an outline of translation practices regarding α *privativum* in our sample of Book Three of the *Rhetoric*. The next step is to study the other translations in our sample and to compare the data.

The largest slice of our terminological sample comes from the *Generation of Animals* and the *Parts of Animals*. With 78 unique Greek terms to 165 unique Arabic equivalents, the texts display a ratio of Greek to Arabic terms of 1:2.1, close to the average of 2.2.

Doublets push the number of negated Arabic terms to 186, shared between the categories as follows: paraphrases and opposites, found 82 times in both texts together, account for 44% of all negated terms. Compared to the other texts whose respective shares come in between 30% and 33%, this represents a significant divergence. With only 48 occurrences and a quota of 26%, *lā* comes in a distant second. The proportion of *ḡayr*, the smallest group of terms with 25 items, amounts to a mere 13%. Thus, we find not only the smallest portion of *lā* of all texts; in addition, the share of *ḡayr* amounts to not more than half of what the two texts with the next highest rates, the *Rhetoric* and the *Placita*, contain. On the other hand, the quota of *laysa*, which features 31 times in the zoological texts and accounts for 17% of the negated terms, far outstrips the respective shares in the other texts, which come in at 10%, 1% and 9%.

The zoological books rely primarily on verbal expressions, which make up three quarters of the 48 instances in the *lā* category. Absolute negations follow with only 7 out of 48 occurrences, the remaining 5 instances consisting of various other types. Opposites stand out as the largest group inside the category of paraphrases and opposites. With 39 out of 82 members of the category, they cover 21% of the entire sample of negated expressions in the zoological books. Their proportion is virtually identical to that in the *Placita* at 21% and significantly lower than the respective count for the *Rhetoric* at 32%.

The *Placita philosophorum* features the same number of unique Arabic equivalents as the *De anima* (112) but a lower number of unique Greek terms (66). The resulting ratio of 1:1.7 is lower than the average but similar to the *Rhetoric*. As we will see, these are not the only parallels between the *Placita* and the *Rhetoric*.

¹⁷³ “Non-temporal”; it translates the adjective *ἄκαιρος*, “ill-timed” or “unseasonable”.

¹⁷⁴ For some examples of different translation methods applied to negative composites, cf. Panoussi (1989, p. 198f).

Due to a number of doublets, the actual count of negated Arabic terms reaches 123, distributed in a manner very similar to the *Rhetoric*. With 43 occurrences, *lā* covers 35% of the sample. Paraphrases and opposites follow with 35 items, yielding 29%. With 32 occurrences and 26%, *ḡayr* ranks third. Last is *laysa*, appearing 11 times (9% of the recorded cases). The similarity to the distribution of the same categories in our *Rhetoric* sample stands out: the respective shares for it are 32%, 32%, 26% and 10%.

A breakdown of the paraphrase category reveals that opposites account for 25 out of 35 items. The resulting percentage of 21% falls short of the corresponding 32% for the *Rhetoric*; furthermore, the remaining 10 items are made up of structures such as nominal or adjectival *ʾidāfab*-constructions which do not figure at all in the *Rhetoric*'s treatment of negative composites. Similarly, the constructions listed under the rubric *lā* show conspicuous dissimilarities. With 15 out of 43 occurrences, verbal combinations with *lā* and *lam*—the mainstay of the same category for the *Rhetoric*—play an important role; absolute negations, however, which rarely occur in the *Rhetoric*, account for the majority of cases (20 out of 43). The remaining 8 items cover several other constructions such as *lā* with adjective or participle or *bi-lā*.

The number of Greek negative composites listed in the glossary of the *Institutio theologica* is comparatively small (20). Adding up the Arabic equivalents, we arrive at 45 unique terms, resulting in a comparably high ratio of 1:2.25 Greek to Arabic terms.

The breakdown of the Arabic terminology is as follows: *lā* accounts for 30 negative composites or 65.2%, the largest proportion of all the texts. There are no translations involving *laysa*; the proportion of *ḡayr*, used nine times (15.2%), is similar to that we observed in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. Opposites make up the remainder of the small terminological sample, they occur 9 times (19.6%).

In almost half of the 30 cases in which *lā* is used to render the negations, it occurs in conjunction with a verb (14 times or 46.7%). Absolute negations make up 36.7% (11 occurrences) of the *lā* category, *bi-lā* is used twice (6.7%) and *lā* with an adjective or participle accounts for the remaining 3 cases (10%).

The Themistius-text includes substantially more unique negated Greek terms than our sample of the *Rhetoric*. The 86 words in question have been translated into 112 unique Arabic phrases. The rate of 1.3

Arabic to each Greek term is thus significantly lower than the average and the quota we arrived at for the *Rhetoric*.

Including an additional term contained in the single doublet used to translate a negated term, the 113 Arabic counterparts are spread across four of our groups, i.e. *lā* with 33 items (29%), *ḡayr* with 42 items (37%), 20 opposites (18%) and 17 paraphrases in conjunction with elements other than *ḡayr* (15%). An important difference between this text and the *Rhetoric* is the virtual absence of *laysa*, which accounts for only one translation of α *privativum*. The share of *laysa* has been inherited by *ḡayr*, which takes up a percentage almost one and a half times higher than that of the *Rhetoric*.

Taking a closer look at occurrences of *lā*, we notice additional discrepancies: most prominent here are absolute negations, which account for almost two thirds of the 33 items (19 cases). Verbal constructions with *lā* and *lam* play a significantly less important role (9 cases). Likewise, opposites occur less frequently at only 18% (20 items) as opposed to the *Rhetoric*'s 32%. Conversely, we find a commensurately higher share of non-*ḡayr* paraphrases, absent in the *Rhetoric*, which account for 17 translations (15%).

Thanks to its short and selective glossary, the sample of negative composites from the *Nicomachean Ethics* only contains 7 Greek terms with 20 Arabic equivalents. The resulting ration of 1:2.86 puts it somewhat outside the range of the other texts, as do the numbers in the detailed breakdown of the negations covered by the index. Since the sample is too small and unrepresentative for any useful analysis of the methods employed to translate α *privativum*, it will not be used below.

The numbers in context

The first thing we notice about this data is the wide discrepancies between term/translation ratios between texts: the *Rhetoric* comes in at the lower end of the surveyed texts; earlier translations seem to offer a larger variety of renderings to terms, whereas later ones are apparently somewhat more restricted. The *Institutio theologica* and the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, probably the earliest in the group of texts we are comparing with the *Rhetoric*, exhibit the widest range of translations for a number of central technical terms. In the former, we find words such as ἀπειρος translated by seven and ἀμερής by five different Arabic words and phrases, the latter displays an equally wide range of equivalents e.g. for ἀγονος (9 different renderings),

ἀδιόριστος (8) or ἀπεψία (6). At the same time, both texts show the highest incidence of doublets in translating Greek negative composites.

Seen in isolation, the marked prominence of doublets is not sufficient to establish relative dates of texts. They can on the one hand indicate a certain terminological immaturity of texts: the translator supplies two terms where he himself is unable to make a binding decision for a suitable Arabic term. On the other hand, they might point to a higher degree of translational sophistication: the translator employs two terms in order to transmit the semantic scope of a Greek expression as fully as possible.¹⁷⁵ In the case of a high degree of variation in the translation of specific terms, we can assume that the text hails from an early stage in the translation phenomenon in which the technical terminology had not yet been standardized and unified. To find this phenomenon side by side with a high incidence of doublets lends some credibility to the assumption that texts combining these two phenomena belong to an early stage of the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

Comparing the texts in our sample in terms of the quota of the different translational alternatives for negative composites, we can draw the following (very tentative) conclusions:

We find that the use of uninflected *laysa* as negation particle equivalent to *lā*, which Graf and Blau identify as one characteristic of Middle Arabic,¹⁷⁶ loses ground from its high point of 16% in the zoological texts, registering at only 9% in the *Placita* and virtually disappearing by the time Ishāq translated Themistius' *De anima*-commentary. The apparent development between these translations might be read to support the scholarly consensus about the sophistication of translation techniques and the linguistic quality of the translations produced by members of the circle associated with Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq which, with the help of competent native speakers of Arabic and a general increase in the linguistic experience of the translators, has succeeded in weeding out some of the more objectionable grammatical phenomena introduced by Aramaic and Syriac

¹⁷⁵ Daiber (1980, p. 30) tentatively interprets such doublets as symptoms for the translator's uncertainty in the handling of certain terms. Kruk (1979, p. 24) refrains from qualitative judgments and maintains that they served to emphasize a term or to specify its meaning. According to Endress (1973, p. 155), doublets are evidence for a translator's attempt to cover as many shades of meaning as possible for a Greek term for which there was no satisfactory Arabic equivalent. For a comparative analysis of the occurrence of doublets in the translations of Proclus-texts, see p. 155–162. More recently, Pierre Thillet (1997) has discussed this phenomenon in some detail and developed a taxonomy of doublet types on the basis of examples pulled from a large variety of translated texts.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Graf (1905, p. 41), Blau (1982, p. 104).

usage. The *Institutio theologica* on the other hand does not seem to operate with *laysa* at all and apparently contradicts this seemingly clear-cut trend.

Together with the depreciation of *laysa*, we observe a marked rise in the use of translations relying on *ḡayr*. Its share in the overall sample of translated negative composites grows from 13% in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and 15% in the *Institutio theologica* to 26% in the *Placita philosophorum*, reaching 37% in the Themistius-commentary. Parallel to the growing importance of *ḡayr*, we notice a gradual decline in the use of other periphrastic expressions. Accounting for 44% of cases in the zoological works, they drop to a share of slightly less than a third at the time of the *Placita*-translation and remain at that level in the Themistius-text.

If we consider phrases negated by *lā* or *lam*, we find even more evidence for a directional development in the treatment of *α privativum*. In each of the texts, verbal phrases and absolute negations make up the bulk of phrases negated with either *lā* or *lam*. Both the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Institutio theologica* show a marked preference for verbal phrases, accounting for three quarters of all translations for the former and almost half in the latter. Their share then sinks continually to only slightly more than a quarter in the Themistius-translation. Conversely, the quota of absolute negations grows from a mere 15% to 47% in the *Placita* and 58% in the *De anima*-commentary with the notable exception of the *Institutio theologica* in which they account for ca. 37% of all phrases negated with *lā*.

The situation is somewhat different for opposites and the various types of paraphrases. Opposites as translations for Greek negated terms are a prominent feature of all our texts. They cover 48% of all expressions subsumed under the opposites/paraphrases-section in the zoological texts. They play an equally important role in the latest text, Themistius' *De anima*, accounting for 54% of the items in the same category. Their share peaks, though, in the *Institutio theologica* (100%) and the *Placita* (71%). The remarkable prominence of opposites is accompanied by an equally conspicuous difference between the texts regarding the distribution of noun+noun transcriptions, the second largest group of phrases in the category under consideration. While the difference between the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* (27%) and the Themistius-text (24%) is too small to detect any significant developments between the texts, those texts stand in stark contrast to the *Institutio theologica* and the *Placita* with its pal-

try respective share of 0% and of 9% for the same type of noun+noun paraphrases.

Where does the *Rhetoric* fit into all of this? Starting with the ratio between unique Greek terms and unique Arabic translations, we have seen that the *Rhetoric* is situated at the lower end of the sample, between the *Placita* and the text with the lowest ratio, the Themistius-commentary. The breakdown of translation alternatives for *α privativum* reveals a number of similarities between the *Rhetoric* and the *Placita philosophorum*: both rely mainly on combinations of *lā* and *lam* with verbs with shares of 32% for the former and 35% for the latter on the one hand and opposites/paraphrases with shares of 32% and 30% respectively on the other. For both groups of renderings, the *Rhetoric* falls between the *Placita* and the *De anima*-commentary. Unlike the latter, however, the *Rhetoric* has not yet shed *laysa* and uses it to translate 10% of the Greek terms under consideration, almost on par with the *Placita* with its share of 9%.

Looking again at instances of phrases negated with *lā* and *lam*, we discover that the *Rhetoric* does not always conform to the precedent set by the *Placita*. Absolute negation, a feature that becomes widespread over the period marked by our set of text, plays a comparatively small role in the *Rhetoric* with a rate of only 13%, even lower than but very similar to the lowest limit of our comparative sample marked by the zoological works (15%). The quota of verbal constructions for our text, which amounts to 44%, is closest to the *Institutio theologica* (47%); at the same time, it places the *Rhetoric* between the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* at 75% and the *Placita* at 37%. Interestingly enough, the puzzling peaks in the distribution of the two most important classes of the opposites/paraphrases-category we have found in the *Placita*, i.e. opposites and noun+noun paraphrases, re-occur even more extremely in the *Rhetoric* and the *Institutio theologica*. In both texts, the entire category consists of occurrences of opposites and excludes any form of paraphrase altogether, somewhat similar to the findings in the *Placita* (71% and 9%, respectively).

If we accept the relative dating of the texts in our comparative sample as it emerges from internal evidence and bio-bibliographical sources and if we accept that the findings presented above, which in some cases tally surprisingly well with the datings and which place the texts on a temporal scale starting with the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Institutio theologica*, progressing to the *Placita philosophorum* and culminating in Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn's translation of the *De anima*-commentary, re-inforce and supplement that dating pattern, we are now in a position to use our compar-

ative data from the *Rhetoric* to situate it tentatively on that chronological scale. The respective numbers for the *Rhetoric* oscillate around the data provided by the *Placita*, falling more often on the side of the Themistius-text than the zoological treatises. On the basis of the remarkable number of similarities between both texts in their handling of negative composites, we are tempted to place it in both temporal and geographic proximity to the *Placita*-translation.

Both our findings and their interpretation, however, still depend very much on the quality of the data we have used and the wide variations in the subject matter and terminology of the texts. The numbers we pulled from the *Institutio theologica* are a case in point: the terminological sample is substantially smaller than that of the other texts and possibly not representative. This might explain why it sometimes seems to contradict the findings from the other translation ascribed to the same person, the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. Also, again echoing the concerns expressed by Kruk and Gätje about using such terminological evidence to argue for the dating of a text, it could be argued that terminology was often subjected to manipulations by later readers and copyists. The relative dating proposed above therefore cannot be more than a hypothesis to be checked against other textual and extra-textual evidence. This will be our next task.

TRANSCRIPTION OF PROPER NAMES

Transcription in the Arabic *Rhetoric*

Thanks to Aristotle's habit of illustrating his discussion with abundant quotes from philosophy and literature, our sample contains its fair share of proper names. The extent of the material allows us to characterize the transcription methods of the translator of the *Rhetoric* as follows:

The translator dealt with proper names and some technical terms with the help of a "standard" transcription. The relative scarcity of exceptions suggests that he either took great care with his transcription or, more likely, that he applied pre-existing and widely used transcription standards:

- $\gamma \Rightarrow \dot{g}$: Γλαύκων \Rightarrow *ḡlawqūn*; but: ḡurḡiyās (Γοργίας)
- $\delta \Rightarrow d$: Δημοσθένης \Rightarrow *dimūstānis*
- $\theta \Rightarrow t$: Θρασύμαχος \Rightarrow *trasūmāḥūs*

leading him to the “proper” Arabized form. Moreover, the use of *tā’ marbūṭah* does not depend on obvious markers such as the feminine endings of the a-declination, e.g. Σαλαμίς ⇒ *Salaminah*, even though the awkward consequences of appending the *tā’ marbūṭah* to Σαλαμίς forces him to compromise and add the suffix to the word stem.

To translate names of persons or peoples, the translator opted for paraphrase more often than outright “pluralization”. Thus, we encounter numerous expressions on the lines of *’abl Bābīl* for Βαβυλώνιοι, *’abl Sāmūs* for Σαμίοι or, as quoted before, *’abl al-Buwāṭīyah* for οἱ Βοιωτοί. This apparently also applies to singular adjectives such as Δημόκριτος ὁ Χῖος ⇒ *Tāūqrītus alladī min ’abl Kiyūs*¹⁷⁹—in marked contrast to cases like Ἡρόδοτος Θούριος, confidently rendered as *Iruduṭūs al-Tūrī* and Λάκων ἢ Θετταλός, which becomes *al-raḡul al-Qūnī wa-l-Tatīl*. Where we encounter plural forms such as Ἀθηναῖοι ⇒ *al-Aṭīnīyūn* or *al-Laqdamīnūn* for Λακεδαιμόνιοι, they seem to point to prior knowledge on the part of the translator: there is no obvious reason to Arabize the Athenians and Spartans to the exclusion of all other Greeks appearing in our text except the fact that they are names one would in all likelihood encounter in many different Greek scientific and philosophical texts and therefore familiar enough to be assimilated.

In spite of his diligence, our translator frequently misses the mark. In a curious case of cross-linguistic “reverse engineering”, he analyses a Greek term into supposed Arabic article and word body: Λάκων becomes *al-Qūnī*; the adjective Θούριος is treated in analogue manner and, interpreting the *i* at the end of the stem as a *nisbah*, appears as *al-Tūrī*. Simple misreadings or manuscript problems might be the source of translations such as εἰς Ἀχαικούς ⇒ [*Alqiyādiltūs*] and Δημόκριτος ⇒ *Tāūqrītus* or the transcription *Fūsīfūs* for Σπέσιππος. This particular reading does not need to be as unusual as it looks at first sight, later translations (e.g. the *Nicomachean Ethics*) sometimes transcribe the name as *Asfūsifūs*. More common are derivations based on flawed nominative forms. Examples range from *Firāā* for Πειραιεύς to *Abīlūs* in place of Ἀχιλλεύς.

A handful of names appear over and over again. In spite of their frequency, their transcription sometimes varies, even if they are repeated in close proximity to each other. The city of Σηστός, transcribed as *Sisītūs*, changes to *Sisītūs* only a few words down the line. Πολύευκτος is introduced as *Fūlūdiqtūs*, only to become *Fūliqtūs* a short while later. The

¹⁷⁹ The substitution of Θεόκριτος for Δημόκριτος suggests a misreading of the Greek source text.

transliterations of Εὐΐξενος, *Ūshinūs* and *Ūsihinūs*, are only one line apart in Lyons' edition. Non-standard transcriptions such as these (which occur only twice in our sample) could be regarded as rare cases of misreading or perhaps carelessness. They are not that rare, though. According to Lyons' reading, Ἀλκιδάμας occurs once as *Alqīdāmīs*, once as *Alqīdāmās* and twice as *Alqīdāmas*. We find slightly less variation in the case of Κηφισόδοτος, appearing once as *Qīfisūdūtūs* and twice as *Qīfisādūtūs* (read once by Sālim and Margoliouth as *Qīfisūdūdūtūs*). For Γοργίας, we find *Ĝurġiyās* four times and only once *Ĝurġās*. The position of these vocalic variations in the middle of words indicates that they are not caused by varying case endings in the source text. This is borne out by a look at the original: the names cited above are transcribed from nominative forms, even where the Greek term is in a different case. The most likely reason for the variations, it seems, would be a combination of inattention on the part of the translator and scribal mistakes.

Or would it? The dwindling of quantitative differences between some vowels such as *ο* and *ω* in postclassical Greek meant that they were frequently confused—with consequences not just for Greek manuscripts, but also translations based on them. In addition, the phonemic values of *υ*, *η* and *ι* became less and less distinguishable before and around the time Arab translators started to work with Greek texts.¹⁸⁰ These and other features of the postclassical pronunciation they most likely learned during their training or from contemporary informants could also have influenced their reading of the Greek sources and caused the seeming inconsistencies in the transcription of Greek vowels.

Also, it is not inconceivable that the translators, for the most part native speakers of a Semitic language with a consonantal alphabet (Syriac) who were working in another such language with a consonantal alphabet (Arabic) regarded the consonantal skeleton of a transcribed word, its *rasm*,¹⁸¹ as more important than its vowel structure. If we simply posited that fluctuations in the vowels of transcribed terms illustrate a supposed lower standard of translation and a general lack of meticulousness by an older, less experienced group of translators, we would be hard pressed to explain the fact that those fluctuations occur with similar frequency in later, allegedly “better” translations, including those that form part of our comparative sample of texts discussed below.

¹⁸⁰ Daiber (1980, p. 43f).

¹⁸¹ Among other things, the term *rasm* denotes a stroke or line produced with a pen and, by extension, the shape of the unvocalized word (Gacek, 2001, p. 55, s. v. *r-s-m*).

The peculiar transcription *Ĝurġiyās* deserves some attention. As we have seen, Greek γ is invariably transliterated with Arabic \dot{g} except in the case of $\Gamma\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\varsigma$. Occurrences of the name in the *Rhetoric* outside our sample conform to this transliteration; apart from one variant (*Ĝāūrġiyas*, 207/15), we find two more instances of the usual *Ĝurġiyās* at 218/10 and 222/8. The very occurrence of a transcription that ignores rules our translator so stringently adheres to together with the relative stability of the transcription—we noted in the preceding paragraph that the name is more immune to graphological mishaps than other frequently occurring names—invites the assumption that our translator had access to translations or word lists in which the name *Ĝurġiyās* appeared in this particular form. In this context, transliterations of other proper names which are part of the translators' daily bread and butter such as $\Pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ could be revealing. Unfortunately, we only come across his name three times in the entire Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*, once as *Aflātūn* (75/22), once as *Flātun* (153/8) and a third time as *Flātūn* (184/9).

Another interesting phenomenon should be mentioned in passing: in one place, the Greek adjective Ὀλυνθιακός is correctly transposed into the corresponding noun: $\text{περὶ τὸν Ὀλυνθιακὸν πόλεμον}$ is paraphrased as *al-ḥarb allatī kāna bi-Ulūntūs*.

Our short survey of transcribed terms and names in the Arabic *Rhetoric* has given us enough evidence to establish that our translator applied a consistent and transparent system of consonantal transliteration, taking Greek nominative forms as his starting point. On the other hand, many transliterated names exhibit a high degree of variation in their vocalic structure, possibly obscuring their relation for contemporary readers. These imprecisions aside, on the basis of the findings presented above, it looks more and more unlikely that the Arabic version of the *Rhetoric* dates back to the earliest days of the Greek-Arabic translation tradition. The evidence strongly suggests that our translator applied a pre-existing system of transliteration and a set of stock transcriptions of proper names. It has to be seen if this claim is borne out by findings on other aspects of translation methodology.

The comparative perspective

In his article on the Arabic translation of Aristotle's *History of Animals*, Johannes den Heijer adds an important qualification to Zimmermann's warning against the interpretation of so-called Syriacisms in transcrip-

tion:¹⁸² he maintains that, rather than the interference of spoken Aramaic on the language of the translations, the most likely source for the retention of transcriptions based on Syriac models was the translators' familiarity with Syriac texts, replete with transcribed Greek words.¹⁸³ With this in mind, we will now turn to the question of how our translation fits into the transcription practices of the other translations in our sample.¹⁸⁴

Den Heijer classifies transcription alternatives as either following the Syriac example or innovating in line with the Arabic phonetic system.¹⁸⁵ In the *History of Animals*, traditionally ascribed to Ibn al-Biṭrīq,¹⁸⁶ den Heijer finds evidence for both conservatism and innovation: with one exception, Greek π is transcribed as *b*, its nearest phonetical equivalent. The "conservative" rendering would have been *f*, the etymological and visual counterpart of Syriac *p*; since the pronunciation of *f* is not suitable to render π , it was subsequently supplanted by *b*.¹⁸⁷ Thus, the *Rhetoric*, in marked contrast to the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, consistently follows the conservative line.¹⁸⁸ This cannot be said for the *Placita philosophorum* which, with few exceptions, adopts *b* as the standard transcription for π . One exception is the name Πλάτων. Possibly due to the weight of translational precedents, it is invariably transcribed with an *f*, irrespective of other variations (i.e. the lengthening and shortening of vowels or the addition of auxiliary 'alif at the beginning). Historical precedents are probably not at the root of the transcriptions for much less prominent names such as Πλούταρχος (*Flūtarḥus*) and Πυθέας (*Fūtā'as*). Such precedents might be influencing the translator's choice only in the case of Πυθαγόρας (*Fūtāgūras*). One is still tempted to explain this seeming inconsistency to a certain fluidity of transcription procedures preceding the standardization of transcription, committing future translators to use *b* as the fixed equivalent for π .

¹⁸² Cf. Zimmermann (1986, p. 114).

¹⁸³ den Heijer (1991, p. 104).

¹⁸⁴ Endress (1973) does not contain transcribed names. The only transcription we find is *qātāfāsīs*, used twice for *κατάρφαισις* (cf. p. 148 for examples from *De caelo*).

¹⁸⁵ His analysis is based on the ideas of Rudolf Macúch (1982) and Joshua Blau (1967).

¹⁸⁶ For a discussion of Ibn al-Nadīm's ascription, cf. below p. 138.

¹⁸⁷ den Heijer (1991, p. 101).

¹⁸⁸ Hans Daiber (1980, p. 17) maintains that there is no need to posit an Aramaic intermediary to explain the substitution of π with Arabic *f*. He argues with the different graphemic inventories of Greek and Arabic: the lack of an Arabic grapheme corresponding to π /[p] forced the translators to choose between either *b* and *f*. This nevertheless does not invalidate den Heijer's suggestion that the choice for *f* over *b* in spite of the latter's relative phonetic proximity to π can be more easily explained on the basis of Syriac precedents.

But does our sample really support a hypothetical standardization away from *f* and toward *b*? The Themistius-commentary, considerably younger than the translations discussed above, stands out on account of its consistency in transcribing π as *f*—the alleged “conservative” choice. Even though this text is in all likelihood the product of the same translator who is responsible for the Arabic version of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, their transcription methods often differ. For π , the latter text alternates between *b* (13 occurrences) and *f* (10 occurrences), sometimes even for the same name, e.g. Νεοπτόλεμος (*Nāūfīlāmūs*, *Nāūbīlāmūs*) or Σπέσιππος (*Asfūsifus*, *Asbūsibūs*).¹⁸⁹ On the basis of this—admittedly limited—sample, we are not in a position to posit a straightforward development of the transcription of π from *f* to *b*.

The translator of the *Rhetoric* takes a less conservative stance in his treatment of Greek χ . As den Heijer explains, Syriac translators customarily rendered it as Syriac *k*, covering the phonetic value of χ with the conditional aspirated pronunciation [x] of the Syriac letter. The etymological equivalent of Syriac *k*, however, is Arabic *k*, which only offers one pronunciation, [k]. Traditional transcription on Syriac lines would still render χ via Syriac *k* with Arabic *k*; the alternative, leaving the well-trodden paths of Syriac translators, is *ḥ*, which also happens to reflect the letter’s medieval and modern Greek pronunciation. Regarding χ , our translation sample, with the one exception mentioned above, prefers *ḥ* to *k*, similar to the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*.¹⁹⁰ As before, the *Placita* reveals a higher degree of inconsistency than the *Rhetoric* and the zoological works. Together with the preponderant transcription *ḥ*, the text has two cases transcribing χ as *š*: Ἀρχέλαος (*Aršilāūs*) and ὁ Χῖος (*min ’abl Šīyus*).

Again, it seems inappropriate to ascribe the transcriptions to the prominence of the names and their frequent appearance in this guise in Syriac or Arabic texts. Fritz Zimmermann explained the occurrence of *š*

¹⁸⁹ One of the fascinating aspects of the Arabic translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is that the ten books of the Greek original have been supplemented by an eleventh book that the medieval editor of the manuscript inserted between Books Six and Seven. In Dunlop et al. (2005, p. 55–62), Dunlop discusses the formal features and contents of this additional treatise and suggests that it might have been derived from Porphyry’s commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He also points out the prominent terminological and stylistic differences between this book and the rest of the text and concludes that it could have been the product of a translator other than that of the remainder of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. To avoid terminological contamination between these two different constituents of the Arabic text, I have taken into account only the terminological and stylistic data from the *Nicomachean Ethics* “proper” ascribed to Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn.

¹⁹⁰ den Heijer (1991, p. 102).

in the *Theology of Aristotle* and the translation of Aristotle's *Sophistical Refutations* (ἐντελέχεια ⇒ *anṭalāšiyā* and Ἀχιλλεύς ⇒ *Ašilūs*) in geographical terms: they are linked to another collaborator of the Kindī-circle, Ibn Nā'imah al-Ḥimšī, a Syrian by birth; the local Syrian pronunciation of χ in certain combinations might be behind this transliteration.¹⁹¹ However, in this and other cases of transcriptions which seem to conflict with our expectations, the phonetic differences between classical and medieval Greek offer a much more straightforward explanation. Among others, Hans Daiber pointed out that š faithfully reflects the contemporary pronunciation of χ when preceded by ε or ι.¹⁹² As well as time and progress in translation methods, the linguistic, geographical and cultural background of a translator and, of course, his own translation experience have a direct bearing on his transcription practices. Finally, both the *De anima*-commentary and the *Nicomachean Ethics* use ḥ for χ.

The customary Syriac transcription of Greek γ, g, again offers two different pronunciations, palatal [g] and velar [ɣ], corresponding to Arabic ġ and ġ̄, respectively.¹⁹³ Whereas the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* opts for ġ throughout, the *Rhetoric*, as seen above, prefers ġ̄ while keeping ġ in the case of Ḡurḡiyās.¹⁹⁴ The *Placita* largely conforms to the standard usage but we find a number of exceptions. Names such as Αἰγὸς ποταμοί, Διογένης, Ἐπιγένης and Σπαργειότης are not sufficiently important and frequent in other translations to warrant special treatment. Their transcription might therefore again be due to the translator's inconsistency, in marked contrast to the Themistius-commentary and the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which employ ġ̄ without exception. These findings disagree with the rule laid down by Georg Graf on the basis of a Christian Arabic manuscript from the end of the ninth century: he claimed that γ occurring before ι, η and ε would be transcribed with ġ̄, otherwise as ġ.¹⁹⁵

Greek τ and κ are normally rendered as t and q. Both straightforwardly reflect the adherence to Syriac modes of transcription in the face of the phonetically more suitable candidates t and k. In the first case, the Syriac translators choose Syriac t over t because of t's conditional pronunciation [θ]; in the second case, Syriac k is equally unsuitable thanks to its alternative pronunciations [k] and [x].¹⁹⁶ It still appears on one occa-

¹⁹¹ Zimmermann (1986, p. 114), Macúch (1982, p. 18f).

¹⁹² Daiber (1980, p. 41f).

¹⁹³ Cf. Macúch (1982, p. 18).

¹⁹⁴ den Heijer (1991, p. 102f).

¹⁹⁵ Graf (1905, p. 12).

¹⁹⁶ den Heijer (1991, p. 103).

sion in the zoological treatises, Θεῖνες for *Itrākīyah*. The word is also one of two examples for θ, usually transcribed as *t*, substituted with *t*. Apart from the three examples for occurrences of *t* for τ cited above, the *Rhetoric* as well as the *Placita* conform to this pattern. Again, we find two examples for non-standard transcriptions for τ utilizing *t* and even *d* (*ibn Mādun* for ὁ Μέτωνος), but they are drowned out by the overwhelming frequency of the standard variety *t*. Additionally, the single occurrence of *d* might be blamed on a scribal mistake or a damaged spot in the Greek text; *d* being employed as the *Placita*'s stock transcription for δ suggests that he could have read δ in this place as well. Conversely, θ is rendered as *t* with *t* occurring in two places.

The impression of a certain carelessness is strengthened by these and other exceptions in his treatment of κ. In addition to the standard *q*, we find *k* on three occasions. With matchless consistency, the *De anima*-commentary and the *Nicomachean Ethics* opt for *t* to transcribe τ. In its transcription of κ, both consistently uses *q* with the exception of three occurrences of *k* (out of a total of 38) in the latter. In both translations, θ is invariably substituted with *t*.

As with the *Rhetoric*, the letter ξ poses something of a problem for the authors of the other translations in our sample. Its composition from two distinct phonemes forces them to adopt several two-letter renderings, none of which is consistently employed. In the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, *ks* is the preferred transcription. The only two exceptions in the *Parts of Animals*, *Anaqsāgūrās* in place of Ἀναξαγόρας and *Nāqsūs* for Νάξος, might be due to scribal errors. This curious treatment of ξ is the preferred variant in the *Placita* which has only one variant with *ks* instead of *qs*: *Ksānūfānis* for Ξενοφάνης. The translator of the Themistius-commentary and the *Nicomachean Ethics* consistently transcribes ξ with *ks*.

The two remaining important consonants treated differently at different stages of the Greek-Arabic translation movement are δ and σ. In the *Rhetoric*, Greek δ is uniformly transcribed as *d*. The *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* displays an even greater degree of consistency than the *Rhetoric* which switches in its transcription of Ἐλλάς from *Alādab* to *Alādab*. The very slight graphical difference between the two Arabic versions, differentiated only by a diacritical dot, could have been due to misreading or scribal mistake. The rule is reversed in the *Placita* which transcribes δ with *d*, reflecting the spirantized post-classical pronunciation of the letter.¹⁹⁷ The alternative *d* occurs in three transcriptions. As for σ, we find it consistently

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Daiber (1980, p. 40).

transcribed as *s* in the *Rhetoric*. The zoological treatises also have *s* as the standard transcription, departing from it only in the *Generation of Animals* by varying the transcription twice in a single word: Λέσβος, *Lāzbūs*. At least the first of them can be explained by contemporary Greek pronunciation: before voiced β, σ was also voiced.

The *Placita* follows the example set by the *Rhetoric* with an unusual degree of consistency. In the case of the *De anima*-commentary, its usual thoroughness is not substantially diminished by the only transcription exceptions we find in the text. While using *d* throughout the text to render δ, in one place the translator transcribes Εὐδημος with *Ūdīmus*. We only find *d* in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. For σ, the regular transcription in both texts is *s*—with some interesting exceptions: Ὀμηρος becomes *Ūmīruš* in the *De anima*-commentary and, with some variation of the vowel structure, the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Πυθαγόρας is transcribed as *Fūtāgūras* in the former, the latter uses *Fūtāgūrīšyūn* for Πυθαγόρειοι. Both are well-known names; their unorthodox form in these markedly consistent texts strongly suggests scribal intervention or the influence of other texts. This would have to be borne out by a comparison of several translations from the period, an undertaking beyond the scope of the present study. In addition, the *Nicomachean Ethics* has two more examples of non-standard transcriptions of σ, e.g. the interesting *Zāṭūrūs* for Σάτυρος and *Šūlun* for Σόλων.

The following table contains our findings so far (letters in brackets represent exceptions):

	<i>Rhetoric</i>	<i>Kitāb al-ḥ.</i>	<i>Placita</i>	<i>De anima</i>	<i>Nic. Ethics</i>
Items	80	34	130	27	134
γ	ġ (ǧ)	ġ	ġ (ǧ)	ġ	ġ
δ	d (d)	d	d (d)	d (d)	d
θ	t	t (t)	t (t)	t	t
κ	q	q (k)	q (k)	q	q (k, f)
ξ	ḥ (sh, ks)	ks (qs)	qs (ks)	ks	ks
π	f	b	b (f)	f	b, f
σ	s	s (z, š)	s	s (š)	s (š)
τ	t (t)	t	t (t, d)	t	t
χ	ḥ (k)	ḥ (k)	ḥ (š)	ḥ	ḥ

While not overly useful in isolation to help us resolve the dating issue, this information can assist us in grouping texts and clarifying relations be-

tween them. Thus, the table shows that in terms of transcriptional consistency, the translation of Themistius' *De anima*-commentary and, with the exceptions noted above, the *Nicomachean Ethics* tower head and shoulder over the rest of the texts. They are clearly the product of a translator who consciously strives for consistency and was in all probability trained in an environment which put great store on it. The *Placita philosophorum* on the other hand displays a remarkable degree of inconsistency. As will be seen below, its transcription problems do not end with numerous exceptions in the rendering of individual letters. The translators of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Rhetoric* occupy the middle ground between these extremes. The number and character of exceptions to transcription rules do not detract from the overall coherence of their respective products.

Ignoring the exceptions for a moment, the agreement between all texts in their choice of Arabic equivalents for Greek letters is striking. In spite of possible interference by oral or written Syriac (and potentially Greek) usage, the consensus on a standardized system of transcription seems to emerge very early on. In our list, we note disagreement on the choice of Arabic equivalents only for two letters, δ and π .¹⁹⁸ The choice between *b* and *f* to substitute π has been discussed above; considering the purportedly "traditional" variety *f* chosen by Ishāq in favor of the allegedly more "modern" *b* which has to be qualified anyhow in light of the transcription methods applied in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, we cannot but agree with den Heijer who doubts the validity of claims about a translation's age or a possible Syriac *Vorlage* on the basis of transcription methods.¹⁹⁹

As is the case with the *Rhetoric*, the transcription of names does not only consist in uniformly substituting a Greek letter with an Arabic one. Translators take a few more steps to fit names into schemata familiar to their Arabic-speaking audience. Two procedures which are employed equally in all translations we have been looking at so far are the derivation of transcriptions from nominative forms of the names in question—with varying degrees of success and consistency in different texts.²⁰⁰ Another phenomenon which has been mentioned above is the suppression of the *spiritus asper*. In our entire translation sample, we only find two exceptions to this rule: in the *Generation of Animals*, the *nomen gentis* Ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης

¹⁹⁸ The letter ξ with its two phonetic components did not lend itself easily to transcription standardization; our sample does not provide us with enough information to identify *ks* as the definitive rendering.

¹⁹⁹ den Heijer (1991, p. 109).

²⁰⁰ Cf. Daiber (1980, p. 18f).

was rendered into *min Hiraqlab*; in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, one of the three occurrences of the name Ἡράκλειτος is transcribed as *Hiraqlitus*.

Several names are directly translated into their Arabic equivalent. An example we find in three out of our translations is Αἴγυπτος, uniformly reproduced as *miṣr*. Αἰθίοψ is matched in the *Generation of Animals* quite fittingly with *ḥabašī*, while the *Placita* generalizes the term into *zanġ* after correctly translating Αἰθιοπία with *ʿarḍ al-ḥabašah*. In the same text, we find the names of Greek gods substituted with their corresponding planet name, e.g. Ἄρης (*al-mirriḥ*), Ἀφροδίτη (*al-zuharah*, also found in the *Nicomachean Ethics*) or Κρόνος (*zuhāl*). Others are both translated and transcribed, e.g. Ἐρμῆς, whom we encounter as *Irmīs* and *ʿuṭārid*, or Ζεὺς, transcribed as *Zāūs* (or *Zūs* and *Diyā* in the *Nicomachean Ethics*) and translated into *al-muštari*.²⁰¹

One translation Daiber discusses in some detail is *ḥunafāʾ* for *οἱ Δαναοί*. He traces it back to the identification of Greeks with pagans in Christian discourse until the rise of Byzantium and transmitted to Syriac Christian circles. Consequently, we often find the term Ἕλληνες translated into Syriac as *ḥanpē* (pagans). Daiber interprets *ḥunafāʾ* as one more piece of evidence for Qusṭā ibn Lūqā's authorship of the *Placita*-translation.²⁰² It has to be added, however, that Qusṭā shared the Christian outlook implicit in this term with any number of Christian Syriac translators.

One issue that apparently was not resolved in the earlier translations is the handling of feminine (place) names (or other terms the translators took to be feminine). Unfortunately, the Themistius-text does not offer any comparative material except for one occurrence of Σικελία, which

²⁰¹ Equating Greek gods with their corresponding planets was a frequent practice of translators, e.g. to “defuse” the polytheistic contents of their source text; cf. Strohmaier (1968, esp. p. 135f). Walbridge (1998) lists other strategies employed by Muslim writers to deal with references to Greek gods in philosophical and scientific works. Although they did not pose any substantial spiritual threat anymore, some scholars felt the need to explain such incidences in works that were too useful for them to dismiss out of hand as the scribblings of polytheists (p. 402f).

²⁰² Daiber (1980, p. 10). Some background information on *ḥanif* can be found in W. Montgomery Watt's article “Ḥanif” in *ET*², vol. 3, p. 165f. The translator's use of the term is very much at odds with its Islamic usage: in the Qurʾān, it denotes “monotheists” (particularly Abraham) as opposed to “idolaters”, *mušrikūn*. The *ḥanif* is understood to be a true monotheist and a predecessor of the Muslims, with which he shares a “pure monotheism”. In Islamic literature, it retains this meaning and is occasionally used as the equivalent of *muslim*. Christian literature employed the term as a polemical appellation of Muslims; its interpretation as “heathen” or “pagan” stems from its Syriac cognate *ḥanpē* which has the same meaning. In some Aramaean circles, the word was often used for people with a Hellenistic education. Both aspects of “paganism” and “Hellenistically educated” were probably intended in the *Placita*.

is transcribed as *Siqiliyah* with final *tā'* *marbūṭah*. The name was in all likelihood familiar to the translator and even before the actual conquest of Sicily, the island had been known under its fully Arabized name. The *Nicomachean Ethics*, on the other hand, exclusively operates with non-arabized transcriptions such as *'ahl Atīniyā* for Ἀθηναῖοι, *'ahl Sqūṭiyā* for Σκύθαι and even *al-'Ahlāq al-nīqūmābiyā* for Ἠθικά Νικομάχεια.

In the earlier texts, we find both the semi-Arabization obtained by adding *tā'* *marbūṭah* and an “unassimilated” transcription with final *ā*. In addition to the findings for the *Rhetoric* discussed above, both varieties occur in the zoological texts in contexts which indicate a certain degree of insecurity in handling geographical references. A few examples, first of “unassimilated” transcriptions: terms such as *min Qrūṭūniyā* are straightforwardly derived from the corresponding noun ὁ Κροτωνιάτης, likewise *Arqādiyā* (Ἀρχαδία) and *Ubūā* or *'Ubūā* (Εὐβοία). The situation is less clear in the case of *Σαυροματικά*, which the translator apparently misunderstands as a place name and transcribed as *Sawrumātā*. The *nomen gentis* Σκύθαι is transcribed as *Isqūṭiyā* or translated as *Turk*. Arabized transcriptions occur more frequently, e.g. *Itrākīyah* (Θεῤῥακες), the aforementioned *min Hiraqlah* (ὁ Ἡρακλεώτης) or *Lūbiyah* (Λιβύη). In the *Placita*, both varieties coexist without any clear preference for one or the other. The names of countries appear in both guises: we read *Britāniyā* for Βρετανία as well as *Ītālīyah* for Ἰταλία. The criterion at work here does not seem to be the degree of familiarity of a given name with more widely known names appearing in an Arabized form; we would be hard pressed to come up with an explanation for the transcription *Arābiyā* for Ἀραβία, a placename one would have thought familiar enough to be translated rather than transcribed. Daiber cites several reasons for the apparent inconsistencies in the *Placita*'s transcription system: lapses of the translator or mistakes of scribes, the difficulties of reproducing certain sounds with the Arabic graphemic inventory and perhaps the translator's attempt to take the different phonetic situation of the contemporary Greek κοινή into account.²⁰³

With the notable exception of Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn's translation of the *De anima*-commentary, each text is affected by two other types of transcription lapses. The first concerns the derivation of placenames from adjectives. Similar to the *Rhetoric*, they are present in both the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Placita*. Whereas the number of cases seems to be rather small in the zoological works, they are a regular feature of the *Placita*,

²⁰³ Cf. Daiber (1980, p. 17, 19).

e.g. *min* 'abl *Qītīs* for ὁ Κιτιεύς, *min* 'abl *Aqrāḡantinā* for Ἀκραγαγαντινός or *min* 'abl *Milīṭiyāb* for ὁ Μιλήσιος. In the case of Ἴωνικός, the translator cleverly avoids the pitfalls of geographical ignorance and nonchalantly describes them as *firqat al-yūnāniyīn*.²⁰⁴ Even though it is ascribed to the same translator who worked on the *De anima*-commentary, the *Nicomachean Ethics* is not entirely free from such lapses. Examples are 'abl *Milasūs*, derived from Μιλήσιοι and *Sifūniyūwā* from Σικωνίοι.

The second type of transcription lapse consists of wrongly derived nominative forms of placenames, a problem that affects the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Placita* to the same degree. Thus, we read *Atīnās* for Ἀθῆναι or *Bīrīmūs* for Πέριθος in the *Generation of Animals* and *A'īdūn* for Αἰδωνεύς or 'abl *Sāmiyā* for οἱ Σάμιοι in the *Placita*.

The last aspect of transcription is its consistency, in its repeated rendering of names across each text. Again, the Themistius-text is almost uncannily precise in its handling of names. We do find variants even here but they confirm Ishāq's transcriptional reliability instead of detracting from it: the variant *Aristū* occurs only once compared to seven occurrences of the standard *Aristūtālīs*. The standard transcription for Σωκράτης, *Suqrāt*, appears no less than ten times, its variant *Suqrātīs* only once. Δημόκριτος is transcribed four times as *Dimuqrītus* and only once as *Dimuqrātus*. The exactitude of Ishāq's work is thrown into even sharper relief when we consider the relative fluidity of vowels: the switch between short and long vowels to replace their Greek counterparts is common in the other translations. Ishāq, on the other hand, works with an established set of stock transcriptions. It is therefore very tempting to explain transcriptions in the *De anima*-text which do not conform to Ishāq's standard with transmission problems.

In terms of its terminology and consistency, the *Nicomachean Ethics* differs to some degree from the *De anima*-commentary: whereas the Themistius-commentary relies on *Aristūtālīs* as its transcription of choice with only one variant, this very variant is standard in the *Nicomachean Ethics* which uses *Aristū* throughout (16 occurrences). The same applies to the two transcriptions for Σωκράτης, *Suqrāt* (preferred in the *De anima*-commentary) and *Suqrātīs* (3 out of 4 occurrences in the *Nicomachean Ethics*). Above, we have seen that this translation also alternates between *b* and *f* in its transcription of π, leading to variant transcriptions for one and the same name. Lastly, like the Themistius-text, this translation displays a certain flexibility in the use of long vowels to reproduce Greek vowels.

²⁰⁴ Interestingly, *yūnānī* is originally derived from the term Ἴωνες, the Ionians.

In sum, it is remarkably less consistent in its transcription methods than the *De anima*-commentary.

The variability of transcription is somewhat higher in the zoological texts. Out of 34 unique personal and placenames in the *Generation* and *Parts of Animals*, 11 appear in more than one form in the Arabic text. Most of them only consist of small variations in the vowel structure of words, e.g. *Andrūnīqūs* and *Andrūnīqus* for Ἀνδρῶνικος. A few involve more substantial mutations, e.g. *Irūdūtūs*, *Irudūtūs* and *Yirūdūtūs* for Ἡρόδοτος. Interestingly enough, such variations do not play a role in the *Placita*; whatever one might think about other aspects of the translator's transcription system, his consistency in regard to this particular detail is exemplary.

Endress mentions the transcription rules applied in all three Arabic versions of Aristotle's *De caelo* only in passing.²⁰⁵ Unfortunately, it is not clear whether the information he provides applies equally to all three versions in spite of their age difference. While in general similar to the transcription system we found in the *Rhetoric*, the texts alternate between *b* and *f* for Greek π. Δ, especially in the second version (which Endress identifies as a revision by Ibn al-Bīṭrīq of his own earlier translation), becomes both *d* and *ḍ*—another reflection of the two possible pronunciations of Syriac *d*, [d] and [ḏ]. Moreover, the translators sometimes transcribe the grammatical form they find in their text instead of “normalizing” them to their respective nominative forms. It is difficult to draw any safe conclusions from our author's preference for nominative forms. Two hypotheses spring to mind: instead of choosing the easier solution of transcribing the form as he found them in his source, he expends some effort to reconstruct the nominative as his starting point—perhaps an indicator of a more careful attitude to his task. Moreover, his more or less competent references to nominative forms might indicate a higher level of linguistic knowledge and/or translation experience.

Returning to the issue we began with, the comparative position of the Arabic *Rhetoric* in terms of the transcription of technical terms and names, we have to admit that even with a thorough characterization of the transcription system of this and other texts—at least as small a sample as we have studied—we are not necessarily better prepared to answer the two key questions: when did our translation come into being and what was the language of the source text? Unable to demonstrate any necessary link between transcription practices on the one hand and source languages and

²⁰⁵ Endress (1966, p. 73f).

translation dates on the other hand, we have to consider both in isolation for the time being.²⁰⁶

THE TERMINOLOGY

In addition to the marginal notes (discussed above)²⁰⁷ which contain important information for dating the translation, its purported deficiencies and its allegedly ancient terminology are regularly cited to support a very early translation date.²⁰⁸ Most commentators confine themselves to general remarks about the text's defects and allegedly undeveloped terminology which seems to correspond only too well with the dating suggested by the marginal notes.

In what follows, we will examine a terminological sample drawn from the *Rhetoric* and compare it to the control group of translations we already consulted, i.e. the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, the *Institutio theologica*, the *Placita philosophorum*, the *Nicomachean Ethics* and Themistius' *De anima*-commentary.

As in the previous subchapters, a number of qualifications apply. Firstly, the differences in the indices put certain restrictions on our comparative data. Especially quantitative data on the distribution of translation variants is not always included. Secondly, the texts deal with a wide variety of subjects and necessarily display substantial differences in vocabulary. The sample therefore does not only contain examples for rhetorical or philosophical terms but a wider sample of terms with varying fields of application. The glossaries of the Proclus-text and the *Nicomachean Ethics* in particular were less helpful than expected. Their subject matter and the relative shortness of the *Institutio theologica* sharply limit the terminological data available from these texts.

For purposes of dating and terminological comparison, our sample is undoubtedly quite small. What we have is three texts from the same translation tradition, i.e. the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, the *Institutio theologica* and the *Placita philosophorum*, all of them produced in the so-called Kindī-circle,

²⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the two most important dictionaries devoted to the language of the Greek-Arabic translations, Gerhard Endress' and Dimitri Gutas' *A Greek and Arabic lexicon: materials for a dictionary of the medieval translations from Greek into Arabic* (Endress and Gutas, 1992-) and Manfred Ullmann's *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Ullmann, 2002-), cannot help us with transcriptions: at this point, neither traces Greek proper names.

²⁰⁷ Cf. p. 50.

²⁰⁸ A representative sample of quotes can be found in Goulet (1989-, vol. 1, p. 455f).

and two translations prepared by the son of Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq, the *Nicomachean Ethics* and Themistius' commentary on Aristotle's *De anima*. While sufficient for a number of general observations, the indices of the last text unfortunately contains the least amount of information. Quantitative relations between different renderings of a single Greek term are not indicated. Moreover, the apparent translational consistency suggested by the pairing of one Arabic for one Greek term might not entirely be due to superior lexical tools and better training available to members of Ḥunayn's circle; Lyons' tendency to normalize index items could have led to the exclusion of translations other indices list separately.

To reduce the impact of the indices' different approaches, we will focus only on the most obvious findings. A more detailed terminological survey including a large number of texts from different periods of the Greek-Arabic translation phenomenon is still lacking. We hope that the inclusion of some additional relevant information from Gutas' and Endress' *GALex*²⁰⁹ and Ullmann's *WGAU*²¹⁰ will fill some of the unavoidable gaps in this terminological survey.

Any attempt to use terminology for dating purposes relies on certain assumptions about terminological development. One of them presupposes an evolution from high terminological volatility towards a stable and less varied set of translations for technical terms. A second hypothesis posits the gradual substitution of transcribed terms and calques from Syriac in a process of continuous "Arabization". At the end of it, we find the highly detailed and specialized terminology of Ibn Sinā and Ibn Rušd. Both claims and the more basic idea that we can distil any information about terminological developments from extant texts in the first place in spite of the problems associated with textual history and manuscript traditions are open to criticism. While it seems prudent to view conclusions drawn from the evidence we are dealing with with a sceptical eye, we are not convinced that generations of scribes and well-meaning commentators have entirely eradicated traces of earlier terminological and phraseological strata in an attempt to "modernize" texts which did not seem to conform to contemporary grammatical and terminological standards.

On the contrary, except for attempts at improving on some of the more obvious stylistic and grammatical idiosyncrasies of earlier translations, I would hold that there probably never was any systematic attempt to

²⁰⁹ *Greek and Arabic Lexicon*, Endress and Gutas (1992-).

²¹⁰ *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Ullmann (2002-), together with its first supplement (Ullmann 2006, henceforth *WGAU Suppl.*).

manipulate translations short of re-translation, i.e. older versions, even though their deficiencies were acknowledged,²¹¹ continued to circulate in spite of their shortcomings unless supplanted by newer, improved translations. Without denying the influence of copyists, commentators and readers on the form of the text as it has reached us, I am very hesitant to give up one of the few tools we have to classify and date texts.

We will now review the issues brought up by a terminological comparison. They relate mainly to degrees of terminological variation and continuity of terms across texts.

Comparison

The first conspicuous phenomenon we encounter is the high degree of terminological variation in the *Rhetoric*. Striking examples are the Greek terms ἀνάλογος, δῆλος and παράδειγμα. In the first case, the translator relies mainly on participles and verbal nouns derived from the root ‘-d-l such as *mu‘ādalab*, *i‘tidāl*, *muta‘ādil* and *mu‘adil*. We moreover find several collocations: *‘alā wazn wa-miqdār*, *‘alā wazn ‘aw al-martabah*, *istiwā’ al-maqādīr wa-‘tidālu-hā* and *mu‘ādalab wa-wazn*. This proliferation of renderings contrasts with the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* which employs forms derived from the verb *lā‘ama* and the participle *muwāfiq*. The vocabulary of the *Placita* is even more limited: the translator confines himself to the phrase *‘alā tilka al-munāsabah* and *munāsib*, both forms from the same stem of the root *n-s-b*. With the *De anima*-commentary, the range of equivalents becomes again somewhat more varied: *nazīr*, *qiyāsī*, *mušākil*, *fi qiyās* and *mā nāba* ‘an serve to translate forms of ἀνάλογος.

The contrast between the *Rhetoric* and the other texts is more pronounced in their respective treatment of the adjective δῆλος. The *Rhetoric* operates with a wide range of terms and roots. Most prominent are expressions based on the roots *b-y-n* and *w-d-h*: we find the verbs *bayyana*, *tabayyana* and *istabāna* together with the collocations *bayyin wādīḥ* and its inverse *wādīḥ bayyin* as well as *istabāna wa-waḍaḥa*. The second root is represented by the participle *wādīḥ* and the verb ‘awḍaḥa. Participles from different roots are for example *muḥaqqaq*, *ma‘lūm* and *zābir*; we also encounter several other collocations (*maksūf bayyin*, *ma‘lūm wādīḥ*), the verb *istabbara* and the phrase *bi-lā šakk*. The zoological treatises display some of the terminological richness of the *Rhetoric*: the Arabic equivalents the

²¹¹ Cf. some of Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq’s acerbic remarks on the merits of his predecessor’s Arabic and Syriac translations. Especially Sergius of Rēs‘aynā is repeatedly taken to task for his allegedly poor performance (Bergsträsser, 1925, p. 5f, 7f).

translator has chosen are *mabsūt*, *mabsūt ma'rūf*, *zābir*, *bayyin* and, again, the verb *istabāna*. The Proclus-translation, in which forms of *δηλος* only occur twice, translates it with the collocation *bayyin wādih* and, in conjunction with the particle *δή*, departs from the precedents set by the other translations by choosing *lā muḥālah 'idan*. The *Placita*-translation has the verb *zāhara* and its active participle *zābir*, whereas the verbs *bayyana* and *tabayyana* are the preferred Arabic renderings for *δηλος* in the *De anima*-commentary. As we can see, the concentration on a single root for the translation of the word *δηλος* apparently takes place already in the Kindī-circle. To appreciate the remarkable difference between the *Rhetoric* and the other texts, we have to keep in mind that the Greek term in question is less a semantically restricted technical term than a non-technical adjective with a fairly wide field of application. This example suggests that the tendency towards a less flexible translational approach seems to set in at a relatively early date for a number of terms.

Our last example is *παράδειγμα*. The terminological proliferation evident in the *Rhetoric* is reduced to a single term, *mitāl*, in the remaining translations. Interestingly enough, this Arabic translation which has been adopted as the standard rendering of *παράδειγμα* in our entire sample is conspicuously absent from the *Rhetoric*. Its translator tries his hand at several translations: aside from single-word renderings such as *burhān* and *dalālah*, he displays a marked preference for collocations such as *taṭbīt 'aw wasf* and *dalālāt wa-burhānīyāt*. Neither of them seems to satisfy him; the use of doublets suggests that he might have felt unsure about the exact meaning of *παράδειγμα* and/or its use in the *Rhetoric*.

Terminological proliferation is not a phenomenon unique to the *Rhetoric*. We find examples for terms with a wide range of Arabic renderings in one text compared to less variation in the other translations in each of the texts we are studying. They are, nevertheless, less frequent than in the *Rhetoric* and, more importantly, the differences between the texts are less pronounced in those cases. Two prominent examples in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* are the compound *ὁμογενής* and the noun *πέρας*. The former is paraphrased with *mutasāwī fī al-ġins* in the *Rhetoric*. The *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* uses different paraphrases, we find *šabih bi-ġinsi-bi*, *munāsib bi-l-ġins*, *muttafiq bi-l-ġins* and *nāsib bi-l-ġins*. With the *Placita*, translations move away from paraphrases towards single-word translations, in this case *mušābih* and *muḡānis*. The *De anima*-commentary reduces the pool of available translations to one term, *muḡānis*. Apart from its interest as an example of gradual decline of terminological variation, the transla-

tors' respective handling of ὁμογενής illustrates a second characteristic of terminological development between the texts: the assimilation of a loan word, in this case *ġins*, into the morphological apparatus of the Arabic language.

The term *πέρας* in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* represents another interesting example of a text leaving the terminological mainstream for a completely different solution. Except for the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, the term is unanimously translated as *nihāyah*. The translator of the zoological treatises, on the other hand, experiments with terms such as *'ābir*, *maḥdūd* and *ġāyah*, singly and in combination (*ġāyāt wa-'awābir*).

Apart from some of the negative compounds discussed above, the *Institutio theologica* offers few examples for conspicuous terminological variation. Whether due to its subject matter (and limited vocabulary), its comparative shortness or some other reason, the terminology of the text is remarkably stable. Even the few instances of variation—e.g. ἀπειρος, which is translated in seven different ways across the text—mostly consist of choosing different nominal and verbal forms rather than verbal roots, in this case *n-h-y*: it is translated with phrases such as *lā nihāyah la-hu*, *lā muntahā la-hu*, *lā ntihā' la-hu*, *ġayr dī nihāyah* or verbal forms such as *lā yatanābī*. Of the 20 occurrences of the term, only one departs from this pattern (*lā ġāyah la-hu*). In its use of the root *n-h-y*, the *Institutio theologica* follows the examples set by previous translations. Translations of the adjective ἀμερής, of which there are four, rely equally on forms derived from the roots *q-s-m* and *ġ-z-'*: *lā yaqbal al-qismah wa-lā al-taġzi'ah*, *lā yataġazza'*, *lā yanqasim* and *lā ġuz'ah la-hu*. The second of these two roots predominates also in the other two translations in which the term ἀμερής occurs, the *Placita* and the Themistius-commentary. These two are the only examples of Greek terms in the *Institutio theologica* with more than three different translations.

Prominent instances of terminological variation in the *Placita philosophorum* are also relatively hard to come by. In fact, the degree of restraint the translator practices with his vocabulary is even higher across the range of terms included in our terminological sample than that displayed by the later *De anima*-commentary. Where we find an apparently wider range of renderings of a Greek term, it turns out to be variations of a single root. The adjective λογικός has been translated as *manṭiqī* in both the *Rhetoric* and the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. The *De anima* prefers *nuṭqī* and *nāṭiq*. All of them are found in the *Placita* too, which has *nuṭq* and *qūwat al-nuṭq* in place of λογικός as well as *nuṭqī*, *nāṭiq*

and *manṭiqī*. The root *n-t-q*, moreover, was employed exclusively for a small number of terms derived from the noun *λόγος* such as *ἄλογος* and *λογικός*: the root has, at least in the *Placita philosophorum*, become the standard source for very specific technical terms.

The *Nicomachean Ethics* contains a noticeably higher proportion of terms with a variety of Arabic equivalents. One remarkable example is the word *λόγος* for which the translator picked forms from no less than eight different roots. In order of their frequency, they are *n-t-q* (*nutq*, 5 times), *f-k-r* (*fikrah*, 5 times), *m-y-z* (*tamyīz*, 3 times), *k-l-m* (*kalimah*, 3 times), *q-w-l* (*qawl*, twice) and one occurrence each for *‘-q-l* (*‘aql*), *‘-l-m* (*‘ilm*) and *q-y-s* (*qiyās*). However, such variability should not come as a surprise. Firstly, it is matched by some of the other translations, most prominently the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Placita* which also rely on a large number of verbal roots to translate *λόγος*. Secondly (and more importantly), the term *λόγος* has such a wide semantic range that it would be very strange *not* to a correspondingly wide variety of Arabic translations. On the contrary, it would reflect badly on the competence of a translator if he attempted to reduce the diverse meanings of the term to one or two Arabic roots in the interest of terminological uniformity.

There are few suitable examples of terminological variation in the *De anima*-commentary. Its slightly higher degree of terminological flexibility compared to the *Placita* only becomes obvious when we look at terms with just one Arabic translation in the *Placita*. For a number of them, Iṣḥāq uses two or even three equivalents. The noun *φωνή* is such a term. Its standard translation, *ṣawt*, already appears in the *Rhetoric* in addition to the less frequent *lafẓ*. While the other two texts rely exclusively on *ṣawt*, the *De anima*-commentary again takes up *lafẓ* as a minor equivalent for *φωνή* and varies its main translation *ṣawt* to *taṣwīt*.

We have seen that if there is a tendency towards a reduction of variety in the translation of numerous terms in our sample, it seems not particularly pronounced. While some earlier translations apparently already exercise some restraint in terms of terminological variation, the *Nicomachean Ethics* seems to buck the trend to some degree by introducing a level of terminological variation that contrasts with the terminological economy of the *De anima*-commentary. According to our findings, the fault line between terminologically promiscuous and fastidious texts cannot be drawn between pre-Ḥunayn translations on the one hand and those produced by one of Ḥunayn's associates on the other. In terms of their degree of variation, it would be more appropriate to group Iṣḥāq's translation of

the Themistius-commentary together with the *Placita philosophorum* and set them apart from the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. The *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Institutio theologica* would fall somewhere between those texts. Before we determine the *Rhetoric's* place in this schema, it seems worthwhile to assemble the numerical distribution of terminological variants for a number of terms in our texts in a table.

	<i>Rhet.</i>	<i>K. al-ḥ.</i>	<i>Inst.</i>	<i>Placita</i>	<i>Nic. Eth.</i>	<i>De an.</i>
ἄδηλος	9	3	—	3	—	2
ἀληθής	7	2	—	1	—	2
ἀνάλογος	11	4	—	2	—	5
ἀπόδειξις	4	1	—	1	1	1
ἀρεμόττω	10	2	—	1	—	2
γλώττω	4	1	—	1	—	1
δῆλος	15	5	2	2	—	2
διάνοια	5	1	—	2	2	2
δόξα	6	2	—	2	3	1
ἕξις	5	2	—	1	3	1
μέγεθος	16	4	1	3	—	4
ὀρθός	9	6	—	2	2	1
παράδειγμα	5	1	—	1	—	1
πάσχω	22	7	5	3	—	3
παίθω	10	1	—	1	—	1
ποιητικός	7	4	2	2	—	3
σαφής	5	2	—	2	—	1
στοιχείον	5	1	—	2	—	1
τέχνη	5	1	—	1	2	1
ὑπερβολή	6	4	—	1	2	1
φανερός	15	7	3	3	—	4

Given the relative infrequency of terms with a higher degree of variation in the *Placita*, the *De anima* and to some extent the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Rhetoric* clearly stands out. Even in comparison with the least terminologically consistent member of our control group, the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, the *Rhetoric* still displays a remarkably high degree of variation. If we would associate terminological variation with an early stage in terminological development or with a lack of technical sophistication on the part of the translator, we would have to classify the text as either a very early product of the Kindī-circle (to which we have tentatively assigned

the *Rhetoric*) or as a text antedating the efforts of al-Kindī and his team of translators altogether.

The results of this short survey can also serve as another reminder of how difficult it is to assign translations to translators or argue for a certain dating on the basis of terminological evidence. To compare terminological samples from texts that deal with such a wide range of subjects is always problematic, because very few technical terms are sufficiently unambiguous in their meaning and field of application. The Arabic translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is a good example for a text in which technical terms are transposed onto a very different terrain. Matching these terms inevitably smacks of comparing apples and oranges.

In addition, the criterion of terminological variation in different texts has its own set of problems. First of all, it is not always true that less variation can be used as an indicator for a better translation (and/or one produced at a later stage of the Greek-Arabic translation activities). Ignoring for the moment the possibility of terminological interference by later readers and copyists, terminological variation can sometimes be a mark of a *better* translator. To convey the nuances of a text, it is often *necessary* to pick and choose from a range of possible Arabic roots and forms. Operating with eight different roots to translate *λόγος*, the translator of the *Nicomachean Ethics* demonstrates a much better grasp of the language than one who would attempt to cut back on terminological choices in this case. There are of course some technical terms with a sufficiently small semantic range for which less terminological variation can be a measure for translational competence but they have to be carefully distinguished from a number of multivalent terms (such as *λόγος*) for which the opposite is true.

In the case of the term *λόγος*, the variety of translations we found in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is outnumbered not by *Rhetoric* which already displays a wide range of Arabic renderings but the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. In addition to collocations (*kalimah wa-mablaḡ al-‘aql*), it makes use of a wide variety of terms derived from an equally wide range of roots: *ḡawāb*, *ḥalṭah*, *dīkr*, *ṣawāb*, *ṭalab*, *‘aql*, *‘ilm*, *qawl*, *ma‘nā*, *qiyās*, *kalimah*, *kalām*, *mulā’im* and *naw’*. Other examples of terms unspecific enough to require several renderings in both earlier and later texts are *διαιρέω*, *εἶδος*, *κύριος*, *μέγεθος*, *πάθος*, *σῶμα*, *τρόπος* and *φανερὸς*.

To shed some more light on the relations between our texts, we will now examine evidence for terminological continuity, exemplified by a

sample of technical and non-technical terms and their respective Arabic equivalents:

αἰσθάνομαι, αἴσθησις: Translated in all texts (except the *Institutio* in which they do not occur) with both forms I and IV of the root *ḥ-s-s*. The *Rhetoric* adds *ša'ara* on one occasion to translate the verb, the noun is rendered once with the collocation *al-ḥiss wa-l-mu'āyanah* in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the more specific expression *'ālāt al-ḥiss* in the *Placita*.²¹²

αἰτία, αἴτιος: The texts switch between *'illah* and *sabab*, both of which already occur in the *Rhetoric*. Whereas the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* remains undecided between the two alternatives, the *Institutio* and the *Placita* come down on the side of *'illah* and the *Nicomachean Ethics* and *De anima* prefer *sabab*.²¹³ Thus, at least in our sample, there seems to be a tendency of older translations to opt for *'illah* whereas later ones largely rely on *sabab*. Additional evidence confirms this hypothesis: *'illah* is the preferred translation in the group of early translations Endress studied and compared with the *Institutio theologica*.²¹⁴

ἀεὶθεός: With *'adad* as the standard translation across the sample,²¹⁵ the only variations we find are the collocation *'adad wa-nihāyah* in the *Rhetoric* and the nouns *'iddah* in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and *'ihṣā'* in the *De anima*.²¹⁶

γένος: All our texts opt for *ġins*.²¹⁷

²¹² Cf. also *WGAU*, p. 84 and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 77.

²¹³ Comparing several translations ascribed to Ibn al-Biṭrīq, Arnzen (1998, p. 151) records the following findings: the second translation of Aristotle's *De caelo* (Endress, 1966) employs *'illah* except for one example of *'illah wa-sabab*; the pseudo-Galenic *In Hippocratis de septimanis commentarium* also uses *'illah* with one occurrence of *'illah wa-sabab* and two cases of *sabab*; the anonymous *De anima*-paraphrase has only *'illah*. A last text, the translation of Aristotle's *Meteorology*, displays enough deviations in terminology and phraseology to doubt Ibn al-Biṭrīq's authorship but it clearly belongs to the output of the Kindī-circle; it uses *'illah* as well.

²¹⁴ Cf. Endress (1973, p. 141ff) and, for additional examples from Galen, *WGAU*, p. 84 and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 78. The *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 57 also records some periphrastic renderings involving *min 'aġl* in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*.

²¹⁵ Except in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, where the term does not appear.

²¹⁶ Cf. *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 166.

²¹⁷ The term *ġins* is the preferred rendering in two of Arnzen's Ibn al-Biṭrīq-translations as well, the *De caelo* and the *De anima*-paraphrase. The *Meteorology* has one occurrence each of *ġins*, *šinf* and *naw'*, pseudo-Galen uses *ġins* twice and possibly *šinf* on two other occasions (Arnzen, 1998, p. 152). The term does not occur in the *Institutio theologica*. Cf. also *WGAU*, p. 177f with numerous examples and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 240.

δύναμις: Aside from the main translation *qūwah* which is the preferred choice in the *Institutio theologica*, the *Placita*, the *Nicomachean Ethics* (with one exception where it is translated as *ʾaʿwān*) and the *De anima*, the *Rhetoric* introduces *qudrab* and *ḡund* and the doublets *qūwah ʾaw bās* and *qūwah wa-qadr*. In the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, *qūwah* occurs on one occasion as part of the collocation *qūwah wastitāʾah*. Already in the *Rhetoric*, the conflict between *qūwah* and nouns derived from the root *q-d-r* seems more or less settled in favor of the former.²¹⁸

ἐνέργεια: The *Rhetoric* offers both *fiʿl* and *faʿāl* with a marked preference for the latter. The decision between both terms seems to be in the balance in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*; the remaining two texts drop *faʿāl* and concentrate exclusively on *fiʿl*. The *Institutio* also has the collocation *al-fiʿl wa-l-ʿamal*.²¹⁹

θεῖος, θεός: In the majority of cases, these terms are translated by either the definite *Allāh* or the indefinite *ʾilāh*.²²⁰ The *Rhetoric* on one occasion uses the interesting expression *rūḥānī* which we also find in a number of early translations, e.g. the *Institutio theologica*. There, it translates both *θεοί* and *ἀσώματος*; it occurs in the same places in other early translations such as the body of Proclian texts examined by Endress. He links the appearance of the term *rūḥānī* in earlier translations with the Christian Syriac (and perhaps also Qurʾānic) usage.²²¹ The *Placita* in which both Greek words appear in more technical contexts than the *Rhetoric* eschews *Allāh* in favor of *ʾilāhī* for *θεῖος* and more specific phrases such as *al-ḡawhar al-ʾilāhī* or *al-ʾumūr al-ʾilāhīyah*; *Allāh* nevertheless figures as translation for *θεός*. The *Nicomachean Ethics* relies on two main translations for *θεός*, *al-ʾilāh* (also in the plural *ʾālihah*) and *Allāh* with two occurrences of the term *al-mutaʾālihūn* (“those who are deified” or “deify themselves”), apparently in order to circumvent the theological problems caused by translating the plural *τοὺς θεούς*.²²² In the *De*

²¹⁸ The *GALex* gives an example from Galen’s *In Hippocratis de officina medici* which translates the term with the doublet *qūwah wa-ʾatar*. Cf. also *WGAU*, p. 208f and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 296f.

²¹⁹ Cf. on this doublet Endress (1973, p. 156). For more examples from medical texts, cf. *WGAU*, p. 243 and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 355f.

²²⁰ Numerous examples for these translations are recorded in the *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 307–316.

²²¹ Cf. Endress (1973, p. 127–131).

²²² Cf. Dunlop et al. (2005, p. 144, n. 97).

anima-commentary, we find both *Allāh* for *θεός* and *ʿilāhī* for *θεῖος*, together with *samawī* for the latter.²²³

λογικός: As we have seen above, this adjective is rendered as *manṭiqī* in both the *Rhetoric* and the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. Remaining committed to the root *n-t-q*, the *Placita* and *De anima* display more variation by picking different terms derived from the same root: *qūwat al-nuṭq*, *nuṭq*, *nuṭqī*, *nāṭiq* and *manṭiqī* in the former and *nuṭqī* and *nāṭiq* in the latter text.²²⁴

λογισμός: The preference of renderings based on the root *n-t-q* for terms derived from *λέγω/λόγος* has its exceptions. This expression, which does not appear in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, is translated as either *fkr* (*Placita* and *De anima*) or alternately as *fkrab* or *fkr* (*Rhetoric* and *Nicomachean Ethics*).²²⁵

νοῦς: Already in the *Rhetoric*, we find *ʿaql* as the standard translation which remains the exclusive term in all our texts. The *Institutio theologica* stands out, because *νοῦς* has both a psychological and a theological component. While *ʿaql* remains the standard translation, proposition 167 also uses terms derived from the root *ʿ-l-m*, e.g. *ʿālim*, *ʿilm* or *dū al-ʿilm*.²²⁶ This terminological continuity is broken by an occurrence of *fabm* in the *Rhetoric*.²²⁷

ὄνομα: We find the same unanimity in respect to the term *ὄνομα*. The *Rhetoric* uses the only non-standard translation, the collocation *ʿaw lafz*, in addition to the main translation *ism*.²²⁸

παράδειγμα: Except for the *Rhetoric*, every text uniformly substitutes *παράδειγμα* with *mitāl*. In what can perhaps be described as continuous experimentation, the *Rhetoric* uses *burhān*, *dalālah* and the collocations *tatbit ʿaw wasf* and *dalālah wa-burhānīyah*. The text's

²²³ In addition to terms derived from the root *ʿ-l-h*, the *GALex* has *ʿabadi* (vol. 1, p. 10f). Cf. also *WGAU*, p. 292 and *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 458f, 460.

²²⁴ The glossaries of the *Institutio theologica* and the *Nicomachean Ethics* do not have any entries for this term.

²²⁵ Cf. also *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 638.

²²⁶ Cf. Endress (1973, p. 138–141) for a discussion of the usage of the *Institutio theologica* and the rest of his comparative sample; he explains the partial deviation of the translator as an ad-hoc terminological decision on the basis of the context of this particular section of the text.

²²⁷ The more technical sense with which it is used in Galen's *De anatomis administrationibus* has been rendered as *dihn*, cf. *WGAU*, p. 438.

²²⁸ Again, there are no entries for the *Institutio* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Cf. also *WGAU Suppl.*, p. 774f.

translation for the adjective *παραδειγματώδης*, *burhānī*, might indicate the translator's preferences in his apparently inconclusive search for a satisfactory translation. The term chosen by the other texts, *mitāl*, also occurs in the *Rhetoric*, but as one of several translations for *εἰκὼν*. *Mitāl* is moreover the standard rendering for *εἰκὼν* in the *De anima*. We also encounter it in the *Placita*, which has *šūrah*, *mitāl* and *timtāl* for *εἰκὼν*.²²⁹

πεῖθω: This is one of the terms which best illustrate the differences in terminological variation between the *Rhetoric* and the other texts. Each of them relies on derivatives of the root *q-n-ʿ*: the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* has *qanaʿa*, the *Placita* *ʿaqnaʿa* and the *De anima* uses the noun *qanāʿah*. Forms of the same root figure prominently in the *Rhetoric* as well—we encounter *ʿaqnaʿa*, *ʿiqnāʿ* and *muqniʿ* and phrases such as *fāʿala al-ʿiqnāʿ* and *tawallā al-ʿiqnāʿ*. Additionally, the text features more “exotic” renderings such as *ṭabbata*, *šafaʿa*, *qabila* or collocations, e.g. *ʿaddana ʿaw ʿaqnaʿa* or *qabila ʿaw ntabā ʿilā*.²³⁰

πέρας: One example of a term rendered more variably in a translation other than the *Rhetoric*. The *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* has *ʿāḥir*, *maḥdūd* and *ḡāyah* in addition to the doublet *ḡāyāt wa-ʿawāḥir* whereas the rest of the texts restrict themselves to the use of *nihāyah*, plus an occurrence of *ṭaraf* in the *De anima*.²³¹

ποιητής: The development from transcription to translation can be seen in the handling of this term. In Book Three of the *Rhetoric*, it is transcribed as *fyūʿitī*;²³² *šāʿir* occurs in the other two books. Both the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Placita* use *šāʿir*, while the *De anima*, in keeping with its different subject matter, has the more general *fāʿil*: the *ποιητής* in question is a maker of all sorts of things, not just poetry.²³³

²²⁹ The term does not occur in the *Institutio* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

²³⁰ There is no entry for the term in the glossaries of the *Institutio* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

²³¹ This term is also absent from the *Institutio* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The *WGAU*, p. 513 has *ʿafāq* (a common translation, cf. *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 234) and *ʿaqṣā* from the two translations of Galen's *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*. There are also numerous examples for the more common renderings derived from the root *ʿ-b-r*, cf. *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 118f.

²³² See above for the potential significance of the transcription as a marker for a Syriac source.

²³³ No entries for the *Institutio* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

- στέρησις: Apart from the *Rhetoric*'s single use of ἰδᾶμ in Book Three, the standard rendering of the term in all our texts is 'adam'.²³⁴
- στοιχείον: For the translator of the *Rhetoric*, the standard translation ἰστυκουσσ is only one of a number of possibilities, the most prominent of which seems to be ḥarf. We find it separately or in collocations such as ḥarfʿay ἰστυκουσσah, ḥarf wa-ʿaṣl, ἰστυκουσσ ʿaw ḥarf and al-ḥurūf wa-l-ḥiḡāʿ. With the exception of the *Placita* which has a single occurrence of ʿunṣur, ἰστυκουσσ is the standard translation in the remaining texts.²³⁵
- σύνθεσις: The term (which does not appear in the *Institutio*, the *Placita* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*) has been translated as tarkīb through-out.²³⁶
- σχῆμα: The translational consensus for this term seems to emerge early on, šakl is the rendering of choice for each text. Slight variation is introduced by the doublets hayʿah wa-šakl (*Rhetoric*) and šakl wa-šūrah (*Kitāb al-ḥayawān*). The one occurrence of šakl in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is supplemented by one occurrence of tašakkul.²³⁷
- τέχνη: As with some of the other terms, the *Rhetoric* already contains all the Arabic renderings which become standardized in other texts. Aside from the expressions mibnah, ḥīlah and šināʿah, it provides the collocation šināʿah ʿaw/wa-ḥīlah. The *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* opts for mibnah, the other texts favor šināʿah.²³⁸
- φαντασία: To translate φαντασία, the *Rhetoric* employs expressions derived from different roots, most prominently ḥ-y-l and w-h-m, e.g. taḥayyul and wahm and the doublets mutaḥayyal ʿaw mutawahham and taḥayyul ʿaw tawahhum. We also find a single occurrence of

²³⁴ Except the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

²³⁵ The examples compiled in *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 218f and 227 and in the *WGAU*, p. 640 also have ḥarf, ἰστυκουσσ and ʿaṣl.

²³⁶ Cf. *WGAU*, p. 657 and *GALex*, vol. 1, p. 291.

²³⁷ According to Arnzen's sample, the *De caelo* and the *De anima*-paraphrase also employ šakl. In the *Meteorology*, the translator renders the term twice as ġins and adds one occurrence each of the doublet šakl wa-ḥayʿah and the noun qadr (Arnzen, 1998, p. 156). The term does not appear in the *Institutio*. Examples from medical texts in *WGAU*, p. 663 show that šakl was the predominant translation also in this field.

²³⁸ Ibn al-Biṭrīq's translations are slightly more consistent, he uses šināʿah in all texts compared by Arnzen. In the *Meteorology*, it is collocated with mibnah to mibnah wa-šināʿah; in the *De anima*-paraphrase, both šināʿah and šanʿah appear (Arnzen, 1998, p. 156). No occurrence of the term is listed in the glossary of the *Institutio*. The *WGAU*, p. 673 lists some examples from the *Sententiae* of Menander which were translated with mibnah, šināʿah and once with ḥīlah.

šahwah. The choice between the roots *ḥ-y-l* and *w-h-m* is settled in favor of the former in the *Placita* and the *De anima* (φαντασία does not occur in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*). Both texts use the verbal noun of the V. form introduced in the *Rhetoric* together with *ṭabḥīl* (*Placita*) and *ḥayālah* (*De anima*).²³⁹ Interestingly, the *Nicomachean Ethics* prefers the transcriptions *fanṭāsiyā* and *fanṭāsiyāt* (3 occurrences) to the more regular terms *ṭabḥayyul* and *yataḥayyal* (a single occurrence each).²⁴⁰

φύσις: A standard term for φύσις apparently only emerges with Ḥunayn and his associates, Ishāq replaces the relative profusion of renderings in the other three texts with the single expression *ṭabī'ah* in the *De anima*. A certain degree of variation is still observable, though, the *Nicomachean Ethics* alternates between *ṭabī'ah* and *ṭab'*. The term *ṭabī'ah* already figures in the *Rhetoric*, but is accompanied by the form *ṭibā'* and included in the collocation *ṭab' 'aw ṭabī'ah*. The *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* favors *ṭibā'* and, infrequently, *ḥāl* and *taqwīm*. In the *Institutio*, we find *ṭabī'ah* as the preferred translation with one occurrence of *ḡawbar*. The *Placita* uses both *ṭab'* and *ṭabī'ah*.²⁴¹ Part of the reason for the apparent terminological instability is the range of contexts in which φύσις occurs. Adverbial uses such as φύσει and κατὰ φύσιν are frequent in Aristotle's writings and widen the scope of the word's application far beyond its use as a technical term of natural philosophy.²⁴²

φωνή: The terminological consensus focuses on *ṣawt* already at the time of the *Rhetoric*, the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Placita*-translation. The second rendering in use in the *Rhetoric*, *lafz*, is again taken up in the *De anima*-commentary together with *taṣwīt*.²⁴³

ψυχή: *Nafs* is the standard translation ψυχή in each of our texts.²⁴⁴ Greek

²³⁹ So also in Galen's *De elementis*, cf. *WGAU*, p. 722.

²⁴⁰ The treatment of the term in translations produced in the Kindī-circle and later texts is discussed on p. 102.

²⁴¹ According to David Pingree and Syed Nomanul Haq, the authors of the article "Ṭabī'a" in *IE²* (vol. 10, p. 25–28), the terms *ṭabī'ah*, *ṭibā'* and *ṭab'* are functional equivalents in Islamic science, philosophy and theology.

²⁴² Arnzen records *ṭabī'ah* for each of the three texts he credits Ibn al-Biṭrīq with. The *Meteorology* mostly uses *ṭabī'ah* as well, but also has *kiyān* (twice) and *māddab* (once). We also find four occurrences of *ṭab'* without attestable Greek equivalents (Arnzen, 1998, p. 157). The *WGAU*, p. 75of has numerous examples from the medical literature which operate with translations such as *ṭabī'ah*, *ḡawbar* and also *ṭibā'*.

²⁴³ Neither the *Institutio* nor the *Nicomachean Ethics* have entries for this term.

²⁴⁴ As it is for the Arabic translator of Menander's *Sententiae*, cf. *WGAU*, p. 785.

terms derived from $\psi\chi\eta$, e.g. $\acute{\alpha}\psi\chi\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\psi\chi\omicron\varsigma$, emphasize the role of *nafs* and the root *n-f-s*: we encounter negations such as *lā nafs la-hu* in each text for the first of these two terms. The *Rhetoric* adds some variation with phrases such as *bi-lā nafsāniyah* and *ḡayr al-nafsāni*. The second term is translated as *dū al-nafs* in the *Rhetoric*, the remaining translations shift to the V. form and employ *mutanaffis*. The abstract noun *nafsāniyah* remains in use throughout the time covered by our sample, it figures equally in the earlier *Institutio* and the later *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Overall, we noticed a very high degree of terminological variation in the *Rhetoric* not only with derivatives from a single root; its translator often experiments with a number of different roots to translate Greek terms in different contexts. A certain amount of terminological proliferation is also evident in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*; it decreases once more in the *Institutio* and is absent in the *Placita* and *De anima*, while playing only a secondary role in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Interpreting these results, we will have to make allowances for the fact that not all of the terms we have examined are technical terms with a restricted field of application.

Bearing this qualification in mind, we still have to conclude that the results do not support a developmental schema of increasing terminological discipline leading from the *Rhetoric* via the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, the *Institutio* and the *Placita* towards the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *De anima*. What we arrive at is a group of texts deploying a very restricted set of renderings for the terms we have studied (the *Placita*, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, although with some qualifications, and the *De anima*), one text displaying an extremely high degree of variation in its terminology (the *Rhetoric*) and two texts falling between those two poles (the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* and the *Institutio*).²⁴⁵

In spite of its apparent terminological inconsistency, numerous standard terms are anticipated by the *Rhetoric*, often mixed with translations which were dropped in other texts. In many cases, we notice complete agreement between the *Rhetoric* and the other texts, even though the former is often less consistent in the application of terminological standards. The *Rhetoric* substantially departs from the terminology of the other translations on only a few occasions; the same phenomenon is, at least to a certain degree, also evident in the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*.

²⁴⁵ The classification of the last text is for the reasons listed above—specialized subject matter, restricted vocabulary, relative shortness—only tentative.

The transition from transcription to translation of technical terms is not a very prominent feature of the terminological sample under consideration. If we add evidence from other terms not included (i.e. those not occurring in all of our texts), it is more conspicuous in the *Rhetoric* than in any other text.

If we adopt the (problematic) assumption that degrees of terminological variation indicate chronological stages in the evolution of the translation movement, we have to conclude that the *Rhetoric* represents a level of terminological development that precedes not only the *Institutio*, the *Placita*, the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *De anima*, but clearly also the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*. Apparently unguided by the compass of a fully developed terminology, the translator moves through his difficult source text with a fair amount of experimentation. The fact that he surprisingly often settles for translations that are part of the standardized terminology of other texts suggests that he was probably not entirely helpless: the *Rhetoric* in all likelihood marks not the beginning of terminological evolution for the majority of the Greek terms we have studied but represents an already highly developed stage of it. Moreover, the parallels in vocabulary we have found between the *Rhetoric* and the other translations produced in the Kindī-circle strongly suggest more than pure coincidence.

In sophistication and consistency, it clearly cannot compete with the *Institutio* or the polished *Placita*-translation, let alone the much superior texts ascribed to Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn. Even the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* with its frequent inconsistencies and occasional terminological lapses is overall a better translation. Before rashly condemning the translator of the *Rhetoric*, however, we should remember that he tried his hand at a very difficult text. We can only speculate how much additional problems such as the condition of his Greek manuscript(s) or the quality of whatever Syriac translation he might have consulted complicated his task. Keeping these factors in mind, the evidence seems to confirm our previous hypothesis that the *Rhetoric* belongs to the output of the Kindī-circle (cf. p. 150). My initial chronological placement of the *Rhetoric* in proximity of the *Placita*-translation is, however, not borne out by our results. On the basis of the evidence we have collected so far, it seems more prudent to limit ourselves to the more general claim that the translation belongs to the output the Kindī-circle without attempting to place it in a relative chronology of translations produced by members of this group.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE RECEPTION OF THE ARABIC TRANSLATION

INTRODUCTION

Although crucial for the process of transmitting knowledge from one culture to another, the translation of a text is only a first step. Sometimes, for a variety of reasons, the process stalls and translations leave little or no traces in the literature of the target culture: new ideas do not address the concerns of contemporary readers; the original author or the contents of a text are regarded as alien or suspected of challenging or undermining native traditions; or a translation is simply too flawed or obscure to attract any attention. To some degree, all of these points applied to the Arabic *Rhetoric*. The text discussed issues that clearly lay outside the cultural frame of reference of its audience—there was no immediately obvious Islamic equivalent to the rhetorical genres Aristotle discussed. At the same time, the *Rhetoric* was associated with the field of logic, one of the domains of the philosophers and as such highly suspect in the eyes of many scholars of the time. It also encroached on the nascent field of Islamic rhetoric, *balāḡah*. Lastly, its very obscurity and translational deficiencies limited its appeal.

In spite of these substantial problems, the Arabic *Rhetoric* found an audience and was read, commented on and incorporated into Islamic philosophical, scientific and even theological thought. Interestingly enough, this text, which had not been as extensively commented on in antiquity as most other Aristotelian writings, experienced quite a renaissance in the Islamic tradition.¹ As we will see, the cornerstone of this reception process was less the translated text itself than a number of commentaries written by the major philosophical figures of the tenth to twelfth centuries, al-Fārābī (d. 950), Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037) and Ibn Rušd (d. 1198). To understand their procedure, the character of the commentaries they produced and the impact they had on subsequent Islamic scholars and their use of Aristotelian rhetoric, we introduce this chapter with a few remarks on the forms Arabic philosophical commentaries took.

¹ Aouad and Rashed (1997, p. 43f).

The art of writing philosophical commentaries and the different forms involved were transmitted to Muslim philosophers by way of the same tradition that gave them the original texts: late antique Hellenism. Mostly uninterrupted by the Muslim conquests of the seventh century, the Christian educational system in Syria where the (mostly Christian) translators of antique philosophical and scientific works were schooled also preserved the texts and methods of the Greek scholars of Alexandria and other centers of scientific and philosophical teaching. Thus, the translators and, through them, later philosophers and scientists inherited a centuries-old system of reading and interpreting such texts.² For two important reasons, however, the character of and terminology for commentary genres remained in flux throughout the period we are looking at: firstly, logic (which included rhetoric) was taught outside formal educational institutions which would have enforced a certain level of standardization in terms of terminology and genre; and, secondly, without the restrictions imposed by a rigidly enforced tradition, philosophers were unencumbered by precedents and experimented freely with different literary forms. Therefore, while we are still able to discern a number of relatively stable genres of commentary writings, they frequently overlap and are often known by different names.³

Among the Arabic writings on the *Rhetoric*, these are the most important genres we encounter:

- The *Long Commentary*, often called *šarḥ* (or, more generically, *tafsīr*), a genre that ranges from long, detailed commentaries closely following the wording of the original text to shorter, paraphrasing interpretations.⁴
- The *Medium Commentary* or *talḥīṣ*, an exposition of the subject matter of a text, later understood to mean a summary. Dimitri Gutas points out that the difference between this genre (especially in the understanding of Ibn Rušd, who frequently uses this and related terms) and the *ğawāmi'* ("summary", see below) is one of purpose rather than form: the former denotes an exposition (purpose), the latter a compact summary (form). This explains why Ibn Rušd occasionally uses both terms for the same text.⁵

² Cf. Gutas (1993, p. 43f).

³ Gutas (1993, p. 31f,).

⁴ Cf. Gutas (1993, p. 33ff).

⁵ Gutas (1993, 38–43).

- The *abridgement*, often called *muḥtaṣar*, a textual genre of variable length that largely adheres to the wording of the original text. The boundaries between a short *ṣarḥ* and a *muḥtaṣar* are not always obvious; most of the time, the label was applied by later scholars trying to categorize the writings of the commentators.⁶
- The *Short Commentary* or *ḡawāmiʿ*, at first used only in connection with the works of Galen and later in a more general fashion for short verbatim extracts or summaries of works.⁷

In addition to explicit commentaries in these and other forms, the Arabic *Rhetoric* has left its imprint on a substantial number of original writings on subjects as varied as rhetoric, political theory, literary criticism and even theories of prophecy. The following survey will concentrate on some of the most important figures in the Muslim reception of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and its subsequent transmission into other languages, specifically Hebrew and Latin. It is arranged by centuries, concentrating on the works of the major philosophical authorities of the day and tracing their influence on their contemporaries and successors.

THE NINTH CENTURY: FIRST ENCOUNTERS

The evidence presented in the previous chapters indicates that the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric* was a product of the ninth century, possibly the work of a translator belonging to or at least working around the same time as the members of the so-called “Kindī-circle”. The members of this loosely-knit group of translators, focusing mostly on philosophical texts, produced the corpus of Arabic translations used by the philosopher al-Kindī.⁸

In spite of the similarities between the Arabic *Rhetoric* and the translations of the Kindī-circle and the likelihood of a link between its author and the translators sponsored by al-Kindī, however, the works of the latter give us no reason to think that he knew of the translation (or an Arabic epitome of the text) or was even much interested in it. Commentaries on or summaries of the *Rhetoric* or on an alleged antique commentary on the *Rhetoric* by Alexander of Aphrodisias (d. early third century)⁹ he was

⁶ Gutas (1993, p. 35f).

⁷ Gutas (1993, p. 37f).

⁸ For an in-depth study of this circle, its members and their role in the formation of Islamic philosophy, see Endress (1997).

⁹ Cf. Goulet (1989, vol. 1, p. 125–139 and 2003, p. 61–70).

credited with¹⁰ had been identified long before Rescher's time as misreadings of a manuscript of al-Qiftī's *Ta'riḥ al-ḥukamā'*⁷ caused by a misplaced leaf.¹¹ There is no evidence to support the idea that another treatise mentioned in the bio-bibliographical sources entitled *Risālah fī ṣifāt al-balāghah* (*Treatise on the characteristics of eloquence*) had anything to do with the subject matter of the *Rhetoric*.¹²

If anything, al-Kindī's interest in logic was secondary and always subordinated to his other philosophical and scientific interests.¹³ The very perfunctoriness of his remarks on the *Rhetoric* in a short treatise on the number and contents of Aristotle's works¹⁴ demonstrates that he had little (if any) knowledge about the work above and beyond its name and a rough idea of its contents.¹⁵

The bio-bibliographical sources record another potentially relevant but unfortunately lost text by a close contemporary of al-Kindī, Muḥammad ibn Mūsā, entitled *Kitāb 'alā mā'iyat al-kalām* (*On the Essence of Speech*). Its author was one of the famous Banū Mūsā, three brothers who became generous sponsors of translations and scientific research in ninth-century Baghdad. The interpretation of the book's title is disputed and does not necessarily refer to Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, even if the historian al-Qiftī mentions his activities in collecting works on "logic" (to which the *Rhetoric* was thought to belong).¹⁶ Equally unconfirmed is the existence of a handful of other potentially relevant texts: commentaries on (or better: summaries of) the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* among the corpus of ninth to tenth-century treatises associated with the alchemist, physicist and philosopher Abū Mūsā Ḡābir ibn Ḥayyān (d. ca. 815).¹⁷

The little evidence we have about the contents and even existence of these and other allegedly "rhetorical" writings suggests that in the ninth century, knowledge of the *Rhetoric* was still limited. Extant texts (such as al-Kindī's *Risālah fī kammīyat kutub Aristū*) and the titles of other,

¹⁰ E.g. by Nicholas Rescher (cf. 1963, p. 45 and 1964, p. 110).

¹¹ Cf. Steinschneider (1960, p. 84, 86, 87, 88), quoted by Heinrichs (1969, p. 107) and Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 461).

¹² Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 4).

¹³ A fact Rescher (1963, p. 45) freely acknowledges.

¹⁴ His *Risālah fī kammīyat kutub Aristū* mentioned above.

¹⁵ He lists the book as the "seventh of the books on logic" and translates the (transcribed) title of the *Rhetoric* as "persuasive speaking". According to al-Kindī, It dealt with oratory, especially the three types of "persuasion" applied in courts of law, public assemblies and in "praise and blame as they go together in eulogy" (Rescher, 1963, p. 53, 57).

¹⁶ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 461) and Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 4).

¹⁷ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 461), Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 4).

lost works we know of strongly suggest that the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric* was not yet available. Whatever the case, the study of Aristotelian rhetoric began in earnest only with the appearance of al-Fārābī a generation later.¹⁸

THE TENTH CENTURY: LAYING THE FOUNDATION

Considering the lack of evidence for the availability of the Arabic translation or any serious study of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* before his time, al-Fārābī's role in the reception history of the text was of paramount importance. As we will see, his writings inspired the other two key commentators of the text, Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd, either by suggesting interpretations that they adopted and extended or by serving as a foil to present their own rhetorical and logical thought. Unlike the reception of other components of the *Organon*, that of the *Rhetoric* was not mediated through or facilitated by extant late antique commentaries. Its readers could not rely on the help of generations of commentators in their attempt to understand its sometimes obscure language and overcome its frequently substantial translational problems. Al-Fārābī alone deserves credit for making this text accessible to future generations of Islamic scholars and initiating the process of study and appropriation of the *Rhetoric*.¹⁹

Even though rhetorical concepts played an important role in many of al-Fārābī's writings, especially those dealing with his political thought and his theory of prophecy, we find the most sustained discussion of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in two central works: the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* (*Book of Rhetoric*)²⁰ and in a part of what seems to have been a Long Commen-

¹⁸ An interesting example for a relatively early Arabic text that was strongly influenced by the Arabic *Rhetoric* is the so-called *Kitāb al-fawā'id al-šī'riyah*, the *Book of Poetic Gleanings*. Ascribed to Alexander of Aphrodisias and allegedly translated by Hunayn ibn Iṣḥāq, the short text forms part of a collection of writings attributed to Alexander. Zimmermann (1994b) analysed the text and concluded (p. 318) that it is most likely an Arabic compilation from Arabic sources by an author who had access to the Arabic *Rhetoric*; its style also resembles that of the translation.

¹⁹ So also Grignaschi (1968, p. 176).

²⁰ There are a number of editions and translations. A first edition and French translation by Langhade (1968, reviewed by Vajda 1969) was replaced only three years later by an almost identical edition (Langhade and Grignaschi, 1971) combining the edition and French translation of the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* with an edition of the *Didascalía* (see below). It was positively reviewed several times by Gätje (1972), Najjar (1973), Vajda (1973), Zimmermann (1974) and Ullmann (1977a). In addition to Langhade's edition, we also have editions by Sālim (1976) and, more recently and as part of a collection of al-Fārābī's logical writings, Dānēš-Pažūh (1988–1990, vol. 1, p. 456–492).

tary on the *Rhetoric*, extant only in a Latin translation, the *Didascalía in Rethoricam Aristotilis ex glosa Alpharabii*.²¹

The first of these two rhetorical texts, the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah*, consists of a commentary on a small sub-set of the *Rhetoric*. Following the sequence of the second chapter of Book Two of the source text (with a number of references to other passages of the *Rhetoric*), it presents al-Fārābī's ideas on a number of key rhetorical concepts.²² In this chapter, Aristotle summarizes the contents of the *Rhetoric*, paying particular attention to issues of argument and proof. The limited scope of the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* together with the ambiguity of the information provided by the bio-bibliographical literature has led some scholars to believe that the extant text is incomplete.²³ This assumption has been laid to rest by recent research; the current consensus is that the book is a complete and self-contained treatise.²⁴

Limiting himself to this part of the work at the expense of the remainder of the *Rhetoric* might have been dictated by the philosopher's desire to concentrate on the aspects of the text that were of particular relevance to him, namely logical matters and the theoretical basis of rhetorical proof. In this regard, the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* closely resembles other texts in a group of al-Fārābī's logical works on the *Organon* sometimes called the "Bratislava series" after one of the extant manuscripts in which they were collected. In spite of a number of formal differences between these treatises, they share a pronounced emphasis on the logical principles explained in the respective source texts and their theoretical roots—while downplaying Aristotle's remarks on the practical application of these principles. Thus, in the case of the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, al-Fārābī concentrated on those chapters in which the principles of rhetoric and poetry are explained while more or less ignoring the bulk of the texts which dealt with their application.²⁵

²¹ Edited by Langhade and Grignaschi (1971). Thanks to a number of excellent articles on the reception of the *Rhetoric* by Maroun Aouad, we need not rehearse the often confusing bio-bibliographical evidence for al-Fārābī's rhetorical writings. Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 126–131) and Grignaschi (1972, p. 45–60) have collected the relevant textual material which has been untangled and extensively discussed by Aouad (1998b, p. 170–173). His arguments for the existence of a Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric* seem entirely convincing.

²² Aouad (1992, p. 135). See Aouad (1992, p. 136–143) for a parallel comparison of the contents of the second chapter of Book One of the *Rhetoric* and the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah*.

²³ E.g. Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 9f, 23).

²⁴ The case has been convincingly argued by Aouad (1992, p. 134–143).

²⁵ Galston (1988, p. 198f, 201f).

Instead of merely re-stating Aristotle's ideas, however, al-Fārābī expands the discussion with a number of notions that are either only implicit in or not at all part of Aristotle's exposition.²⁶ One of his central concerns is the concept of *bādi' al-ra'ī al-muštarak* ("immediate, common opinion").²⁷ Apparently, the systematic use al-Fārābī made of it not only allowed him to resolve some of the textual difficulties of the admittedly often obscure Arabic *Rhetoric*, it also helped him answer two central questions posed by the text itself and by the Alexandrian commentators: firstly, what role or position does Aristotle assign to the the art of rhetoric, especially compared to dialectics? And, closely related to the first question, what was the role of the *Rhetoric* in the *Organon*?²⁸

In spite of the terminology used by some scholars,²⁹ the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* seems to be both *more* and *less* than a commentary: more, insofar as a summary of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* serves the author as a backdrop for elaborating his own, often independent thinking about rhetoric; less, insofar as it is limited to a small portion of the Aristotelian source text.

The genre of the second text, the *Didascalia in Rethoricam Aristotilis*, is much easier to pinpoint.³⁰ Only extant in Latin, it consists of several parts: an introductory section that discusses the nature of rhetoric and lists its divisions and a commentary section that quotes the Arabic version of the very beginning of the *Rhetoric* (1354a1–4): a general commentary and then a detailed, phrase-by-phrase commentary.³¹ The introductory section is in all probability identical to the so-called *Ṣadr li-kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* (*Prologue to the Book of Rhetoric*) listed in the bio-bibliographical sources.³²

²⁶ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 5).

²⁷ I.e. those shared opinions and unexamined notions a majority of people would immediately and unquestioningly assent to. Maroud Aouad deserves ample credit for demonstrating its importance for al-Fārābī and later philosophers and tracing its development during the history of Islamic philosophy in numerous publications. The centrality of this concept in the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* becomes immediately obvious in his comparison between its text and the relevant passages of the *Rhetoric* (Aouad, 1992, p. 136–143).

²⁸ Aouad (1992, p. 180).

²⁹ E.g. Galston (1988, p. 193), who classifies the text as a Short or Middle Commentary.

³⁰ The text is extant in a single manuscript in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. latin 16097. It was edited together with the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* by Langhade and Grignaschi (1971). Cf. above, p. 185, n. 20 for information on the reviews. A "conflated excerpt" was printed in Venice in 1481 and 1515 under the title *Declaratio compendiosa per viam divisionis Alfarabii super libris rethoricorum Aristotilis* (Boggess, 1971, p. 227f, 235).

³¹ Boggess (1971, p. 236) and Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 5).

³² Aouad (1998b, p. 174f) and Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 127); it was already tentatively identified as such by Steinschneider (1869, p. 59).

The text is the product of Hermannus Alemannus (fl. 1240–1256), a Latin translator specializing in Arabic versions of Aristotelian texts (among others, he is the creator of the Latin version of the Arabic *Rhetoric*) and Arabic commentaries, and was published around 1256. We now know that it is just the beginning of a Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, unfortunately lost in Arabic.³³ Only recently, Arabic fragments of the Prologue have come to light in a work by the Cairene physician Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Riḏwān (d. 1061 or after 1068),³⁴ to be discussed below. We also know that al-Fārābī’s commentary broke off before the end of Book Three of the *Rhetoric*: in a note at the end of chapter nine of Book Three of his Latin translation of the Arabic *Rhetoric*, Hermannus writes: *Huc pervenit glosa Alpharabii*.³⁵

The importance of this lost commentary must have been immense. In his writings on the *Rhetoric*, Ibn Sinā explicitly refers to it in a way that demonstrates his knowledge and use of the full text. Ibn Ruṣd also undoubtedly used the commentary, even though he does not refer to al-Fārābī by name.³⁶ He does, however, allude to commentaries he consulted in his own research in the colophon to Book Three of his own Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, particular one by a commentator he deemed “satisfactory” (*man yurtaḏā min al-mufasssirin*). Aouad has shown that this “satisfactory” commentator is none other than al-Fārābī, whose Long Commentary must have been one of Ibn Ruṣd’s most important sources.³⁷ We will return to Ibn Ruṣd’s commentary below.

Al-Fārābī’s efforts to make Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* accessible to his contemporaries and to integrate rhetorical concepts and ideas into his own philosophical thought thoroughly transformed the reception process. What is more, the *Rhetoric* started to leave its imprint also outside the limited circles of philosophical experts. Among the works which exemplify a growing contemporary interest in Hellenistic rhetoric in the tenth century, two stand out: the *Kitāb al-burbān fī wuḡūh al-bayān* by the Arab ṣūfī theologian Iṣḥāq ibn Wāḥb al-Kātib (fl. during the first half of the tenth century) and the *Kitāb al-saʿādah wa-l-ʿisʿād*, frequently ascribed to the Persian *sunni* theologian and philosopher Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-ʿĀmirī (d. 992).

³³ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 464f).

³⁴ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 5), Goulet (2003, p. 220).

³⁵ Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 131).

³⁶ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 464).

³⁷ Cf. Aouad (1998a, p. 91–98, 113).

Unfortunately, we know next to nothing about the life of the first author, Ibn Wahb. His family seems to have had connections to 'Ab-bāsid rulers and we find some of his ancestors among the officials at the caliphal court.³⁸ His treatise, the *Kitāb al-burbhān*, was often attributed to the ninth-century literary critic Qudāmah ibn Ġa'far (d. 873);³⁹ it contains an extensive discussion of rhetoric, style and the prerequisites and accomplishments required of state officials and represents a striking synthesis of Greek philosophy on the one hand and *šī'ī* and *sunni* religious thought on the other. It is both strongly influenced by and very critical of a ninth-century text similarly focussed on rhetoric and style in philosophical and theological contexts, the *Kitāb al-bayān wa-l-tabayīn* (*Treatise on Clarity and Clarification*) by the celebrated littérateur al-Ġāhiz.⁴⁰ Ibn Wahb's work is replete with references to Aristotelian texts, especially the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, but also the *Topics*.⁴¹ It gives us a glimpse not just of a particular stage of the early reception of the *Rhetoric* in particular and Aristotelian philosophy in general; also, Ibn Wahb's writings (like the next work discussed below) speak of an intellectual climate in which scholars were able freely to appropriate whatever source they deemed suitable to support their particular philosophical or theological argument while constantly reminding their audience of the universal value of logical and rhetorical knowledge.⁴²

As suggested above, the identity of the author/compiler of the *Kitāb al-sa'ādah*, which used to be listed among the works of the philosopher al-'Āmirī, is still disputed.⁴³ The only information provided by the single

³⁸ Maṭlūb and Ḥadīṭī (1967, p. 37–40), Ḍayf (1965, p. 95f).

³⁹ Edited by Maṭlūb and Ḥadīṭī (1967). For an exhaustive discussion of the evidence against Qudāmah's and for Ibn Wahb's authorship, see p. 19–28. The editor of Qudāmah's most important work on literary criticism, the *Kitāb naqd al-šī'ī*, Bonebakker (1956, p. 17f), notes that the *Kitāb al-burbhān* shows no sign of being influenced by this or other works written by Qudāmah, even though they discuss a number of literary issues in a similar way (examples on p. 18ff).

⁴⁰ Cf. *EP*², supplement, p. 402 with additional sources; Maṭlūb and Ḥadīṭī (1967, p. 28f); and Gutas (1998, p. 132 and n. 34). Montgomery (2006) is an excellent introduction to the *Kitāb al-bayān*, focussing on its reception of rhetorical thought and the historical and intellectual context of the text and its author.

⁴¹ Cf. Ḍayf (1965, p. 101f); see p. 96–101 for an outline of the book's contents.

⁴² Aouad (1998a, p. 153).

⁴³ The arguments for an against al-'Āmirī have been summarized and evaluated by Wakelnig (2006, p. 35–39). Like another eminent authority on al-'Āmirī and his thought, Everett Rowson (1988, p. 15ff), she remains sceptical: while not implausible, the evidence cited in favor of al-'Āmirī is insufficient to establish his authorship of the *Kitāb al-sa'ādah* beyond reasonable doubt.

manuscript of the work is what purports to be the name of the author, a certain Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Abī Ḍarr, otherwise unknown. Assuming that he is not identical with al-ʿĀmirī, the contents of the *Kitāb al-saʿādah* at least suggest that he lived at around the same time and came from a similar educational and intellectual background.⁴⁴

The *Kitāb al-saʿādah* is an anthology of theological, historical and philosophical material in six parts. The first two deal with ethics, the next two with politics and the last two contain aphorisms on a range of topics, e.g. the proper conduct of state functionaries or more general advice on the proper forms of religious and intellectual life.⁴⁵ Unlike the *Kitāb al-burbān*, this text does not present a structured argument; rather, it consists of a compilation of snippets from a range of sources which have a bearing on the ethical or political issues under discussion.⁴⁶ This is exactly what the author himself had in mind—in one place, he explicitly states that he wants to present the opinions of different peoples side by side to demonstrate how little disagreement there is between them.⁴⁷

Given its subject matter and the compilatory and comparative bent of its author, the book is a veritable treasure trove of quotations from a considerable number of Greek-Arabic translations, most prominently the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Rhetoric*. Since quotations are not always clearly marked and an exhaustive analysis of the *Kitāb al-saʿādah* is still lacking, we are not yet in a position to assess the range and character of its sources, including the question whether its author used any commentaries on the latter.⁴⁸ It is clear, however, that the number of quotations in the book considerably exceeds those already signaled in the secondary literature. The *Rhetoric* is quoted and referenced four times; very likely, there are many more unreferenced quotations.⁴⁹ In addition, the book antedates the manuscript of Aristotle's *Organon* that is our only source for the complete text of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and is therefore the earliest known witness for the translation.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ There are two editions of the book, one a facsimile of a transcript taken by Minovi (1336 AH), the other a printed version by ʿAtīyah (1991). Both are based on the only extant manuscript in Dublin, ms. Chester Beatty no. 3702.

⁴⁵ Pohl (1997, p. 201).

⁴⁶ Dunlop et al. (2005, p. 19) call it “a collection of material rather than a fully digested philosophical work”.

⁴⁷ Lacroix (1989, p. 167f), citing Minovi (1336 AH, p. 324).

⁴⁸ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 462f).

⁴⁹ Pohl (1997, p. 211ff) compares three such quotations with the text of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and shows that the author of the *Kitāb al-saʿādah* used the same translation.

⁵⁰ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 462f).

The interest of the *Kitāb al-sa‘ādah wa-l-’is‘ād* lies not so much in its creative use of those sources —its author prefers to present the texts side by side and let them speak for themselves rather than to comment, let alone indulge in philosophical innovation. Together with the *Kitāb al-burbān*, it is the product of the period immediately following the zenith of Greek-Arabic translation activities. Like the somewhat earlier works of al-Kindī, they are both representatives of a first wave of texts illustrating the appropriation of translated material and its combination with Islamic religious and literary traditions. Greek philosophy and Islamic religious literature are not the only sources the author draws on: the *Kitāb al-sa‘ādah* is also the first known literary work that draws equally freely on Persian and Greek wisdom literature.⁵¹

THE ELEVENTH CENTURY: ELABORATION AND EXTENSION

For the eleventh century, the bio-bibliographical literature records a flurry of activity around Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*. Mere titles is all we have in many cases. Among the scholars credited with writings on the *Rhetoric* are the Andalusian logician and mathematician Ibn Badr (d. ca. 1020), who allegedly penned a series of summaries on the “Eight Books” of logic, including the *Rhetoric*, but excluding the *Poetics*.⁵² Less certain are both the range of writings and even identity of another author of an alleged series of summaries on Aristotelian logic, this time on the “Seven Books”. It is unclear whether the “Seven” include the *Rhetoric*;⁵³ moreover, the identity of its author, Ibn al-Ḥayṭam, has yet to be established: of the two scholars known under the name, he has long been identified as the noted mathematician and scientist of the same name (d. 1039), but recent scholarship sees in him a less well-known contemporary of the mathematician, the philosopher and physician Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥayṭam (born around 965).⁵⁴

Until quite recently, the philosopher, theologian and physician Abū al-Farāğ ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ṭayyib (d. 1043) was credited with a Long

⁵¹ Pohl (1997, p. 206f).

⁵² Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 462); Aouad (2002, p. 4f).

⁵³ Rescher (1964, p. 145) thinks they do not whereas Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 462) seems to agree with the earlier opinion of Steinschneider (1960, p. 78), who listed the *Rhetoric* as one of the works summarized by this author.

⁵⁴ Goulet (2003, p. 221). For the opposite view (that the entries in the *Fihrist*, the *Ta’rīḥ al-ḥukamā’*, the *‘Uyūn al-’anbā’* and other such works refer to one and the same person), see Sabra (1998).

Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, known to (and criticized by) both Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd.⁵⁵ Besides an entry in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘ah’s *Ṭabaqāt al-‘aṭibbā’*, another important source for information about the work are two extant logical commentaries by the same author on the *Isagoge* and *Categories*.⁵⁶ On closer examination, however, it turns out that the only tangible piece of evidence for the existence of Ibn al-Ṭayyib’s Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric* is its mention in the *Ṭabaqāt al-‘aṭibbā’*—the rhetorical doctrines discussed in the Long Commentaries on the *Isagoge* and the *Categories* do not necessarily refer to another Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, but seem to be drawn from Greek sources (summaries rather than the full text of the *Rhetoric*) or are his own, original ideas.⁵⁷ Since this alleged Long Commentary probably never existed, its identification with the “unsatisfactory commentary” referred to by Ibn Rušd in his own Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric* is also very much in doubt.⁵⁸ Equally in doubt is the existence of a second text by Ibn al-Ṭayyib on the *Rhetoric*, a summary similar to those that complemented his other Long Commentaries. The evidence for such a summary is even slimmer than that for the existence of the Long Commentary itself.⁵⁹

According to our (scant) information, all three of these authors wrote what could be termed “conventional” commentaries, if not on the *Rhetoric*, then at least on some of the other texts of the *Organon*. From their titles, we can infer that they usually took the form of summaries, paraphrases or lemmatized commentaries that fit the scheme of Short, Middle and Long Commentaries. The boundaries between these genres start to blur with the philosopher Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥusayn ibn Sīnā. As part of the Aristotelian *Organon*, the *Rhetoric* plays a role in all of Ibn Sīnā’s writings on logic,⁶⁰ but he reserved his most extensive discussions of rhetorical is-

⁵⁵ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 462).

⁵⁶ Aouad and Rashed (1997, p. 49–57) list the relevant passages.

⁵⁷ For a discussion of the evidence, cf. Aouad and Rashed (1997, p. 58–62).

⁵⁸ Aouad and Rashed (1999, p. 98f).

⁵⁹ Rescher (1964, p. 155) and Gyekye (1979, p. 20) base their argument for the existence of the summary exclusively on the proven existence of such summaries for other logical texts on which Ibn al-Ṭayyib wrote a Long Commentary. Having discredited the evidence for the Long Commentary itself, Aouad and Rashed (1997, p. 58f) add that none of the bio-bibliographical and other sources contain even a hint of information on such a text which could support Rescher’s and Gyekye’s claim.

⁶⁰ Some of his works have not yet been edited and might contain additional relevant material; cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 468f), where the author also discusses the rhetorical section of Ibn Sīnā’s *Kitāb al-nağāt* (*The Salvation*) and concludes that they do not qualify as a “commentary”. See also Aouad (1999a) on rhetorical concepts, especially concerning rhetorical syllogisms, in his late *Kitāb al-‘iṣārāt wa-l-tanbihāt* (*Pointers and Reminders*).

sues for two larger works which cover the entire breadth of philosophy as it was known from the Aristotelian tradition. The first and earlier of the two is the *Ḥikmah al-‘arūḍīyah* (*Philosophy for ‘Arūḍī*, also known as *Kitāb al-mağmū‘*, *The Compilation*) in which he comments on Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* in two chapters entitled *Fī ma‘ānī kitāb riṭūrīqā*⁶¹ and *Fī al-‘ablāq wa-l-infi‘ālāt*.⁶² Years later, during what has been termed the “mature period” of his philosophical activities,⁶³ he his voluminous exposition of all branches of philosophy, the *Kitāb al-šifā’*, starting with logic; among them, the chapter entitled *al-ḥaṭābah*⁶⁴ contains the most extensive presentation of Ibn Sīnā’s thought on the *Rhetoric*.

Even though they are separated by another chapter (on the *Poetics*) in the unique Uppsala manuscript, the two chapters *Fī ma‘ānī kitāb riṭūrīqā* and *Fī al-‘ablāq wa-l-infi‘ālāt* belong together.⁶⁵ They form part of the first section of the *Ḥikmah al-‘arūḍīyah* which deals with Aristotle’s logical corpus. The book, allegedly commissioned by a neighbor of the then only twenty-one year old Ibn Sīnā, is considered his first work⁶⁶ and attempts to cover systematically all branches of Aristotelian theoretical philosophy.⁶⁷ Together, the two chapters on rhetoric only cover part of the contents of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*: the first sums up Book One (except the last chapter), the second those of Book Two which deal with the passions and their manipulation by orators.⁶⁸ The wording of the two chapters makes it clear that the text relies on the same translation used by al-Fārābī before him and Ibn Rušd after him.⁶⁹ But unlike al-Fārābī (and, as we will see, Ibn Rušd), Ibn Sīnā does not single out the second chapter of

⁶¹ “On the meanings of the Book of Rhetoric”, edited by Sālīm (1945); the edition was reviewed by Anawati (1954).

⁶² “On natural dispositions and affections of the soul”, edited and translated into French by Rémondon (1954).

⁶³ Gutas (1988, p. 102).

⁶⁴ “Rhetoric”; the chapter (or rather, book) was edited by Sālīm (1954); so far, we only have a translation of the first of four parts into German, prepared by Würsch (1991, p. 140–174). In his detailed and positive review, Aouad (1993) suggests a number of improvements and corrections for the translation itself and Würsch’s introduction and discussion of Ibn Sīnā’s rhetorical thought. Cf. also Aouad (1997a) and Goulet (2003, p. 221).

⁶⁵ As Gutas (1988, p. 89) indicates in his table of contents of the work; cf. also Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 467).

⁶⁶ Anawati (1957, p. 171). Gutas (1988, p. 87) calls it “the first medieval philosophical summa which can be said to have signaled the beginning of scholastic philosophy”.

⁶⁷ See Gutas (1988, p. 87–93) on the sequence of subjects, the sources and the relation of the work to the other writings of Ibn Sīnā.

⁶⁸ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 467), Gutas (1988, p. 89).

⁶⁹ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 467) and Würsch (1991, p. 11).

Book One for special treatment; rather, his concise summary of the parts of the *Rhetoric* that could be put to immediate practical use by Islamic orators resembles something of a handbook or manual of rhetoric.⁷⁰

The relevant chapters of the *Kitāb al-šifā'*, on the other hand, cover the entire text of the *Rhetoric*.⁷¹ Ibn Sīnā wrote the *Šifā'* following a request by his students in Hamaḍān to rewrite those of his books that were inaccessible to them because they had been lost or were in the hands of scholars in remote places. Instead of merely reproducing these texts, i.e. writing the sort of commentaries which his students expected, Ibn Sīnā decided to create a “running exposition” of all fields of philosophy “according to his own opinion”. Thus, the work represents a break with the late antique commentary tradition and its forms on which philosophical writings on Aristotelian texts had been modeled so far.⁷²

Structurally, the *Šifā'* follows a similar path as the *Ḥikmah al-ʿarūḍiyah*: its first part discusses logic with the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* relegated to the end.⁷³ The section on *al-ḥaṭābah* (rhetoric) falls into four parts (called *maqālāt*). The first one is a free discussion of the contents of the first two chapters of Book One of the *Rhetoric*; it clearly shows the influence of al-Fārābī's similar discussions in the *Didascalia* and his *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah*. However, Ibn Sīnā restructures the material and develops a number of new ideas and interpretations, especially on the theory of the *enthymeme*.⁷⁴ The other three parts cover the remainder of the *Rhetoric*. Formally, they are more akin to a conventional Middle Commentary: Ibn Sīnā paraphrases or directly quotes and then explains passages of the *Rhetoric*.⁷⁵ However, the author frequently intervenes to restructure the text and insert his own interpretations. The composition of a separate *maqālah* with his commentaries on the first two chapters of Book One together with his remarks on the connection between rhetoric and logic is a prime example for this tendency.⁷⁶

While he uses the same Arabic version of the *Rhetoric* as everyone else, Ibn Sīnā's attitude is quite critical. He frequently corrects passages that

⁷⁰ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 6).

⁷¹ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 467).

⁷² Gutas (1988, p. 101f).

⁷³ For an outline of the subjects and texts treated in the *Šifā'*, see Gutas (1988, p. 102).

⁷⁴ Cf. Würsch (1991, p. 12, 109). For a summary of the contents of the first part of the section on rhetoric, see p. 133–139. In another publication, Würsch (1993) describes and compares Ibn Sīnā's and Ibn Rušd's concepts of the *enthymeme*.

⁷⁵ Würsch (1991, p. 12, 109, 132); Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 468).

⁷⁶ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 6).

make no sense or contradict what he considers to be Aristotle's "true" ideas.⁷⁷ He does not quote other sources, even though he obviously knew (and used) al-Fārābī's commentaries.⁷⁸ Their treatment of the *Rhetoric* turns out to be quite different—for one, al-Fārābī is not at all interested in the practical aspects of rhetoric.⁷⁹ Given his re-arrangement of the text, criticisms and corrections of the translation and deviations from the formal framework of the late Alexandrian commentary tradition, it is not unlikely that Ibn Sīnā's rhetorical section in the *Kitāb al-šifā'* is the "unsatisfactory commentary" referred to by Ibn Rušd.⁸⁰

A generation later, the pioneering work of al-Fārābī on logic in general and the *Rhetoric* in particular was taken up again by the Cairene physician Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Riḍwān.⁸¹ Among the numerous works he is credited with in the bio-bibliographical literature, there are several texts on logic.⁸² For our purposes, the most interesting one is his *Kitāb fī al-musta'mal min al-manṭiq fī al-ʿulūm wa-l-ṣanāʿi'* (*On what is used from logic in the sciences and arts*).⁸³ In the form of a manual, the book covers the entire *Organon* with separate chapters dealing with each of its components (including Porphyry's *Isagoge*).⁸⁴ Ibn Riḍwān's purpose is eminently practical: as the title of the book suggests, he wants to identify and explain those parts of logic and logical concepts that are relevant to the sciences and arts. According to the author, the *Rhetoric* in particular should be read and used not only by philosophers, but also scholars in Islamic disciplines such as *balāḡah* and Islamic law. This is an idea we already find in Ibn Wahb's *Kitāb al-burbān* discussed above: both authors stress in sim-

⁷⁷ Würsch (1991, p. 120–127) has collected a sample of evidence for Ibn Sīnā's use of the same Arabic *Rhetoric* that is still extant. For examples of his corrections, see p. 114–117; there is also a concordance of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and all four *maqālāt* on rhetoric on p. 218f.

⁷⁸ Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 468).

⁷⁹ Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 24ff) with a useful summary of the contents of the rhetorical section of the work.

⁸⁰ This, at least, is the conclusion of Aouad and Rashed (1999, p. 113) based on their detailed discussion of the evidence (p. 98–113). For additional information on Ibn Sīnā's rhetorical thought, see Würsch (1993) and Aouad (1997a, 1999a).

⁸¹ On the biographical details, cf. Schacht and Meyerhof (1937, p. 12f) with additions by Dietrich (1982, p. 7f).

⁸² Aouad (1998b, p. 180f).

⁸³ The *Kitāb fī al-musta'mal* has not yet been edited. It is extant in the Escorial in Madrid, ms. Derenbourg no. 649, fol. 173v–202v. Aouad (1998b) has edited the chapter on rhetoric (f. 200r–202r); in addition, he has compiled, translated and analyzed rhetorical material from other parts of the book in Aouad (1997b, 1998a), including a comparison of the relevant passages with al-Fārābī's *Didascalía*.

⁸⁴ Aouad (1998b, p. 182f).

ilar terms the universal benefit of rhetorical knowledge which transcends the narrow limits of Hellenistic *falsafah*.⁸⁵

In addition to the short chapter on rhetoric, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* plays an important role in the rest of the *Kitāb fi al-musta'mal*. Textual similarities and verbatim parallels between the frequent rhetorical quotes in the book and al-Fārābī's *Didascalía* demonstrate its importance for Ibn Riḍwān.⁸⁶ In fact, those passages of the book which correspond closely with the Latin text represent the only known Arabic fragments of al-Fārābī's Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, more specifically the *Ṣadr* or "Prologue".⁸⁷ However, Ibn Riḍwān also used his sources to develop rhetorical doctrines which differ profoundly from those of al-Fārābī or any other of the Arabic commentators.⁸⁸ These differences make it unlikely that the *Kitāb fi al-musta'mal* was derived from the full text of the Long Commentary of which the *Didascalía* represents only the Prologue. More likely, Ibn Riḍwān made extensive use only of this Prologue (which might already have circulated as a separate text) while adding his own ideas.⁸⁹ His treatment of the subject matter of the *Didascalía* left some traces in later philosophical literature, e.g. a letter by the Andalusian physician and philosopher Abū Bakr al-Ṣā'ig ibn Bāğğah (d. 1139) to his friend and student Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Imām.⁹⁰

THE TWELFTH CENTURY: THE RETURN TO ARISTOTLE

With Ibn Bāğğah, we are already in the twelfth century, dominated by the towering figure of Abū al-Walīd ibn Ruṣd, the Averroes of the Latin tradition. As the example of Ibn Bāğğah shows, however, he is not the only Islamic scholar of this century who showed an interest in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and his other logical writings. In his *Kitāb al-mu'tabar fi al-ḥikmah*, the philosopher and physician Abū al-Barakāt Hibat Allāh ibn Malkā al-Bağdādī (d. after 1165)⁹¹ devotes a chapter to rhetorical syllogisms which heavily depends on Ibn Sīnā's treatise *Fī ma'ānī kitāb riṭūriqā*.⁹² He

⁸⁵ Cf. Aouad (1998a, p. 149–155, esp. 153).

⁸⁶ Aouad (1998b, p. 169f).

⁸⁷ Aouad (1998b, p. 207f).

⁸⁸ Aouad (1997b, p. 163).

⁸⁹ Aouad (1998b, p. 216).

⁹⁰ Aouad and Rashed (1999, p. 91f and n. 21).

⁹¹ On Abū al-Barakāt, his works and philosophical thought, cf. Shlomo Pines' article "Abū al-Barakāt" in *EI*², vol. 1, p. 111ff.

⁹² The chapter can be found in Abū al-Barakāt (1357–1358 AH, vol. 1, p. 269–276).

often quotes it verbatim but introduces some interesting terminological variations.⁹³

Two works by Ibn Rušd on Aristotelian rhetoric are extant: his Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric*⁹⁴ and his Short Commentary (or *ḡawāmi‘*).⁹⁵

The Short Commentary formed part of a whole series of such commentaries on the various works of the *Organon* which concentrate on the theoretical principles of the logical subject matter discussed in each work. This “textual context” helps explain why the emphasis of the *ḡawāmi‘* on the *Rhetoric*, written before 1159, is the relevance of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*

⁹³ Cf. Goulet (2003, p. 221f); see Würsch (1991, p. 11, 63, 77, 79, 217) for examples of quotations and close correspondences between both authors.

⁹⁴ Cf. Goulet (2003, p. 222). Before the first complete edition of the Middle Commentary, a part of Book One was edited by Lasinio (1875–1878); Sallam (1952) edited and translated Book Three into English. The first full edition was the work of Badawī (1960); in his (mostly uncritical) review, Anawati (1959–1961b) follows Badawī in wrongly claiming that Ibn Rušd used a translation of the *Rhetoric* other than the extant Arabic version. This and the later edition by Sālim (1967) have now been replaced by the magisterial edition and French translation prepared by Aouad (2002).

⁹⁵ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 469). Together with the Short Commentaries on the *Topics* and *Poetics*, it was edited and translated into English by Butterworth (1977) on the basis of several manuscripts in which the Arabic text was transcribed with Hebrew letters. The verdict of its many reviewers seemed to depend on their own background and approach to Ibn Rušd and the Aristotelian commentary tradition: more philologically and logically minded scholars such as Badawī (1979–1980) and Zimmermann (1979) dismissed it, pointing to the numerous misreadings and flaws of the (reconstructed) Arabic text and its underlying Hebrew transcription. Those interested in the political and philosophical dimensions of the Short Commentaries such as Berman (1981), Gueguen (1978), Harvey (1980), Motzkin (1981) and Vajda (1979) viewed it in a more positive light without ignoring some of its shortcomings. Leaman (1980) took the editor and other interpreters of Arabic philosophical texts to task for their tendency to view philosophical works mostly as expressions of the conflict between philosophers on the one hand and Muslim theologians on the other while ignoring a much more straightforward reading of the texts as genuine contributions to largely philosophical debates such as the purpose and procedures of Aristotelian logic.

Schoeler (1980) commented in some detail on some of the editor’s flawed notions about the inclusion of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* among the *Organon* (p. 295f); the classification of syllogisms (p. 296f); and the methods of persuasion and their alleged origin in al-Fārābī’s *Kitāb al-ḡaṭābah* (p. 297–300). Finally, similar to Leaman (1980), he criticizes the editor’s claim that the relation between politics, philosophy and religion, especially Ibn Rušd’s alleged critique of dialectical theology, is the central issue discussed in the three Short Commentaries (p. 300f).

Several years later, the publication of an edition of Ibn Rušd’s Middle Commentary on the *Poetics* (Butterworth, 1996) occasioned the most vociferous attack yet on the scholarly merits of the editor’s approach. Gutas (1990) faults him for inexact translation, idiosyncratic terminological choices and ignoring large parts of the secondary literature on the texts he is translating. In Gutas’ opinion, these flaws render this and other editions and translations by the editor completely worthless for scholarly purposes.

for the wider field of logic. The (relatively short) text focuses on the second chapter of Book One of the Arabic *Rhetoric*, reading it through the lense of al-Fārābī's *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah*. Like the latter, it explains the theoretical principles of rhetoric while at the same time determining its position and rank in comparison to other logical disciplines. Its relative independence from the text of the *Rhetoric* suggests that Ibn Rušd wrote it while still under the influence of al-Fārābī and before he then returned to the Aristotelian text itself and interpreted it afresh.⁹⁶ As for the other commentaries on the *Rhetoric* discussed above, Maroun Aouad has shown the importance of the concept of *bādi' al-ra'ī al-muštarak* in rhetorical arguments, inherited from al-Fārābī, also for this Short Commentary.⁹⁷

Completed in 1175, almost twenty years after the Short Commentary, the Middle Commentary shows how Ibn Rušd emancipated himself from the Arabic commentary tradition and developed a more "Aristotelian" understanding of the *Rhetoric* and other Aristotelian works he commented on later in his life. Like his Short Commentary, it is part of a series of commentaries covering the entire *Organon*.⁹⁸ Thanks to its relative closeness to Aristotle's rhetorical thought, some scholars have even suggested that the Middle Commentary, allegedly devoid of innovative ideas, "slavishly" followed Aristotle's text.⁹⁹ Recent scholarship, especially the publications of Maroun Aouad, has prepared the way for a more nuanced appreciation of this work. Formally, Ibn Rušd follows the conventions of a Middle Commentary: instead of quoting and then explaining the Arabic *Rhetoric* line by line, he directly explains the intention of the author, i.e. he concentrates on the sense of the text rather than its wording. This does not keep him from quoting the *Rhetoric* where suitable in unmodified or modified form; thus, his procedure somewhat resembles that of Ibn Sīnā in the *Šifā'*, except that Ibn Rušd's interventions are less fre-

⁹⁶ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 469) and Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 7). In addition to listing the correspondences between the Arabic *Rhetoric* on p. 276f, Aouad (1994, p. 293–298) shows how closely Ibn Rušd followed the sequence of al-Fārābī's thought with a synoptical presentation of the text of the Short Commentary, the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* and the Arabic *Rhetoric*. Ibn Rušd's shift away from the Islamic philosophical tradition and back to the "original" Aristotelian teaching has been persuasively argued by Schoeler (1980).

⁹⁷ Cf. Aouad (1994). See also al-Šannūfi (1999) on one of the key questions the concept was designed to answer, the distinction between dialectics and rhetoric in Aristotle's logical system and its interpretation by Ibn Rušd.

⁹⁸ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 470) and Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 7). The date of the commentary, its sources and methodological underpinnings are discussed in detail in Aouad and Rashed (1999, p. 84–91) and especially Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 9–50).

⁹⁹ Cf. e.g. Thillet (1978, p. 105f).

quent and radical.¹⁰⁰ The differences between the Middle Commentary and al-Fārābī's *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* are more pronounced. Ibn Rušd follows the structure of the *Rhetoric* in its entirety while al-Fārābī develops his own, creative rhetorical thought (much of which has no equivalent in Aristotle's text) on the basis of a small sample of the Arabic *Rhetoric* that matches with his main concern: logic and the role rhetoric plays in it.¹⁰¹

Like his predecessors, Ibn Rušd relies on Ibn al-Samḥ's text of the *Rhetoric*, i.e. the extant Arabic version—only that the text he had at his disposal was apparently superior to that which was incorporated in the *Organon* manuscript now at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Also, his text, while derived from the same source as the extant translation, is perhaps closer to the version read and translated into Latin by the thirteenth-century German translator Hermannus Alemannus.¹⁰² Apart from a number of minor divergences, the main difference between these two texts is their length: the text used by both Ibn Rušd and later by Hermannus Alemannus for his Latin translation of the *Rhetoric* is slightly shorter, an *exemplar decurtatum* that lacks chapters 15–17 of Book Two.¹⁰³

Apart from the translation, Ibn Rušd also made use of several commentaries on the *Rhetoric*, chiefly those of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā. In a revealing note in the colophon at the end of Book Three of his Middle Commentary, the author mentions that for one part of the commentary, he could not refer to any commentary “by the satisfactory commentator” (*li-man murtaḍā min al-mufassirin*). This offhanded remark tells us a number of things: firstly, that he did use other commentaries in the first place; secondly, that there must have been at least two, one by the “satisfactory” commentator, one by another commentator who apparently did not pass muster.¹⁰⁴ The wording of the passage also tells us that the commentaries in question must have been at least Middle Commentaries, if not Long ones. Above, we have already identified these two commen-

¹⁰⁰ Aouad (1994, p. 263f). Aouad (1999b) has compared the different methods of commenting on the text in Ibn Rušd's Short and Middle Commentary.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Langhade and Grignaschi (1971, p. 26). Thillet (1978) also discusses some of the similarities and differences between the two texts.

¹⁰² Cf. Goulet (1989–, p. 470); as mentioned above, the previous editor Badawī (1960) and his reviewer Anawati (1959–1961b, p. 262) still erroneously thought that the commentary was based on a different translation, supposedly by Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn or (Badawī's preference) Ibrāhīm al-Dimašqī. They are mentioned in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* and in the marginal notes in the manuscript of the *Rhetoric*, respectively.

¹⁰³ Corresponding to 1390b14–1391b7; cf. Aouad (2002, p. 2). On the problem of the *exemplar decurtatum*, cf. also Bottin (1975).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 470).

taries: the “satisfactory” commentator al-Fārābī and his Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric* found Ibn Rušd’s approval, Ibn Sīnā’s chapter on rhetoric in his *Kitāb al-šifā’* did not.¹⁰⁵

Many scholars have attempted to clarify Ibn Rušd’s understanding of rhetoric and its purpose in relation to political philosophy.¹⁰⁶ Butterworth sums up Ibn Rušd’s idea of rhetoric as an art of persuasion on any given subject aimed at the masses or those who are unwilling or unable to follow the complicated reasonings of the philosophers.¹⁰⁷ We have encountered some of the key differences between Aristotle’s and Ibn Rušd’s understanding of rhetoric before, e.g. Ibn Rušd’s view of rhetoric as a logical art; the requirement that an orator has to be a competent logician and even philosopher; the requirement that an orator has to have political knowledge exceeding that of an audience which thinks in terms of received, unexamined opinions; and, finally, his idea that an orator has to be a master of theoretical knowledge in addition to his practical skills emphasized by Aristotle.¹⁰⁸

BEYOND THE TWELFTH CENTURY

The writings of Ibn Rušd marked the peak of the reception of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* in Arabic. For all we know, the number of works concerned with Aristotelian rhetoric fell off after his death. In addition, they referred not to the text of the *Rhetoric* itself anymore. Instead, most post-Ibn Rušd writings on rhetoric merely summarized previous Arabic commentaries by al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rušd with varying degrees of addition and adaptation.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ For a survey and a thorough analysis of the evidence, see Aouad and Rashed (1999, p. 91–113).

¹⁰⁶ E.g. Blaustein (1992), who examines the role of political considerations in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and Ibn Rušd’s Middle Commentary and the consequences this has for the scope of rhetoric and the rhetorical means that an orator can employ in communicating with the masses.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. Butterworth (1992, p. 187). See the rest of the article for the author’s interpretation of Ibn Rušd’s political philosophy as expressed in his Middle Commentary and his commentary on Plato’s *Republic*.

¹⁰⁸ Butterworth (1998, p. 228). These differences, the author claims, put Ibn Rušd’s idea of rhetoric much closer to a Socratic (or Platonic) idea of speech and action (p. 240). For a discussion of various doctrinal points, cf. Aouad (1994, 1996), especially the central role of the concept of *bādi’ al-ra’i al-muštarak* in his Middle Commentary, and Goulet (2003, p. 111f). Würsch (1993) concentrates on the development of the theory of certain types of *enthymemes* from Aristotle to Ibn Sīnā and then Ibn Rušd.

¹⁰⁹ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 8).

Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭumlūs (d. 1223), an Andalusian physician and logician, was a close contemporary and perhaps also student of Ibn Rušd.¹¹⁰ He is the author of a *Madḥal ʿilā šināʿat al-mantiq* (*Introduction to the art of logic*) in several parts, the largest of which consists of a *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah*.¹¹¹ This chapter on rhetoric is a detailed summary based mostly on Ibn Rušd's Middle Commentary which Ibn Ṭumlūs occasionally quotes verbatim.¹¹² In addition to its indebtedness to Ibn Rušd, whose Short and Middle Commentaries figure prominently, the *Madḥal* relies on several previous summaries and commentaries, namely al-Fārābī's work of the same title and Ibn Sīnā's rhetorical parts of the *Šifāʾ*. The author skillfully combines the strands of the previous reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in a synthesis that is in this form unprecedented in the Arabic rhetorical tradition.¹¹³ Interestingly, like Ibn Rušd before and Hermannus Alemannus after him, Ibn Ṭumlūs also used the shortened *exemplar decurtatum* of the Arabic *Rhetoric*.¹¹⁴

The rhetorical treatises of the physician and philosopher Muwaffaq al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī (d. 1231), also known for a number of other writings on Aristotelian philosophy,¹¹⁵ are not extant. Several suggestive book titles listed by Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿah amply document his interest in the rhetorical tradition, both Aristotelian and Islamic. On the basis of our available, albeit scant information, they have been interpreted as more or less extensive summaries.¹¹⁶

A little later, the physician and theologian Ibn al-Nafīs (d. 1288) made extensive use of al-Fārābī's *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* for the chapters on rhetoric in his *Kitāb šarḥ al-wurayqāt*.¹¹⁷ Finally, the rhetorical chapters of Ibn Sīnā's *Šifāʾ* were the source of an anonymous and undated philosophical text extant in a manuscript now at the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁰ Cf. Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 8) and Goulet (2003, p. 223). Our information about his life, especially his relations with Ibn Rušd, depends on the few hints he drops in his various writings, studied by Elamrani-Jamal (1997).

¹¹¹ The *Madḥal* was edited by Assin (1916), re-printed in 2000 by the Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt. Aouad (2006) has prepared a separate edition and French translation of the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* which I have not been able to consult.

¹¹² Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 211f) lists the correspondences between the Middle Commentaries and the *Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah* of Ibn Ṭumlūs' *Madḥal*.

¹¹³ Goulet (2003, p. 223).

¹¹⁴ Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 2).

¹¹⁵ E.g. Neuwirth (1976).

¹¹⁶ Cf. Rescher (1964, p. 189ff) and now Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 7).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Max Meyerhof's short article "Ibn al-Nafīs" in *EI*², vol. 3, p. 897f.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 8).

THE LATIN AFTERLIFE

While the interest in Aristotelian rhetoric in the Muslim world apparently leveled off during the thirteenth century and authors turned exclusively to well-established commentaries instead of the text of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* itself, it did not seem to die out completely. Further north, however, the reception of the *Rhetoric* only began during the thirteenth century. Until the mid-twelfth century, scholars in the Latin West only knew those Aristotelian logical works which had been translated by Boethius (d. 524 or 525), i.e. the *Categories*, *De interpretatione*, the *Prior Analytics*, *Topics* and Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Starting around 1150, new Aristotelian sources became available in substantial numbers, first Greek, then Arabic.¹¹⁹

The reception and assimilation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* before the creation of William of Moerbeke's (d. 1286) complete translation from Greek around the year 1270 happened in several stages. During the earliest of these, represented by Dominicus Gundissalinus (fl. ca. 1150) in Spain and Albertus Magnus (d. 1280) in Germany, scholars became aware of the Arabic tradition of the *Rhetoric* through secondary sources, mainly al-Fārābī's *Kitāb 'ihṣā' al-'ulūm* (*The enumeration of the sciences*). This short treatise, known since the end of the twelfth century, had been translated twice into Latin under the title *De scientiis*, first by John of Seville (fl. eleventh century)¹²⁰ and then by Gerhard of Cremona (d. 1187).¹²¹ The secondary literature also familiarized Latin scholars with the notion of the "enlarged" *Organon* including the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*.

During the next stage, represented by Roger Bacon (d. 1294) and his *Opus maius*, we find the first mention of the text of the *Rhetoric* itself (i.e. the translation of Hermannus Alemannus mixed with material from al-Fārābī's *Didascalía*).¹²²

We know little about the life of the translator: he was born possibly in 1202; in the mid-thirteenth century, he apparently worked in Toledo, at least according to notes in his translations which put him there in 1240

¹¹⁹ Kummerer (1989, p. 19). See Green (1994) on the various strands of rhetorical thought which existed before the re-introduction of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the West and how they influenced the translation, transmission and interpretation of the Latin *Rhetoric*.

¹²⁰ Johannes Hispalensis or Hispaniensis de Luna. On his translations, cf. Steinschneider (1956, p. 40–50).

¹²¹ A prolific translator of both Greek and Arabic literature, cf. Steinschneider (1956, p. 16–32).

¹²² The text Hermannus used consists of the same *exemplar decurtatum* available to Ibn Rušd, a product of the textual tradition of which the extant Arabic translation forms part, but it represents an earlier, superior version (Aouad, 2002, vol. 1, p. 9).

and 1256. He is probably the same person as the later bishop of Astorga in Leon between 1266 and his death in 1272. His translation method apparently involved a second person and seemed to have been word-for-word from an intermediary oral translation into the Castilian vernacular given by an Arabic speaker who translated the Arabic text, also word for word.¹²³ To make sense of the many obscure passages of the Arabic *Rhetoric*, Hermann occasionally inserts translated passages derived from al-Fārābī's Long Commentary (of which, as we have seen, the *Didascalía* formed the Prologue), the relevant chapters of Ibn Sīnā's *Šifā'* and Ibn Rušd's Middle Commentary.¹²⁴

Even though Bacon was in direct contact with Hermann, he never directly quotes neither the Latin translation of the *Rhetoric* nor the *Didascalía* which he might not have read; on the contrary, he deplores the fact that both the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, allegedly the "two best books on logic", were unavailable to a Latin-speaking audience.¹²⁵ The only texts he quotes are al-Fārābī's *'Iḥṣā' al-ʿulūm*, parts of Ibn Sīnā's *Šifā'* and the logical part of al-Ġazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifah* (*The Intentions of the Philosophers*), known to him in a Latin translation entitled *Logica al-Gazeli*¹²⁶ by the same John of Seville who was responsible for one of the translations of al-Fārābī's *'Iḥṣā' al-ʿulūm*.¹²⁷

Roger Bacon's writings mark a key stage in the reception of the *Rhetoric* in Latin: it had just become available, but had not been integrated into the university curricula. Rhetoric as a scholarly discipline was already established before the first Latin translation of the *Rhetoric*; like much of post-Aristotelian rhetoric in antiquity, it relied much more on Cicero and Quintilian than on the (relatively neglected) Aristotelian text.¹²⁸ A first, thirteenth century translation from the Greek which may have antedated Hermannus' version had been more or less ignored. William of Moerbeke's translation (which was used extensively by Thomas Aquinas) only became available around 1270 but quickly replaced the Arabo-Latin text which in fact never made its way into the universities.¹²⁹ Considering its deficiencies and obscurity, some of it undoubtedly just a product of

¹²³ Kummerer (1989, p. 27f).

¹²⁴ Cf. Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 9) and Goulet (1989-, vol. 1, p. 468). Boggess (1971, p. 239-244, 246f) lists quotations from Ibn Rušd.

¹²⁵ Dahan (1998, p. 65).

¹²⁶ Steinschneider (1956, p. 45).

¹²⁷ Cf. Rosier-Catach (1998, p. 110f).

¹²⁸ Cf. Dahan (1998, p. 66).

¹²⁹ Rosier-Catach (1998, p. 97) and Kummerer (1989, p. 25).

the shortcomings of its Arabic source, it does not come as a surprise that Hermannus' translation was quickly abandoned.¹³⁰

More successful than the Latin translations of the Arabic *Rhetoric* were those of Ibn Rušd's Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric*. After getting a taste of the commentary in the form of passages quoted in Hermannus' translation of the *Rhetoric*, Latin scholars received the full text through a Hebrew translation by Todros Todrosi of Arles (fl. in the fourteenth century), finished in 1337, which served as the source of a Latin translation produced by Abraham of Balmes (d. 1523). It was frequently printed during the Renaissance.¹³¹ Ibn Rušd's Short Commentary was translated into Hebrew at least twice, once by Jacob ben Maḥir in the thirteenth century; also, there was a sixteenth-century Latin translation.¹³² With these texts and the subsequent Latin commentaries written on the *Rhetoric*, we leave the history of the Arabic translation and reception of Aristotelian rhetoric.

¹³⁰ Rosier-Catach (1998, p. 102).

¹³¹ Cf. Goulet (1989–, vol. 1, p. 471) and Aouad (2002, vol. 1, p. 9).

¹³² Harvey (1980, p. 616f).

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Having reached the end of the reception of the Arabic *Rhetoric* and the Islamic philosophical tradition by Latin Renaissance scholars, it is time to look back and assess our results. What do we now know of the Arabic *Rhetoric*? Did our approach avoid some of the problems described in the first chapter? We will confine ourselves to a general outline; details can be found in the respective chapters.

The division of the text into smaller units has uncovered a number of structural and rhetorical differences between the Greek and the Arabic versions of the *Rhetoric*. In some cases, they decisively influence the translator's understanding of a passage as well as his interpretation of other ideas and arguments in the Greek text. Especially longer and intricate stretches of argumentation cause the two texts to diverge: translation issues and misinterpretations reinforce each other and occasionally led to translations which have little in common with the Greek.

Structural discrepancies were, as we have seen, not only caused by problematic translations or technical issues such as damaged manuscripts. Preconceived notions played an important role in the translator's reading of the Greek text. Accordingly, structural modifications fall into two groups: those that have an immediate and obvious impact on a given passage and those which predispose the translator to a specific interpretation of terms or ideas while not necessarily leading to immediate modifications. The former are very often caused by syntactical and stylistic phenomena, e.g. the segmentation of the continuous text into sentences and clauses; Aristotle's often elliptical and terse style; or by technical difficulties such as misreadings and manuscript problems. The necessity to simplify intricate, longer syntactical structures in the process of translation also influenced the Arabic target text. Finally, parenthetical insertions in the Greek text proved to be a major stumbling block for the translator.

A more general factor impacting the translator's reading of the *Rhetoric* is his belief in the consistency and coherence of his Greek source.¹ His

¹ The translator's trust reflects the attitude of many antique commentators, cf. Hadot (1995, p. 73f).

attempt to reconcile the two lists of important aspects of speech he finds in Sections I.1² and II.1³ led to substantial structural divergences between the Greek and Arabic texts. Key terms such as *φαντασία* seem to have triggered interpretive schemata such as the contrast between *tawabbum* and *tabayyul* on the one hand and *handasah* on the other (cf. above p. 101).

In sum, the structural analysis suggests that not only the Greek text but also the translator's preconceptions affected his work. Often enough, the Aristotle's prose was simply beyond the translator's grasp. On occasion, he had to resort to extremely close imitations of the Greek text's word order in an attempt to squeeze some sense out of a passage. This happened frequently when extensive background knowledge about Greek literature, history and geography was required to understand the text. This knowledge was often not available to the translator. In combination with other issues, his unfamiliarity with much of the subject matter discussed in the *Rhetoric* caused substantial departures from the Greek text, e.g. in his puzzling argument about "acting" and "contestants" in Elements II.6.7f.⁴ Metaphorical expressions were often translated literally meaning of such phrases, resulting in statements which must have confused both the translator and his readers. On occasion, he resorted to paraphrase or outright deletion to cope with difficult passages.

Lack of background knowledge or the obscure subject matter demanded considerable creativity and flexibility. In one case, the translator transposed Aristotle's excursus on the use of the voice in speech into the field of music which he could expect his audience to be more familiar with than aspects of the Greek accent system.⁵

In spite of his troubles, he nevertheless proved himself comparably adept at handling complex syntactical constructions and creatively adapting Aristotle's demanding text for an Arabic-speaking audience. Where he failed, we have not only the translator's linguistic competence or the deficiencies of his sources to blame. He was equally often defeated by the difficult subject matter, the complicated structure and language of the text and the wide range of literary material it contains.

To cope with these challenges, he had to rely even more on the only formal markers of argumentative progression in the Greek text, particles. As we have seen, he displayed a remarkable subtlety and flexibility in

² On p. 67.

³ On p. 73.

⁴ On p. 104f.

⁵ Cf. Section II.3, p. 84.

uncovering the complex network of connectors and structural particles the Greek version is dotted with. Even so, some constructions eluded him: overlapping *μέν ... δέ*-constructions and clusters of particles as well as structures connecting distant textual elements marked the limits of his syntactic grasp.

In his handling of morphological features of the Greek language, specifically negative composites, the translator used the full range of instruments the Arabic language put at his disposal. In comparison to the other translations we have examined, the *Rhetoric* displays an average degree of terminological consistency; in terms of its treatment of negated terms and its coherence, the text exhibits numerous similarities with the translation of the *Placita philosophorum*.

Transcription is another field in which the *Rhetoric* shows a remarkable degree of consistency, notwithstanding some variation in the vocalic structure of many names. While features of the transcription system applied in different translations are ill suited to help us date a text, they at least reflect similarities in the approach taken by different translators and assists us in grouping translations. In comparison with the control group of texts, it becomes obvious that the translator of the *Rhetoric* applied a fully developed and consistent system of transliteration.

In terms of its terminology, the *Rhetoric* stands out, thanks to its high degree of variation in the translation of Greek technical terms. In spite of such apparent inconsistencies, the *Rhetoric* already contains the very range of expressions which became standardized in subsequent translations. This circumstance suggests once more that the text did not emerge in a terminological and methodological vacuum. Where we detect problems, e.g. in his frequent recourse to doublets, the explanation is often found in ambiguities in Aristotle's own terminology. Moreover, doublets do not necessarily point to a translator's lack of sophistication: they may also reflect his desire for terminological precision or illustrate his efforts in making the text more comprehensible for his audience.

Our analysis took only a small number of textual features and a small comparative sample of translations into account. On the basis of the findings outlined above, we are not in a position make a positive judgement about its translator(s). However, it provides us with enough material to place the text in close proximity to the Kindī-circle. The evidence clearly does not support an early, eighth century dating but suggests a translation date sometime in the first half of the ninth century. Whichever member or associate of the Kindī-circle took on this task, it shows the mark of a

comparatively inexperienced translator who had problems not only with the language of the *Rhetoric* but also with the cultural background required to understand it.

Conceptual issues loomed large in our historical survey of the Greek-Arabic translation movement, e.g. the subtle and not so subtle influence of preconceived notions about the nature of language and the translation process. Among them were the effects of what we have called the “philological outlook” such as a tendency to look at translations outside their historical and intellectual context. Also prominent was the problematic status of oral transmission, the transfer of information (terms, phrases, ideas) through alternative channels which preceded or took place alongside the systematic written translation of entire texts.

It hardly bears repeating that translation is a process that involves much more than the transfer of content from one medium into another. It depended (and depends) on many variables such as a translator’s education and experience, his cultural background, contemporary intellectual, religious and political circumstances, the distinctive features of source and target language, the character of the source text and the quality of the material (manuscripts etc.) available to the translator.

On the linguistic level, echoes of the translators’ struggle with complex Greek syntactic constructions and its complicated verbal system can be heard in each extant translation, especially the *Rhetoric*. In spite of such problems, the translators, sometimes together with their revisers, made masterly use of the abundant resources provided by Syriac and Arabic to produce readable and understandable texts.

In addition to linguistic issues, the translators had to bridge an entire millenium and to understand and convey ideas originating in a cultural context which could not have been further removed from their contemporary concerns. Their task was alleviated to a certain degree by the vestiges of Greek and Byzantine scholarly institutions still active at the time of the Islamic conquest, e.g. Syrian educational institutions. Scholars trained in such institutions transmitted the core of the texts which formed part of the late antique scholarly curriculum and translated a number of central works into Syriac. While some of this textual heritage made its way into the hands of the Arabic translators, readings and interpretations of these texts had undergone major changes. The effect of Neoplatonic thought on the commentary tradition is one factor which had a substantial impact on the translators’ understanding of their texts. Their concerns had moreover been shaped by their Christian faith. These and other factors

left their mark on the translations produced in the course of the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

The way the *Rhetoric* was understood by the translator and Islamic philosophers is a good example of the impact of interpretations inherited from translated literature. The classification of the *Rhetoric* as a logical treatise was a given and the text was translated and read in this light.

This and other aspects of a translator's work have the potential to change substantially the way we look at Greek-Arabic translations. The decisions translators took during their work were considerably more complex than to pick one of two basic approaches ("literal" or "free") and then to select suitable Arabic equivalents for a given Greek word or phrase. A great many of these decisions were involved in the production of a translation, some of them conscious, some taken unconsciously on the basis of their education, training and experience and a host of other factors guiding their judgement.

The complexity of this process calls for a reconstruction and appreciation of as many of these factors as possible in order to understand the resulting text as fully as the available information allows. It also calls for a rethinking of simplifying categories of translation such as mistranslation, translational competence etc., all of which depend on outdated concepts of language and translation. What we are beginning to learn is that the texts produced during the Greek-Arabic translation movement are *independent literary facts*: they are based on Greek and/or Syriac source texts but they often enough put forward arguments and make points which differ from what we would expect on the basis of our carefully collated and thoroughly annotated and researched Greek editions.

This is not to absolve the translator or scribe from their lapses. On the contrary, these often enough marred the process of translation and transmission—something the translators themselves were acutely aware of—and have to be pointed out as such. It is, however, to raise our awareness of the constraints under which translators were working and to increase our appreciation for the admirable results they produced under often adverse conditions.

Even more importantly, it is to emphasize the status of translations as *literary creations in their own right*. What we perceive as a fault and misunderstanding might and, in all probability, will have been read as a valid idea or argument by contemporary readers. It could have made its way into contemporary discussions and writings and developed a life of its own, independent of the translation it was derived from. Any aware-

ness of a translation's shortcomings which might have cautioned readers tends to be lost once these ideas have successfully "escaped" into the intellectual world. Thus, however inadequate we consider a translation, it was probably read and understood as a substantial contribution to specific literary traditions. This phenomenon is akin to the appearance and utilization of spurious texts or whole groups of texts and the influence they had on several disciplines and subjects of Islamic thought. Probably the most prominent example of such texts are pseudo-Aristotelian writings, chiefly the *Theology of Aristotle*, which had such a formative impact on Islamic philosophy and theology.⁶

The distinction between "literal" and "free" translations frequently mentioned above proved to be particularly persistent in the secondary literature. Its attractiveness for the Greek-Arabic translation movement is obvious: firstly, it offers two mutually exclusive categories to classify translations both qualitatively and, according to several commentators, chronologically and secondly, its authoritative status as a distinction originating inside Islamic discourse on translation is assured by the testimony of al-Ṣafadī. We have seen that, quite apart from the question of its applicability to the translations he so confidently writes about, his claims cannot be corroborated by any authoritative source contemporary to and familiar with the translation movement. It had come to a close three centuries before al-Ṣafadī's death.⁷

What, then, do we mean when we talk about "literal" translation? A synonym frequently used in the context of early Greek-Arabic translations is "word-for-word" or *verbum-e-verbo* translation: the linear substitution of a source language word with a target language word. This typology of translation has a long and venerable history.⁸ Considering the case of a "literal" translation between cognate languages such as French and Italian, it works reasonably well: the process of mechanical substitution of one French term for an Italian one will, owing to the high degree of syntactic similarity between the languages and semantic congruity between terms, lead to a text that is comprehensible, even though it probably would, in the eyes of a native speaker, not make for a very pleasant read or necessarily convey the same set of meanings.

⁶ Cf. Zimmermann (1986, 1994a), Adamson (2001) and Taylor (1986).

⁷ Similar sentiments have been expressed by Gutas (1998, p. 142).

⁸ Brock (1991, p. 143) records the role of the distinction in the classical and late Greco-Roman world. A short sketch of the history of the concept *translation* can be found in Gerzymisch-Arbogast (1994, p. 11ff). For a concise discussion of this and other basic categories of translation and translation studies, cf. Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 1–20).

Things are substantially more complicated between unrelated languages such as Greek and Arabic. Mechanical substitution fails not only on account of widely differing syntactic and stylistic standards. Also, the assumption of terminological congruity fails us most of the time. Thus, word-for-word transposition, were it possible, would result in texts which were not only unreadable but incomprehensible. Obviously, it does not make much sense to posit a clear-cut distinction between literal and free translations in the context of the Greek-Arabic translation movement. We can, however, still talk about relative degrees of literalness as long as we specify what feature of a source text has been reproduced "literally". The *Rhetoric* contains numerous examples of relatively close imitations of the source text's word order. We have already pointed out that this specific form of "literalness" coincides with passages which the translator apparently has not understood very well, if at all.

Without its counterpart, it does not make sense to talk about "free" translations as well: however early or flawed a translation from Greek to Syriac or Arabic may appear to us, it must by necessity be "free" to qualify as a translation in the first place, to relay *meaning* from one linguistic medium into another.

The resources which translators used in understanding and translating texts comprised not only obvious elements such as their Syriac Christian background and ability to draw on the collective experience embodied in the Greek-Syriac translation tradition or their training with other translators and their access to source texts and other Arabic translations. They lived in a cultural milieu that was suffused with ideas and concepts from a variety of sources.⁹ Diffusion relied only in part on written texts and was probably often achieved through oral communication. Ideas, theories, even certain terms were offered on the intellectual marketplace of the time and either accepted or discarded. Some of the material brought into circulation by these processes of diffusion found its way to the translators and influenced their reading of texts: it suggested interpretations, offered parallels and might even have provided some of their terminology. That is to say, attempts to reconstruct influences on a translator's output on the basis of written texts without acknowledging the potential impact of non-textual diffusion leads to numerous problems: it invites misleading

⁹ (Morony, 1984, p. 10) reminds us that Iraq in particular was a region which, on account of its cultural diversity, had a decisive influence on the shaping of early Islamic civilization: "Iraq was a place of cultural creativity and a center for cultural diffusion. Changes that were taking place there make the region unique during late antiquity but characteristic of Islamic civilization".

reconstructions of translation traditions, gives rise to flawed chronological classifications and it deprives us of an important factor which can help to explain terminological decisions and interpretations.

The translation of the *Rhetoric*, even though obviously an early product of the translation movement, already shows a surprising degree of consistency and standardization in areas such as transcription and terminology. Without evidence for a preceding *textual* tradition from which standards such as these could have been derived, oral diffusion of concepts and terms should not be excluded as a potential source for this kind of lexical and linguistic knowledge.

In addition to these more general considerations, some methodological issues associated with the study of Greek-Arabic translations have emerged in the course of this study.

The first one has, thanks to the healthy scepticism of more recent research, lost some of its urgency, i.e. the tendency to construct sweeping generalizations and elaborate historical reconstructions on the basis of a handful of sources. The most striking example for this tendency is the subject of the *bayt al-ḥikmah*, its history, structure and role in the translation movement. As tempting as it is to detect traces of something comparable to modern research institutions behind the scant references in our sources, the material is simply not trustworthy and substantial enough to allow any such inferences.

The second one is more complex and harder to resolve: the identification of “Syriacisms” and other evidence for alleged Syriac intermediaries, an important part of translation analysis ever since the beginnings of systematic research into the Greek-Arabic translation tradition. In some cases, the Syriac origins of an Arabic translation can be plausibly suggested on the basis of philological criteria and the evidence provided by marginal notes and/or information derived from secondary sources. In other cases, we do not have corroborating evidence outside the texts themselves. The interpretation of often ambiguous textual findings quickly becomes a guessing game: there are a number of different explanations for the existence of Syriacisms, e.g. a translator’s deficient command of Arabic; contaminations introduced by later scribes and commentators; misreadings and defects of manuscripts transmitted through the ages; or—finally—the sought-after Syriac source text used by a translator for the production of an Arabic version. Where corroboration from outside sources is not forthcoming, it is possible to cite any number of them to

explain the terminology and phraseology of a given text *without* having to posit a hypothetical Syriac source.

Nevertheless, the existence of a Syriac intermediary as the source for specific translations instead of a Greek text seems to be the default choice for some commentators. The *Rhetoric* is a good example for the interpretation of textual and secondary evidence influenced by the *expectation* of a Syriac intermediary. The mere reference to a Syriac translation in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* in combination with alleged Syriacisms in the text of the *Rhetoric* have led Lyons to assume as a matter of course rather than proof that the translation was produced on the basis of a Syriac text. This assumption has not been borne out by our text analysis. The marginal notes in the manuscript which refer to a Syriac version do not indicate more than the use of a Syriac version of uncertain date in the *collation process* of the extant manuscript. While it does not conclusively prove the central role of a Syriac source in the translation process, it at least corroborates the testimony of Ibn al-Nadīm regarding the existence of such a Syriac *Rhetoric* (or parts of it).

As with many a generalization we encounter in the secondary literature, the only possible course of action seems to be to present the sources as we have them, to evaluate their relevance and to interpret them with caution. In the end, agnosticism probably serves us better than speculation.

Are there, apart from thorough philological analyses and a comprehensive study of all available sources to establish the context of specific texts, any additional instruments which could help us to add to and improve our knowledge about Greek-Arabic translations? I think there are.

The study of the translation movement is one of the fields in which the conscientious application of philological methods has enabled us to make the most out of a relatively small collection of extant texts and scattered references in the bio-bibliographical literature. After careful philological analysis combined with a meticulous examination of secondary sources and the various translation fragments distributed over a vast amount of philosophical and non-philosophical literature, we are able to draw a surprisingly detailed picture of the history of the translation movement, its exponents and methods. Without the work of the authors whose writings we have explored in the first chapter, our understanding of the translation movement would still be in its infancy.

Chronologically parallel to the activities of these and other scholars in the field, translation as a more general phenomenon of linguistic and cultural exchange has been the focus first of linguistics and, since the early

1970s, the independent discipline of translation studies. Even though substantial amounts of research in this field have focused on modern translation between related languages, some of the concepts and analytical methods developed in translation studies can be fruitfully applied to the Greek-Arabic translation movement.

One important addition to our analytical equipment is the ability to analyse and compare textual units which fall outside the scope of philological analysis, i.e. units larger than a sentence. Since we are, in the context of Greek-Arabic translation, mostly dealing with sources which do not give us any graphical indications for such larger units, we have to divide the text according to semantic criteria. The model applied in this study to a sample from Book Three of the *Rhetoric* is one such approach. A text is split up into smaller units along lines drawn by the rhetorical purpose¹⁰ of a text and the steps an author or translator takes to achieve this purpose. The division of texts into rhetorical units allows us to retrace the rhetorical structure of a source text and a translation, compare them and identify such modifications as occurred in the process of translation. The resulting insight into the way a stretch of text is rhetorically organized and the way rhetorical purposes are given expression and arranged provides us with a wealth of comparative data: how does the translator render discrete arguments? Does he understand and accurately reproduce relations between arguments? Does he perceive standard figures of persuasion and successfully transfer their rhetorical import, if not their actual structure? Does he grasp the overall rhetorical purpose of a text and bring it out in his translation? As we have seen, these modifications can be serious enough to alter substantially the meaning of the Arabic version.¹¹

In addition to the ability to study higher-level textual units, text linguistics and translation studies could provide our field with a number of other helpful methodical tools. The division of texts as demonstrated in our sample is only a preliminary step: in a second analytical stage which we have not undertaken in this study, argumentative relations between textual units would be examined to identify patterns which in turn would lead to the classification of a text sample according to “text types”, e.g. “argumentation” or “exposition”. Without going into further detail, it

¹⁰ In this paragraph, the term “rhetorical” is used in its technical meaning in the field of translation studies. Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 243) define “rhetorical purpose” as “The overall intention of a text producer, as instantiated by the function of a text, e.g. to narrate, to counter-argue”. To employ a technical term used in speech-act theory, it denotes a text’s “illocutionary force” (Hatim, 1997, p. 118f).

¹¹ Cf. above p. 124.

is obvious that this approach would afford the study of the translation movement an additional classificatory matrix which could play a role in text comparisons. Moreover, it would help us to identify cross-cultural differences between text type structures and their influence in the process of translation between Greek, Syriac and Arabic. On a more general level, the introduction of methods developed in the context of text linguistics and translation studies would act as a powerful antidote against simplified conceptions of translation such as those we have encountered in the course of this study.

GLOSSARY

The following indices are based on the section of the *Rhetoric* we have analysed in some depth in the third chapter, i.e. the first half of Book Three which corresponds to 1403b6–1412a16 in Kassel's edition of the Greek text and 171/1–204/3 in Lyons' Arabic edition. Omissions, mistranslations and damaged sections of the manuscript have complicated things a bit; terms without any identifiable equivalent in the other version as well as obvious mistranslations have, with few exceptions, been excluded. Arabic nouns and participles with articles are reproduced with it in both indices.

For the highly frequent Greek terms *αὐτός*, *γίγνομαι*, *δεῖ*, *ἔχω*, *εἶρω*, *λέγω*, *ποιέω*, *χρᾶω* and *χρήσιμος*, the index contains only a representative selection of occurrences to avoid repetition. For a discussion of some of the central Greek philosophical terms and their terminological development across several Greek-Arabic translations, see p. 173–179.

GREEK-ARABIC

A

<i>ἀάω</i>	12a1 <i>ἄσαι</i>	203/11 مسحوا ¹
<i>ἀγαθός</i>	05a15, b23 τοῦ βελτίονος	177/18, 180/6 أفضل
	05b29 τὸ ἀγαθόν	180/13 الخير
	08a4 ἀγαθῶν	189/7 في الخيرات
	11b26 τὸν ἀγαθόν	202/22 الصالح
<i>ἀγαμένωσ</i>	08a18 ἀγαμένωσ	189/22 للاستدراج ²
<i>ἄγαν</i>	06b8 ἄγαν	183/7 جدّ
	06b11 ἄγαν	183/11 جدّاً
<i>ἀγανακτέω</i>	11a7f ἡγανάκτει	200/12 جعل يتعسرّ
	11a11f ἡγανάκτει	200/17 جعل يمتعضّ
<i>ἡ ἀγκύρα</i>	12a14 ἀγκύραν	204/2 الكلوب

¹ The translator misunderstood Aristotle's quotation.

² The translator misunderstood Aristotle's quotation.

ἀγνοέω	10b24 ἀγνοούμενά ἐστιν	199/16 لم يفهم
ἀγνώω	10b12 ἀγνωντες	199/3 مجهولة خفية
ἀγνωστος	08b27 ἀγνωστων	192/15 خفي مشكل
ὁ ἀγρός	10a28 ἀγρόν	198/5 الخراج
ἀργω	11a22 ἡσυχίαν ἀγειν	201/8 لزوم الصمت
ὁ ἀγών	03b32 τῶν ἀγῶνων	172/15 المنازعات والمزاوالات
	03b34 τοὺς ... ἀγῶνας	172/17 المنازعات
	09b35 τοὺς ... ἀγῶνας	196/16 وقائع
ἀγωνίζομαι	04a5f ἀγωνίζεσθαι	173/2 يتنازعوا
ἄδηλος	07b15 ἄδηλον	187/20 لا ندري
	07b17 ἄδηλον	187/23 ليس بينا
ἀδικέω	05a26 τὸν ἀδικήσαντα	178/10f ظلم ... من
	05a27 ἀδικῆσαι	178/11 ظلم
	12a13 τὸ ἀδικούμενον	204/1 المظلوم
ἡ ἀδολεσχία	06a34 τὴν ἀδολεσχίαν	182/14 بالهذو
ἀηδής	08b27 ἀηδές	192/15 ليس بلذّي
	09a31 ἀηδής	195/1 غير لذيد
οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι	11a9 τοὺς Ἀθηναίους	200/14 ³ الاثنيين ³
	11a11 Ἀθηναίων	200/16 الاثينيون
τὸ ἄθλον	03b32 τὰ ... ἄθλα	172/14 ذوو المنازعة
	04a17 ἄθλα	منازعين أو مجاهدين
		173/16f
Αἶγινα	11a14 τὴν Αἶγιναν	201/1 اجينة
τὸ αἶνιγμα	05b1 τῷ αἰνίγματι	179/4 الرمز
αἰρέω	08b25 αἰρεῖται	192/11 شرف
αἰσθάνομαι	07b21 τὸ ... αἰσθόμενος	188/5 أحسست
ἡ αἰσθησις	05b19 αἰσθήσει	179/23 الإحساس
Αἰσίων	11a25 Αἰσίων	201/11 اسيون
τὸ αἰσχος	05b8 αἰσχος	179/11 [القبح]
αἰσχρολογέω	05b10 αἰσχρολογεῖν	179/3 يتكلم بالقبيح
αἰσχρός	05b16 αἰσχρόν	179/20 القبيح
	05b22 [ἀπό] αἰσχροῦ	180/5 [من الأمور] الرديغة
	06b10 αἰσχροῦς	183/10 بشرة
	06b17 αἰσχρόν	183/16 ما أقبح
	06b18, 07b29, 30 αἰσχρόν	183/17, 188/14, قبيحا

³ Badawī: الاثنيين.

		15
	06b18 <i>αἰσχρόν</i>	183/18 قبيح
	08a17 <i>αἰσχερά</i>	189/21 [ب-]الشنة
	10a13 <i>αἰσχεῶς</i>	197/11 مفتضحين
<i>ἡ αἰσχύνη</i>	06a29 <i>τὴν ... αἰσχύνην</i>	182/8 عورة
<i>αἰσχύνομαι</i>	08a35 <i>αἰσχυνόμενος</i>	190/18 استحياء
	11b7 <i>αἰσχυνθέντες</i>	202/3 استحيى
<i>ἡ αἴτησις</i>	05a19 <i>αἰτήσεις</i>	178/1 مسألة
<i>ἡ αἰτία</i>	06a7 <i>αἰτία</i>	181/5 العلل
<i>ἡ αἰχμή</i>	12a1 <i>αἰχμή</i>	203/12 السيف
<i>ἄκαιρος</i>	06a11 <i>ἀκαίριος</i>	181/10 اللازميّات
<i>ἡ ἀκμή</i>	11b28 <i>τὴν ἀκμήν</i>	ذوات الزهرة أو البهجة 203/2
<i>ἀκολουθέω</i>	10a2 <i>τοὺς ἀκολουθήσαντας</i>	196/20 الذين تبعوا
<i>τὸ ἄκος</i>	08b1 <i>ἄκος</i>	191/2 الصحة والحقيقة
<i>ἀκούω</i>	06a27 <i>τῶν ἀκουόντων</i>	182/6 السامعين
	08a23, 35 <i>ὁ ἀκούων</i>	190/3, 18 السامع
<i>ἀκριβής</i>	08b31 <i>ἀκριβῶς</i>	193/1 محققة
<i>ἀκριβολογέομαι</i>	04a37 <i>ἀκριβολουγητέον</i>	ينبغي ... أن نتكلم 174/19f
<i>ὁ ἀκροατής</i>	04a8 <i>τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ</i>	173/6 السامع
	04a12, 09b19, 32 <i>τὸν ἀκροατὴν</i>	173/10, 195/21, السامع 196/13
	07a36 <i>οἱ ἀκροαταί</i>	186/19 الذين يسمعون
	08a25 <i>τοὺς ἀκροατάς</i>	190/5 السامعين
	08a33 <i>οἱ ἀκροαταί</i>	190/15 السامعين
	08b5 [<i>ὁ ἀκροατής</i>]	191/7 السامع
	08b14 <i>τοὺς ἀκροατάς</i>	191/17 السامع
<i>ἄληθής</i>	08a21 <i>ἀληθῶς</i>	190/1 يقول الحق
	08b3 <i>ἀληθές</i>	191/4 حق
<i>Ἀλκιδάμας</i>	06a1 <i>Ἀλκιδάμας</i>	181/2 القيداميس
	06a18 <i>τὰ Ἀλκιδάμαντος</i>	181/18 [القيداماس]
	06b11 <i>Ἀλκιδάμας</i>	183/11 القيدامس
<i>ἄλλος</i>	08a19 <i>τῶν ἄλλων</i>	189/23 سائر الآخر
	10b29 <i>τοῖς ἄλλοις</i>	199/23 الآخرون
<i>ἀλλότριος</i>	04b23f <i>αἱ ... ἀλλότρια</i>	176/5 غريبا

	10b32 ἀλλότριαν	199/25 غريبا أو مهملا
ἄλυρος	08a7 ἄλυρον	189/9 [معزفِيّة] لا
	08a9 ἄλυρον	189/12 غير معزفي
ἄμα	10b24 ἄμα	199/17 من ساعته
ἁμαρτάνω	05a27 ἁμαρτάνειν	178/11 أساء
	05a27 ἁμαρτάνοντα	178/11 أساء
τὸ ἁμαρτήμα	07b1 ἁμαρτήμα	187/1 الخطأ
ἡ ἁμαρτία	05a31 ἁμαρτία	178/16 خطأ
ὁ ἁμύντωρ	05b23 ὁ ... ἁμύντωρ	180/6 الذي أثار
ἁμύνω	05a21 ἁμύντον	178/4 غير أديب
ἁμφιβόλος	07a32 ἁμφιβόλοις	المشكّكات والمتصرّفات
		186/14
	07a37 ἁμφιβόλα	186/20 المشكّكات
ἀναβάλλω	11b14 ἀναβαλλόμεθα	202/11 نريثهم
ἡ ἀναβολή	09a25 αἰ ... ἀναβολαί	194/17 فيه تلبّثا
	09b25 ἀναβολῆ	196/6 [التلبّث]
	09b27 ἀναβολάς	196/8 تلبّثا
	09b29 ἀναβολή	196/10 التلبّث
	11b15 ἡ ἀναβολή	202/11 الريث
ἀναγκαῖος	04a3 ἀναγκαίου	172/24 يضطرّ
	04a9 ἀναγκαῖον	173/7 اضطراري
	07a25 τοῦ ἀναγκαίου	186/5 يضطرّ
ἡ ἀνάγκη	03b16 ἀνάγκη	171/15 يحتاج باضطرار
	09a24, b19 ἀνάγκη	194/15, 195/22 ينبغي
	10a25 ἀνάγκη	198/2 لا بدّ
	10b20 ἀνάγκη	199/11 من الاضطرار
ἀναιμος	06b9 ἀναιμα	183/9 ⁴ فيه دم
ἀναισχυντέω	12a3 τὸ ἀναισχυντεῖν	203/14 الاستحياء والوقاحة
	12a6 ὁ ἀναισχυντῶν	203/17 الذي لا يستحي
	12a6 τὸν ἀναισχυντούμενον	الذي لا يستحي منه
		203/17f
ἡ ἀναλογία	11a1 κατ' ἀναλογίαν	200/6 المعادلة أو التكافؤ
	11b3f, 12a4f κατὰ ἀναλο- γίαν	201/21, 203/16 المعادلة
ἀνάλογος	05a11 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	177/12 المضادّات

⁴ According to Lyons, the word was apparently misread as ἔναιμα.

	06b31 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	استواء المقادير واعتدالها 184/8
	07a14 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	185/II المعادلة والوزن
	08a8 ταῖς ἀνάλογον	189/II المعادلة
	08a11 ἀνάλογον	189/14 معتدلة
	08a12 τὸ ... ἀνάλογον	189/14 الاعتدال
	08b4 τοῖς ἀνάλογον	191/6 المتعادلة
Ἀναξανδρίδης	π1a18 Ἀναξανδρίδου	201/5 ⁵ انكساندريدوس
Ἀνδροτίων	06b27 Ἀνδροτίων	184/3 اندروطيون
ὁ ἀνήρ	05b1, 10a36 ἄνδρα	179/5, 198/13 رجلا
	05b2 ἀνέρι	179/5 رجلا
	08a28, 28, 09b28 ἀνήρ	190/9, 9, 196/9 الرجل
	10a36 ἄνδρα	198/13 رجلا
	11b26 ἄνδρα	202/22 الرجل
ἀνθρώπινος	06b12 ἀνθρωπίνου	183/12 الناس
ὁ ἀνθρωπος	06a35 οἱ ... ἀνθρωποι	182/16 الناس
	07b17 ἀνθρωποι	187/22 الرجل
	11b19f τῶν ἀνθρώπων	202/17 الناس
ἀνταποδίδωμι	07a15 ἀνταποδιδόναι	185/10 نجعل
	07a23 ἀνταποδιδόναι	186/3 يحاذي
ἢ ἀντίθεσις	10a22f ἀντίθεσις	197/20 الموضوعة بالخلاف
	10b1 ἀντίθεσιν	198/15 موضوعا بالخلاف
	10b3 ἀντιθέσεις	198/17 موضوعات بالخلاف
	10b36 ἀντιθέσεως	200/4 الوضع بالخلاف
	11b1 ἀντίθεσιν	201/19 الوضع بالخلاف
ἀντίκειμαι	09a12 ἀντικείμενα	194/3 يضاد أحدهما الآخر
	09b35 ἀντικειμένη	196/17 المخالفة
	10a6 ἀντίκειται	197/2 [مخالف]
	10a22 τῶν ἀντικειμένων	197/19 المتضادات
	10b29 ἀντικειμένως	199/22 بالخلاف
	10b30f ἀντίκειται	199/23 خلاف
ἢ ἀντίκρουσις	09b22 τὴν ἀντίκρουσιν	196/2 الصدمة المخالفة
Ἀντίμαχος	08a1f Ἀντιμάχου	189/4 انطيمماخوس
ἀντίμιμος	06a29f ἀντίμιμον	182/9 الاقتداء المنكوس
Ἀντισθένης	07a9 Ἀντισθένης	185/5 انطيسثانيس

⁵ Margoliouth, Sālim: انكساندرينوس.

ἀντισπάω	09b21 ἀντισπασθῆ	لكيما يسلموا من الألم 196/1
ἀντίστροφος	09a26f ταῖς ἀντιστρόφοις 09b27 τῶν ἀντιστρέφων	194/17 كرور 196/8 الكرور
ἀνωθεν	12a15 τῷ ἀνωθεν	204/3 إلى أسفل
ἀνώνυμος	05a36 τὰ ἀνώνυμα 05b2 ἀνώνυμον 06a35 ἀνώνυμον	179/2f التي لا أسماء لها غير ذي اسم 179/6 غير مسمّي 182/17
ἄξιος	05a30 κατ' ἄξιαν 10a32 ἄξιος 10a33 ἄξιος 11a31 ἄξιον	ذو قدر 178/15 تتأهل 198/9 مستو 198/10 ينبغي 201/17
ἄξιόω	10a8f ἠξιώθησαν	197/5 يبلغوا
τὸ ἀξίωμα	04b4 ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα	مجاورة للقدر الذي يستوجب 175/1f
ἀπαιδέυτος	04a27 τῶν ἀπαιδύτων	الذين لا أدب لهم 174/7
ἀπαιτέω	07a22 ἀπαιτεῖ	يقتضي 186/2
ἀπαρτάω	07a24 ἀπαρτᾶν	يباعد 186/4
ἀπειρος	08a4 ἀπειρον 08b28 τὸ ἀπειρον 09a31 τὸ ἀπειρον	غير ذي حدّ أو نهاية 189/7 الذي لا يتناهي 192/15 لا يتناهي 195/2
ἀπέραντος	08b26 ἀπέραντον 09b2 τῷ ἀπεράντῳ	لا يتناهي 192/13 الذي لا يتناهي 195/9
ἀπίθανος	06b14 ἀπίθανα 08b10 ἀπίθανον 08b22 ἀπίθανον	غير مقنع 183/14 مقنعة ⁶ 191/13 غير مقنع 192/8
ἀποδείκνυμι	03b12 τῷ ἀποδεῖχθαι 04a6 τοῦ ἀποδεῖχαι	171/10 التثبيت المقنع 173/4 التثبيت
ἀπόδειξις	09a28 ἀπόδειξις	194/14 تبين
ἀποδέχομαι	08b18 ἀποδέχονται	192/2 يقبل
ἀποδίδωμι	07a20 ἀν ἀποδιδῶ 07a25 ἀποδιδόναι 07b8 ἀποδιδόναι 07b19 ἀποδιδόναι	185/18 جاد 186/5 المحاذات 187/9 استعمال 188/2 يستعمل
ἀποκάμπτω	09b23 οἱ ... ἀποκάμπτων-	الذين [يميلون] 196/4

⁶ The *a privativum* has not been translated.

	τες	
ἀποκόπτω	09a19 ἀποκόπτεσθαι	194/9 تقطع
ἡ ἀπόλαυσις	10a6 ἀπόλαυσις	197/2 اللهو
ἀπολαύω	10a5 ἀπολαύσαι	197/2 اللهو
ἀπολείπω	09b22 ἀπολείπεσθαι	196/3 الترك أو المغارقة
	09b23f ἀπολείπουσι	196/5 [يتجاوزون]
ἀπόλλυμι	10a13 ἀπώλοντο	197/10 هلكوا
	11a2 ἀπολομένην	200/7 الذين هلكوا
ἡ ἀπρέπεια	06a33 τῆ ἀπρεπεία	182/12 غير ما يجمل
ἀπρεπής	04b15 ἀπρεπέστερον	175/14 أقلّ أو أنقص
	05a12 ἀπρεπέες	177/13 غير جميل
	06a13 τὰ ... ἀπρεπέστερα	181/12f لا تحسن البتّة
	06b6 ἀπρεπεῖς	183/4 ما ليس بجميل
	07b29 ἀπρεπέες	قبیحا أو غير جميل
		188/14f
ἄπων	04b11 τῶν ἀπόντων	175/11 البعيدات
ἀργός	10a29 ἀργόν	198/6 القراح
	10a36 ἀργόν	198/13 بطالا
ἡ ἀρετή	04b2 ἀρετή	174/23 فضيلة
	04b37 ἡ ἀρετή	176/19 فضيلة
	11a33 τῆ ἀρετῆ	201/18 فضيلتهم
ἄρης	07a17 ἄρεως	185/14 المریخ
ὁ ἀριθμός	08b28 ἀριθμῶ	192/16 عدد ونهاية
	09b5, 7 ἀριθμόν	195/10, 13 عددا
τὰ ἀριστεία	10a8 τῶν ἀριστείων	197/5 المراتب العظيمة
Ἄριστοφάνης	05b30 Ἄριστοφάνης	180/13 ⁷ ارسطوفانيس
ἡ ἀρμονία	03b31 ἀρμονία	172/14 التوفيق
	08b33 ἀρμονίας	193/4 التوصيل
ἀρμόττω	04b13 ἀρμόττει	175/12 يستولي ويوليقي
	05a11 ἀρμοττούσας	177/12 كان مشاكلا
	07a25, b19f, 09a12, b30	186/5, 188/3, يشاكل
	ἀρμόττει	196/11, 194/3
	08a26 ἡ ἀρμοττούσα	190/7f يلزم أو يشاكل
	08b7 ἀρμόττουςιν	191/9 يشاكل
	08b11 μάλιστα ἀρμόττει	191/15 أوفق

⁷ Badawī: ارسطوفانيس.

	08b19 ἤμεοσεν	192/3 يشاكل
ἄρρην	07b7 ἄρρυνα	187/8 [ذكرا]
ἄρρυνθμος	08b22 ἄρρυνθμων	غير ذي وزن ولا عدد 192/7
	08b26 τὸ ... ἄρρυνθμων	192/13 الاورا(ط)مون
	09a22 ἄρρυνθμων	194/12 السخيف
ὁ ἀρρτιασμός	07b3 τοῖς ἀρρτιασμοῖς	187/3 الأعداد
ἀρρτιος	07b3 ἀρρτια	187/3 الزوج
ἀρرخاῖος	09a26 ἀρرخαίων	194/17 القدماء
	09a27 ἡ ἀρرخαία	194/18 القديمة
ἡ ἀρرخή	07a19 ἀρرخή	185/16 بدو
	07a38 ἀρرخήν	187/1 رياسة
	07b16 τῇ ἀρرخῇ	187/21 فاتحة
	09a11 τῆς ἀρرخῆς	194/2 البدو
	09a12, 10a25 ἀρرخῆ	194/3f, 198/2 البدو
	09a36 ἀρرخήν	195/6 بدوه
	10a9 τὴν ἀρرخήν	197/6 سلطان
	10a26 ἀρرخή	198/3 المبادئ
	10a28 ἀρرخῆ	198/5 المبادئ
	10b2 αἰ ... ἀρرخαί	198/16 مبادئ
	10b9 ἀρرخή	198/23 البدو
Ἀρرخίδαμος	06b30 Ἀρرخίδαμον	184/7 ارخدامس
	06b31f Ἀρرخίδαμος	184/9 ⁸ ارخيداموس
Ἀρرخύτας	12a12 Ἀρرخύτας	203/25 ارخوطيس
ἀρرخω	04a19 ἤρرخαντο	173/20 ابتدؤوا
	09a10 ἀρرخόμενοι	194/1 ابتدؤوا
	09a13 ἀρرخει	194/4 بدوه
	09a16 ἀρرخουσι	194/6 يبتدئ
ἀσαφής	06a34 τὸ ἀσαφές	182/14 الغامض
	06b8 ἀσαφές	183/8 خفية
	07a30 ἀσαφές	186/10 ليس ... محققا
	07b21 ἀσαφῆ	188/5 خفياً
ἀσειβής	08a17 ἀσειβῆ	189/21 الإثم
ἀσημος	05a35 ἀσημοις	178/19 القبيحة
ἀστεῖος	10b7 τὰ ἀστεῖα	198/21 المقالة الحسان

⁸ Badawī: ارخداموس.

	10b16 <i>ἀστεῖον</i>	199/7 حسنا
	10b20 <i>ἀστεῖα</i>	199/II الحسان
	11b21 <i>τὰ ἀστεῖα</i>	202/18 اسطيون حسنا
<i>ἀσύνδετος</i>	07b39 <i>ἀσύνδετα</i>	189/2 [رباط] بلا
<i>ἀτελής</i>	09a18 <i>ἀτελής</i>	194/8 ليس كلاما
<i>ἀτεχνος</i>	04a16 <i>ἀτεχνότερον</i>	173/14f بزيادة غير صناعي
<i>ἀτιμος</i>	05a23 <i>ἀτιμον</i>	178/7 غير شريف
<i>ἀτυχέω</i>	10a7 <i>ἀτυχεῖν</i>	197/4 لا ينجحون
<i>αὐθάδης</i>	06b23 <i>αὐθαδες</i>	183/I الإقدام
<i>αὐξάνω</i>	11b12 <i>αὖξειν</i>	202/8 التكبير أو التعظيم
<i>αὐτοκάβδαλος</i>	08a12 <i>αὐτοκαβδάλωσ</i>	189/15 بالتكذيب
<i>ἀφαιρέω</i>	11a14 <i>ἀφελεῖν</i>	201/I يفردوا
<i>ἀφανίζω</i>	11a2f <i>ἠφανίσθαι</i>	200/7 فقدوا
<i>ἀφελής</i>	09b13 <i>ἀφελής</i>	195/16 غير منفرج
	09b16 <i>ἀφελή</i>	195/18 لا ينفرج
<i>ἄφετος</i>	11b29 <i>ἄφετον</i>	203/3 ينزل أو يسوّغ
<i>ἀφήμι</i>	04a33, 35 <i>ἀφείκασιν</i>	174/13, 16 تركوا
	09a7 <i>ἀφετέοι</i>	193/17 متروكة
<i>ἄφρων</i>	10a8 <i>τοὺς ἄφρονας</i>	197/4 الحمق
<i>ὁ Ἀχαιῖκός</i>	07b34 <i>Ἀχαιῖκούς</i>	188/20 [القيادلطوس]
<i>Ἀχιλλεύς</i>	06b21, 24 <i>τὸν Ἀχιλλέα</i>	183/21, 22 اخيلوس
<i>ἄχορδος</i>	08a6 <i>ἄχορδον</i>	189/9f لا زفنيّة ولا رقصيّة ⁹
<i>ἄψυχος</i>	11b10 <i>τὸ ἄψυχον</i>	202/5 الذي لا نفس له
	11b32 <i>τὰ ἄψυχα</i>	203/7 بلا نفسانيّات
	12a7 <i>τῶν ἄψύχων</i>	203/19 غير النفسانيّات

B

<i>οἱ Βαβυλώνιοι</i>	05b30 <i>τοῖς Βαβυλονίοις</i>	180/14 ¹⁰ [بابل] أهل
<i>βαδίζω</i>	05a1 <i>τὸ βαδίζειν</i>	177/2 يمشي
<i>βαρβαρος</i>	10a14 <i>ταῖς βαρβάρους</i>	197/II الأجنبيّين
<i>βαρύς</i>	03b30 <i>βαρεία</i>	172/12 الثقيلة
<i>ὁ βασιλεὺς</i>	06a23 <i>βασιλεῖς</i>	182/2 مشورات
<i>ὁ βίος</i>	06b12 <i>βίου</i>	183/12 معاش

⁹ Lyons suspects that the translation of the term is based on the reading *ἄχορον*.

¹⁰ Badawī: بابل.

	08a29 τῷ βίῳ	190/10 العالم
ἡ βλάβη	11b20 βλάβη	202/17 مضرة
βοάω	11a27 βοῆσαι	201/13 تصرخ
βοηθέω	11b5 βοηθήσοντας	202/1 ينتفع
ἡ βοήθημα	05a7 ἐξ ... βοηθημάτων	177/9 المنافع
οἱ Βοιωτοί	07a3 Βοιωτοῦς	184/18f أهل بيوطية
	07a4 τοῦς Βοιωτοῦς	184/20 أهل بيوطية
βούλομαι	05a15 βούλη	177/17 أردت
	09a32 βούλονται	195/2 يتشوق
	10a6 βουλομένοις	197/2 المشتاقين
βραχύκωλος	09b31 βραχύκωλοι	التي صغرت وصولها
		196/12
βραχύς	09a14 βραχεῖαι	194/5 مفصلة
	09a16 βραχεῖαι	194/6 منفصلة
	09a18 ἡ ... βραχεῖα	194/7 المتقلص
ὁ βωμός	12a13 βωμόν	203/25 المذبح

Γ

ἡ γαῖα	11b35 γαίη	203/11 الأرض
τὸ γάλα	06a12 γάλα	181/11 اللبن
ὁ γάμος	11a19 τὸν γάμον	201/6 المتزوجات
γελοῖος	04a35 γελοῖον	ما يستحق أن يضحك منه
		174/17
	06a33 τὸ γελοῖον	182/13 [...] يضحك منه
	06b6 τὸ γελοῖον	183/5 ما يضحك منه
τὸ γένος	05a15 γένει	177/18 الجنس
	05a17 τῷ ... γένει	177/21 الجنس
	07b1 τῶν γενῶν	187/2 أجناس
	07b7 τὰ γένη	187/8 أجناس
	08a27 γένει	190/8 جنس
	08a27 γένος	190/8 الجنس
	10b15 τοῦ γένους	199/6 الجنس
ὁ γέρον	05a14 γέροντι	177/16 الشيخ
	08a28 γέρων	190/9 الشيخ
γεωμετρέω	04a12 γεωμετρεῖν	173/10 [...] يهندس أو

	06b30 γεωμετρεῖν	184/7 المهندس
ἡ γῆ	05b36 τῆς ... γῆς	180/20 الأرض
γινώσκω	06b34 γινώσκοντι	182/15 يبصر
τὸ γῆρας	10b14 τὸ γῆρας	199/5 الشيخوخة
γίνομαι	05b34 γίνεται	180/18 تكون من ... أوجه
Γλαύκων ὁ Τῆϊος	03b26f Γλαύκων ὁ Τῆϊος	172/7 غلوقون
ἡ γλῶττα	04b28 γλῶτταις	176/10 اللغات
	06a7 γλῶτταις	181/6 الألسن واللغات
	06b2 αἱ ... γλῶτται	182/21 الألسن أو اللغات
	10b12 αἱ ... γλῶτται	199/3 اللغات
γνώριμος	10a20 γνωριμώτατα	197/17 أخرى أن تعرف
	10a21 μάλλον γνώριμα	197/18 بزيادة معلومة
ἡ γνώσις	10b14 γνώσιν	199/5 علم
	10b24 ἡ γνώσις	199/17 يكون معروفًا
Γοργίας	04a26 ἡ Γοργίου	174/6 جرجياس
	05b37, 08b20 Γοργίας	181/1, 192/5 جرجياس
	06b8f Γοργίας	183/9 ¹¹ جرجاس
	06b14f Γοργίου	183/14 جرجياس
ὁ γραφεύς	09a20 τὸν γραφέα	194/10 الكاتب
γράφω	04a18 γραφόμενοι	173/18 الذي يكتب
	07b11f τὸ γεγραμμένον	187/14 الكلام المكتوب
γυμνάζω	10b8 τοῦ γεγυμνασμένου	198/22 مدرّبا
γυμνικός	09b34f γυμνικούς	196/16 النجدة أو الخدق
ἡ γυνή	07b36 τῆς γυναικός	188/2 المرأة
	08a28 γυνή	190/9 المرأة
Δ		
δάκνω	06b28 δάκνειν	184/5 نهشت
	06b34 δάκνει	184/11 تؤذي
ὁ δαδούχος	05a20 δαδούχον	[...] أي صاحب الكلام
		178/3f
	05a22 δαδούχον	178/5f صاحب الصباح
τὸ δάπεδον	11b34 δαπεδόνδε	203/10 القاع العميق

¹¹ Badawī: جرجياس.

δείκνυμι	10b8 δείξαι	198/22	التثبيت
δεινός	10a35 δεινόν	198/13	شرّ
ἢ δεῖξις	08a26 ἢ ... δεῖξις	190/6	تستبين
δεσμός	06b27f τῶν δεσμῶν	184/4	وثاق
	06b29 ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν	184/6	من وثاقها
δέχομαι	07a2 δέχεται	184/18	يأكلون
δέω	11a23 δεδεμένον	201/8	قيده
ἄλλος	03b24, 04b35, 07a12 ἄλλον	172/5, 176/17,	معلوم
		185/8	
	05a37 ἄλλον	179/3	محققًا
	10b23 τὰ ... ἄλλα	199/14f	مكتشفة بينة
δηλός	04a10 τὸ δηλῶσαι	173/8	فيما بين
	07b31 δηλοῦν	188/16	يوضح
	08b36 δηλοῖ	195/8	يدلّ
	11b13 δηλοῖ	202/10	ينيران
ὁ δημιουργός	06a26 δημιουργός	182/6	الفاعل
Δημοκράτης	07a7 Δημοκράτης	185/2	ديموقراطيس
Δημόκριτος	09b26 Δημόκριτος	196/7	ثاوقريطس
ὁ δῆμος	06b35, 07a5 τὸν δῆμον	184/13, 185/1	العامة
	11a7f τὸν δῆμον	200/13	السوقة
Δημοσθένης	07a5 Δημοσθένης	185/1	ديموستانس
διαβαίνω	07a38 διαβάς	186/21	عبر
διαβάλλω	04b21 διαβάλλονται	176/1	يلقون
ἢ διαίρεσις	09b15 τῆ διαίρεσει	195/17	فصوله أو أقسامه
διαίrew	07b7 διήρει	187/8	قسّم
	09b14 διηρημένη	195/17	منفصل
	09b32f διηρημένη	196/14	مفصّلة
διαῖσω	12a1 διέσσυτο	203/12	ركّز
ὁ δαιτητής	12a13 δαιτητήν	203/25	النصب
διακόπτω	09b9 διακόπτεσθαι	195/15	يتقاطعان
διαλέγω	04a27 διαλέγεσθαι	174/7	ينطقون
	04b34 διαλέγονται	176/15	ينطقون
	07b9 διαλεχθεῖσα	187/10	قالت
	07b23, 24, 08a1 διαλεχθείς	188/7, 9, 189/3	تكلّمت
ἢ διάλεκτος	04a33 τὴν διάλεκτον	174/14	الكلام الجاري
	04b11 τὴν διάλεκτον	175/11	المنطق

	04b24f διαλέκτου	الكلام الجاري 176/6
διαλύω	11b13f διαλυόμεθα	نتراخي 202/10
ἡ διάνοια	04a19, 10b27 τὴν διάνοιαν	المعنى 173/19, 199/20
	09b8 τῇ διανοίᾳ	المعنى 195/14
	10b26 ἡ διάνοια	الفكر 199/18
ἡ διαπτυχή	07b35 διαπτυχαί	ذوات وجهين 188/21
διαριθμέω	10b9 διαριθμησώμεθα	نقول 198/23
διαστίζω	07b13 διαστίζαι	موضع التنقيب 187/17
	07b14 τὰ ... διαστίζαι	التنقيب 187/18
	07b18 διαστίζαι	يتصل 187/23
διαφέρειω	04a9f, 05b19 διαφέρει	يختلف 173/7, 180/1
	06b20 διαφέρει	يختلفان 183/20
	06b26 διαφέρουσαι	أقرب وأخص 184/2
	09a11 διαφέρειν	اختلاف 194/2
	10b18 διαφέρουσα	تختلف 199/8
	12a15 διαφέρει	مختلفان 204/3
ἡ διδασκαλία	04a9 διδασκαλία	تعليم 173/7
δίδωμι	05b24 ἐδίδου	يعطيها 180/8
	05b26 ἔδωκεν	غلب 180/10
	11a6 δοῦναι	يتنصل 200/11
	11b20 διδάσκειν	نغرم 202/16
δέχομαι	12a12 δέχουσι	نافعة 203/24
ὁ διθυραμβοποιός	06b1f τοῖς διθυραμβοποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمى [ديثورامبو] 182/19f
ὁ διθύραμβος	09a25 τοῖς διθυράμβοις	الذي يكون في وزن الدثرامبو 194/16
δίκαιος	04a4 τὸ ... δίκαιον	العدل 172/24
	04a5 δίκαιον ... αὐτοῖς	ينبغي لهم 173/2
	11b21 δικαία	عادلة 202/17
τὸ δικαστήριον	10a17 τῷ δικαστηρίῳ	مجلس الحكومة 197/14
Διονύσιος	05a32 Διονύσιος	ديانوسوس 178/17
ὁ διονυσόκολαξ	05a23 διονυσόκολακας	الجرابزة 178/7
Διόνυσος	07a16 Διονύσου	المشترى 185/13
διορίζω	10b6 διώρισται	حدّدنا ... وفصلناها 198/20

διορύττω	10a11f διορύζας	197/8 حفر
διπλός	04b29 διπλοῖς	176/11 المضاعفة
	05b35 διπλοῖς	180/19 المضعفة
	06a30f διπλοῦν	182/9 مضاعف
	06a36 τοῖς διπλοῖς	182/16 المضعفات
	06b1 διπλή	182/19 المضعفة
	08b10 διπλᾶ	191/14 المضاعفة
ἡ δίπλωσις	06a6 τὴν δίπλωσιν	181/4 مضاعفة
δοκέω	04a24 ἐδόκουν	174/4 يظنون
	04b19 δοκεῖν	175/18 يظن
	08b3, 23 δοκεῖ	191/4, 192/8 يظن
ἡ δόξα	04a2 δόξαν	172/21f الظنون أو الآراء
	04a25 τὴν ... δόξαν	174/4 المدح
ὁ δοῦλος	04b14 δοῦλος	175/15 غليم
δύναμαι	03b33 μείζον δύνανται	[كانوا] أقوى وأقدر
		172/15f
	04a7 δύνανται	173/4 يقدر
	04a17 τοῖς ... δυναμένοις	173/16 الذين يقدرون
	05a4 δύνανται	177/5 قادرة على
	11a22 δύνασθαι	201/8 يقدر
ἡ δύναμις	03b21 δύναμιν	172/1 قوّة
	05b18 τῆ δυνάμει	179/23 القوّة

E

τὸ ἔαρ	11a3 τὸ ἔαρ	200/8 الربيع
ἐγχειρέω	04a13 ἐγχειρήκασιν	173/12 يبدأ
τὸ ἔδαφος	06a5 τὸ ... ἔδαφος	181/3 قعر
ἐθέλω	05b25 οὐκ ἤθελε	180/9 كان كالمتكبر
ἔθω	04b24 τῆς εἰωθυίας	176/6 المتعود
	06a15 τὸ εἰωθός	181/15 الجاري المتعود
τὸ εἶδος	03b14 τὰ ... εἶδη	171/11 أنواعا
	04b27 εἶδη	176/9 أصناف
	05a3 εἶδη	177/4 أنواع
	08b1 τῶν εἰδῶν	191/2 الأنواع
	09a11 εἶδη	194/3 نوعان

εἰκάζω	ο6b3ο εἰκαζεν	184/7 [يشبهه]
	ο7a7, 1ο εἰκασε	185/2, 5 يشبهه
ἡ εἰκῶν	ο6b2ο, 24, 1οb17 ἡ εἰκῶν	183/2ο, 23, 199/7 المثال
	ο6b26f εἰκόνες	184/3 المثال
	ο7a11 εἰκόνας	185/7 المثل
	ο7a13 εἰκόνες	185/9 مثال
	ο7a13, 1οb16 αἰ εἰκόνες	185/9, 199/6 المثل
	11b7 τὴν εἰκόνα	2ο2/4 صنمه
	11b9 ἡ εἰκῶν	2ο2/5 الصنم
	12a7 ταῖς ... εἰκόσιν	2ο3/18 المثل
ἡ εἰρήνη	1οb3ο τὴν ... εἰρήνην	199/22 السلم
	1οb31 εἰρήνη	199/24 السلم
	11b15 ἡ ... εἰρήνη	2ο2/12 الصلح
εἶρω	ο9a24 εἶρομένην	194/15 مفصّلة أو مقطّعة
	ο9a27 εἶρομένη	194/18 المفصّلة
	ο9a29 εἶρομένην	194/21f المفصّل
	ο9a34 ἡ ... εἶρομένη	195/4 المفصّل
ἡ εἰρωνεία	ο8b2ο εἰρωνείας	192/5 مزاح أو هزل
ἡ ἐκκλησία	11a29f [ἐκκλησίας]	2ο1/15 التوافي جموعا
ἐκχέω	11a26 ἐξέχεαν	2ο1/12 ستهراق
ἐκλύω	ο9a33 ἐκλύονται	195/3 ينقطع
ἐλαχίσ	1οa32 ἐλαχίσταις	198/8 مقلاً
τὸ ἐλεγείον	ο5a33 τοῖς ἐλεγείοις	178/17 بيت الإيغاس ¹²
ἐλεεινός	ο8a19 ἐλεεινά	189/22 بالمضادّ
ὁ ἔλεος	ο4a15 τοῖς ἐλέοις	173/14 ذوات الهمّ
ἡ ἐλευθερία	11a34 τῆς ἐλευθερίας	2ο1/18 حرّية
ἐλεύθερος	11b29 [ἐλεύθερον]	منسوباً إلى الحرّية أو الكرم 2ο3/4
Ἑλλάς	11a5 τὴν Ἑλλάδα	2οο/1ο الاذة
	11a27, 33 τὴν Ἑλλάδα	2ο1/13, 17 الاذة
ἐλληνίζω	ο7a19 τὸ ἐλληνίζειν	185/16 تعلّم اليونانية
Ἑλλησποντος	1οa11 τὸν ... Ἑλλησποντον	197/7f ¹³ أليس بونطوس
ἡ ἐλπίς	1οa32 ἐλπίσιν	198/9 بالأمل
ἐμβάλλω	ο7b22 ἐμβάλλειν	188/6 تدخل

¹² Badawī: الاليجيس.

¹³ Badawī: emend. الالاسيونطوس.

ἔμμετρος	08b21 ἔμμετρον	192/7 ذي وزن ... و عدد
Ἐμπεδοκλῆς	07a35 Ἐμπεδοκλῆς	186/18 امفيدوقليس
ἔμφυχος	11b10 ἔμφυχον	202/5f ذي النفس
	12a2 ἔμφυχα	203/13 ذوي الأنفس
ἐναντίος	05a12 τὰ ἐναντία	177/13 المضادات
	05a17 τὰ ἐναντία	177/20 المتضادات
	05a25 τοῦναντίον	178/9 ضدّ ذلك
	07a32 τὰναντία	186/15 على الإضداد
	07b28 τὸ ἐναντίον	188/13 ضدّ ذلك
	07b36 τοῦναντίον	188/23 ضدّ ذلك
	09a15 ἐξ ἐναντίας	194/5f خلاف هذا
	09b2 τὸ ἐναντίως ἔχειν	195/8f على خلاف ما
	09b36 ἐναντίον	196/18 المضادة
	10a1 τοῖς ἐναντίοις	196/19 المضادة
	10a20 τὰναντία	197/17 المتضادات
ἐνδέχομαι	04b36 ἐνδέχεται	176/18 يقدر
ἢ ἐνέργεια	10b36 ἐνεργείας	200/4 الفعّال
	11b28, 33 ἐνεργείαν	203/1, 8 الفعّال
	11b28, 29 ἐνέργεια	203/2, 3 الفعّال
	11b30 ἐνέργεια	203/5 فعّال
	12a4 ἐνέργεια	203/15 فواعل
	12a9 ἢ ... ἐνέργεια	203/21 الفعل
ἐνεργέω	11b26, 12a3 ἐνεργοῦντα	202/21, 203/14 فواعل
ἐνθεος	08b19 ἐνθεον	192/4 بمنزلة النبا
ἐνθουσιάζω	08b14 ἐνθουσιάσαι	191/17 ينبيئ
	08b17 ἐνθουσιάζοντες	192/2 على جهة النبا
τὸ ἐνθύμημα	03b13 τὰ ἐνθυμήματα	171/II التفكيرات
	03b14, 10b22, 28 τῶν ἐνθυ- μημάτων	171/II, التفكيرات
	10b20 ἐνθυμήματα	199/13, 21
ὁ ἐνιαυτός	11a3 τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ	199/12 التفكيرات
ἐντεχνος	04a16 ἐντεχνον	200/8 من دور السنة
ἐξαιρέω	11a3f τις ... ἐξέλοι	173/15 صناعية
ἐξαλάττω	04b8 τὸ ... ἐξαλλάξαι	200/8 مخرجا أخرج
	04b31 ἐξαλάττει	175/7 التبديل والتغيير
	06a15 ἐξαλάττει	176/12 تبدل
		181/14 تبدل

ἑξάμετρος	04a34 τὰ ἑξάμετρα	174/16 الأوزان المسدّسة
ἑξαριθμέω	10b2f ἑξηριθμῆνται	198/16 أحصي
ἕξιμι	11a10 ἕξιναι	200/15 [نلتوي]
ἕξεστι	07a11 ἕξεστι	185/7 ينبغي
ἕξελέγχω	06a14 ἕξελέγχει	181/13 معلومات
ἦ ἕξις	08a27 ἕξει	190/8 [قنية]
	08a29 ἕξεις	190/10 الهمة
	08a30 καθ' ἅπασαν ἕξιν	في كل همة من الهمم
		190/11
	08a31 τῇ ἕξει	190/13 الهمة
ἕξιστημι	08b23 ἕξιστησιν	192/9 يراد به التعجب
ἕξωτέρω	09b23 ἕξωτέρω	196/4 إلى خارج
ἕοικα	04b23 ἕοικεν	176/5 يتشبه
	06b33 ἑοίκασι	184/11 عدل
	06b36 ἑοικε	184/15 يشبهون
	07a2 ἑοικέναι	184/17 يشبهون
	10a21 ἑοικε	197/18 مشبهة
ἐπαινετός	08a18 ἐπαινετά	189/22 بالمدائح
ὁ ἐπαινος	08b14 ἐπαίνους	191/18 [بذوات] المدح
ἐπεμβάλλω	06a34f ἐπεμβάλλη	تزيّد فيه أو نقص منه
		182/14f
ἐπιβουλεύω	04b20 ἐπιβουλεύοντα	176/2 الغشّ والمغبون
Ἐπίδαυρος	11a11 Ἐπίδαυρον	200/16 ¹⁴ افيداروس
ἐπίδηλος	06a20 ἐπίδηλοις	181/20 المعلوم
ἐπικεικός	05b5 ἐπικεικός	179/8 المجازة
	11a16 τῶν ἐπικεικῶν	201/2 الأحرار
ἐπιζεύγνυμι	07b35 ἐπιζεύγνυναι	188/21 تزواج
	10a1 ἐπέζευγται	196/18 التي ... مقرونة
ἦ ἐπίθεσις	05b22 τὰς ἐπιθέσεις	180/5 الموضوعات
ἐπίθετος	05a10 τὰ ἐπίθετα	177/11 الموضوعات
	05b21, 06a11, 07b31f τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	180/4, الموضوعات
		181/9, 188/18
	06a19 τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	181/19 الأسماء الموضوعة
	06a31 ἐπίθετον	182/10 موضوع
	08b11 τὰ ἐπίθετα	191/14 الموضوعة

¹⁴ Badawī: افيداروس.

ἡ ἐπιθυμία	06a30 τὴν ... ἐπιθυμίαν	182/9 الشهوة
ἡ ἐπιμέλεια	04a3 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν	172/24 العناية والجدّ
ἐπίπεδος	07b27f ἐπίπεδον	188/12 السطح
ἐπιπόλαιος	10b21 τὰ ἐπιπόλαια	التفكيرات السخيفة
	10b22 ἐπιπόλαια	199/14
	10b33 ἐπιπόλαιον	199/14 السخيفة
ἐπισκοτέω	06a35 τῷ ἐπισκοτεῖν	200/1 بالإهمال
ἐπιτάφιος	11a31 τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ	182/15 الغامض
τὸ ἐπιτείχισμα	06b11 ἐπιτείχισμα	201/16f ذكر المواراة
ἐπιφέρω	08a7 ἐπιφέρουσιν	183/11 سور
Ἐπίχαρμος	10b3f Ἐπίχαρμος	189/10 يأتيون
ἐπιχειρέω	03b21f ἐπιχειρεῖται	198/18 افبخارموس
ὁ ἐποποιός	06b2 τοῖς ἐποποιοῖς	172/2 تظهر
		الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي
		يسمى افي 182/21f
τὸ ἔργον	04b3 τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον	175/1 عمله
	07b14 ἔργον	187/19 موضع عمل
ἐρυθροδάκτυλος	05b21 ἐρυθροδάκτυλος	180/3 قرمذية الأصابع
ἐρχομαι	04a13 ἔλθη	173/11 وردت
	07b9 ἔλθοῦσα	187/10 جاءت
	07b10 οἱ ἐλθόντες	187/13 الذين جاؤوا
	10a18 ἐλθόντες	197/15 وردوا علينا
ἡ ἐσθής	05a14 ἐσθής	177/17 البزة
ἔσχατος	10a24 τὰ ἔσχατα	198/1 أواخر
ἐτερόφθαλμος	11a5 ἐτερόφθαλμον	200/10 ذات عين واحدة
εὐανάγνωστος	07b11 εὐανάγνωστον	187/14f ممّا تسهل قراءته
εὐανάπνευστος	09b14f εὐανάπνευστος	195/17 يسهل التنفس
Εὐβοια	11a9 Εὐβοιαν	200/15 أوبوا
εὐδοκιμέω	05b1 τῷ εὐδοκιμοῦντι	179/4 الذي ينجح
	07a12 εὐδοκιμῶσιν	185/7 ينجح
	08a7 εὐδοκιμεῖ	189/10f يظنّ ... حسنا
	10b7 τὰ εὐδοκιμοῦντα	198/21 المنجحات
	10b22, 27 εὐδοκιμεῖ	199/13, 21 ينجح
	11a1 εὐδοκιμοῦσι	200/5 تنجح
	12a7 εὐδοκιμούσαις	203/18 المنجحات
εὐήθης	04a24 εὐήθη	174/4 البسيطة والعامية

ἡ εὐθυνα	π1α6 εὐθύνας δοῦναι	200/11 يتنصّل من دينه
	π1α8 τὰς εὐθύνας ... δοῦναι	200/13 [يكشفوا عداّت] [
	π1β20 ἡ ... εὐθυνα	202/17 الغرم
	π1β20 εὐθύνας	202/17 الغرم
εὐκαιρος	08α36 τὸ ... εὐκαίρως	191/1 في الوقت الموافق
	08α36 μὴ εὐκαίρως	[في الوقت] غير الموافق
		191/1
εὐλαβέομαι	05β32 εὐλαβεῖσθαι	180/16 نتوقّي
	08α18 εὐλαβουμένου	189/21 التوقّي
	π1α28f εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἐκέλευε	201/14 أأحذر
εὐμαθής	09β1 εὐμαθής	195/8 يسير التعليم
	09β4 εὐμαθής	195/9f [التعلّم] يسير
εὐμνημόνευτος	09β4f εὐμνημόνευτος	195/10 يسهل حفظه
	09β6 εὐμνημονευτότατον	يحفظ أكثر من جميع
		195/11
Εὐξένος	06β30 Εὐξένω	184/7 ¹⁵ اوسخينوس
	06β31 ὁ Εὐξένος	184/9 ¹⁶ اوسخينوس
εὐοργος	08α12 περι εὐόρκων	ترتفع إلى قول العظام
		189/15
Εὐριπίδης	04β25 Εὐριπίδης	اوريفدس ¹⁷ 176/7
	05α29 Εὐριπίδου	اوريفدس ¹⁸ 178/13
εὐρυθμος	09α21, 23 εὐρυθμον	حسن النبرات, 194/11f, 12f
εὐστόχος	12α12 εὐστόχου	الذي يحسن أن يتوخّي
		الغرض 203/24f
εὐσύνθετος	06α36f εὐσύνθετος	يركّب 182/17
εὐσύνοπτος	09β1 εὐσύνοπτον	ذا قدر معتدل 195/7
εὐτελής	08α13 εὐτελῶν	الخصائص 189/16
	08α13 εὐτελεῖ	الدني 189/16
εὐφραίνω	04α5 εὐφραίνειν	التفريح 173/2
	07α10 εὐφραίνει	يسرّ 185/6
εὐφραστος	07β12 εὐφραστον	مما يسهل تفسيره 187/15

¹⁵ Badawī: emend. اوسخينوس.

¹⁶ Badawī: emend. اوسخينوس.

¹⁷ Badawī: اوريڤيدس.

¹⁸ Badawī: اوريڤيدس.

εὐφυής	10b8 τοῦ εὐφροῦς	198/22 ركيّنا
τὸ ἐφώδιον	11a12 τὰ ἐφώδια	200/18 عدّة
εὐχόμεαι	05a18 εὐχέσθαι	177/21 يتضرّع
	05a18 εὐχόμενον	177/21 يتضرّع
ἔχω	03b16 τὸ ἔχειν	171/14 يكون ... عتيّدا
	04a3 ἔχοντος	172/23 يجب لها
	05b13 ὁμοίως ἔχον	179/17 شبيهه
	07a33 μηθὲν ... ἔχωσι	186/15 أعوذهم
	08a2 ἐξ ἧν μὴ ἔχει	189/4f بما ليس أو بالمعدوم
	09a3 εἶχον	193/11 يقدرّون
	09a4 ἐχόμενος	193/15 يلزم أو يشاكل
	09b2 τὸ ἐναντίως ἔχειν	195/8f على خلاف ما

Z

ζάω	10a16 ζώντας	197/12 الأحياء
	10a34 ζώντα	198/11 في حياته
	12a9 ζώντα	203/21 أحياء
ζητέω	03b18 ἐζητήθη	171/17 قدّمنا النظر
	04a4 ζητεῖ	173/1 يفحص
	10b19 ζητεῖ	199/11 تتشوّق
	10b23 ζητήσαι	199/15 يفحص

H

ἡ ἡδονή	06a27 τῆς ... ἡδονῆς	182/6 اللذّة
ἡδύς	05a8 τὸ ἡδύ	177/9 اللذيذة
	05a32 ἡδείας ἢ σημεῖα	لم [تقرّ] بالتحقيق أو التفخيم
	09b1 ἡδεῖα	195/8 لذیذا
	09b1 ἡδεῖα	195/8 [لذیذا]
	10a19 ἡδεῖα	197/17 لذیذة
	10b10 ἡδύ	199/1 لذیذ
	10b12 ἡδιστα	199/3 لذیذ
	10b18 ἡττον ἡδύ	199/9 أقلّ لذاعة
ἡ ἡδυσμα	06a19 ἡδύσματι	181/19 اللذيذة

ἠθικός	08a11 ἠθική	189/14 خلقية
	08a25 ἠθική	190/6 الخلقيات
τὸ ἦθος	08a31 τὸ ἦθος	190/13 الخلقية
ἦκω	08b24 ἦξει	192/10 يأتي
ἡ ἡλικία	08a27 καθ' ἡλικίαν	190/8 مثل السنن
ἡμιόλιος	09a6 ὁ ἡμιόλιος	193/15f نصف الكل
ὁ ἡμίονος	05b25f εἰς ἡμιόνους	180/10 بالبعال
ἡ ἡπειρος	10a10 τῆς ἡπείρου	197/7 البر
Ἡράκλειτος	07b13f τὰ Ἡρακλείτου	187/18 ¹⁹ [اراقليطوس]
	07b14 τὰ ... Ἡρακλείτου	187/18 اراقليطس
Ἡρόδοτος	09a27f [Ἡροδότου]	194/18 ²⁰ اردطوس
ἡρώος	08b32 ὁ ... ἡρώος	193/3 الياراييقية
ἡ ἡσυχία	11a22 ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν	201/8 لزوم الصمت

⊖

ἡ θάλαττα	06a5, 10a9, 10f τῆς θαλάτ- της	181/3, 197/6, 7 البحر
θαυμαστός	04b11 θαυμασταί	175/11 العجيبة
Θεοδάμας	06b30 Θεοδάμας	184/6 ²¹ اوييموس
τὰ Θεοδέκτεια	10b2 τοῖς Θεοδεκτείοις	198/17 أقاويل ثاودقطوس
Θεόδωρος	04b22 Θεοδώρου	176/3 ثاودوروس
ὁ θεός	05a22 περὶ θεόν	178/6 ما يتنسك به لله
	11b12 ὁ θεός	202/9 الله
θερίζω	06b10 ἐθέρισας	183/10 حصدها
ὁ Θετταλός	08a29 Θετταλός	190/10 ²² الثتيل
[ὁ Θούριος]	09a28 Θουρίου	194/19 الثوري
θεωρέω	04b1 τεθεωρημένα	174/22 لنجعل القول
	04b27f τεθεώρηται	176/9 بين
	12a12 θεωρεῖν	203/24 معرفة
θῆλυς	07b8 θήλεα	187/9 [مؤنثا]
θνήσκω	06b33 τοὺς τεθνεώτας	184/10 الموتى
θορυβέω	08a25 θορυβοῦντες	190/5 يقلقونهم

¹⁹ Hermannus Alemannus transcribes "Abruclytis".

²⁰ Margoliouth, Sālim: اردطوس, Badawī: اردطوس.

²¹ Badawī: [ثيوداموس].

²² Om. Badawī.

Θρασύμαχος	04a14 Θρασύμαχος	173/12 ثرسوماخوس
	09a2 Θρασυμάχου	193/10 ثرسوماخوس
ἡ θυγάτηρ	05b27 θυγάτρεις	180/II بنات
	05b27f θυγατέρες	180/12 بنات
	11a18f τῶν θυγατέρων	201/5 العذارى
I		
ιαμβεῖος	06b3 [τοῖς ιαμβείοις]	الوزن الذي يسمّى يامبو
		183/2
	08b35 ιαμβεῖα	193/5f الوزن اليامبيقي
	09b9 τὰ ... ιαμβεῖα	اليامبو 195/15
ὁ ἱάμβος	08b33 ὁ ... ἱάμβος	اليامبيقيّة 193/4
ἴδιος	07a31 ἴδιος	الأهليّة الخاصّة 186/12
	10a14 ἴδια	في الخاصّ 197/11
	10b30 ἴδιοις	أقاربهم 199/23
τὸ ἴδος	06a20 ἰδρῶτα	العرق 181/20
	06a21 τὸν ὑγρὸν ἰδρῶτα	الرطوبة 182/1
Ἰδριεύς	06b27 Ἰδριέα	ايدران 184/4
ἰκετήριος	11b7 τὴν ἰκετηρίαν	الشفاعة 202/3
τὸ ἱματιδᾶριον	05b31 ἱματιδᾶριον	ثوبيا 180/15
τὸ ἱμάτιον	05b31 ἱματίου	الثوب 180/15
ὁ ἵππος	05b27 ἵππων	الخيل 180/II
τὰ Ἴσθμια	06a21 Ἴσθμια	استاموس ²³ 182/1
οἱ Ἴσθμῖοι	06a22 τῶν Ἴσθμίων	استامانة 182/1
Ἰσοκράτης	08b15 Ἰσοκράτης	ايسقراطيس 191/19
	11a30 Ἰσοκράτης	ايسقراطوس 201/15
ἴσος	04b4 ἴσως	بالحرى 175/2
	07b28 ἴσον	المتساوي 188/12
	10a24 ἴσα	متساوية 197/21f
ἴστημι	10a33 σταθῆναι	تقوم 198/10
	11b35 ἴσταντο	كانوا قيّاما 203/II
ἡ ἱστορία	09a28 ἱστορίας	الحديث 194/14
ἰσχυρός	06b35 ἰσχυρῶ	قوي 184/13
ἰσχύω	04a18f μείζον ἰσχύουσι	يكون أقوى 173/18f

²³ Badawī: استحمانيوس.

Ἰφικρέατης 05a20, 11a10, b2 Ἰφικρέατης 178/2, ايفيقراطيس
200/15, 201/19

Κ

καθίστημι 09b35 καταστησάντων 196/16 الذين ثبتوا
καθορέω 09a32 καθορέω 195/3 ينقضي
κακός 05a16 ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων 177/19 من الحقيرات
05b17 ἦττον 179/21 [بـ]الأقل
05b29 τὸ κακόν 180/13 الشرّ
06a17 κακόν 181/17 [باطلا]
06b10 κακῶς 183/10 بشرّ
08a5 κακῶν 189/7 الشرور
08b12 κακόν 191/16 شرّ
09b28 κακά 196/9 شرّاً
09b28 κακά 196/9 الشرّ
09b29 κακίστη 196/10 الشرّ
10a13 κακῶς 197/10 محمودين²⁴
10a34 κακῶς 198/12 أسواء الذكر
10a35 κακῶς 198/12 أسواء الكتب
κακουργέω 04b39 κακουργεῖ 177/1 الخيل والحديعة
καλέω 05a24, 26 καλοῦσι 178/7, 10 يسمون
11a24 ἐκάλει 201/9 يسمي
Καλλίας 05a20 Καλλίαν 178/2 قلياس
05a20f ὁ δὲ [sc. Καλλίας] 178/4²⁵ اقلياس
τὸ κάλλος 05b6 κάλλος 179/9 حسن
05b14 κάλλιον 179/18 أفضل
11b16 πολὺ κάλλιον 202/13f أفضل ... جداً
καλός 03b37 καλῶς 172/20 أجد
04a27 κάλλιστα 174/8 مزينا أو مزخرفا
05b6 καλῶν 179/9 الجميل
05b16 καλόν 179/20 الحسن
05b18 ἀπὸ καλῶν 179/22 من الحسن
06b12 καλόν 183/12 الجيدة

²⁴ Perhaps misread by the translator as *καλῶς*.

²⁵ Badawī: emend. قالياس.

κάμνω	09a33 κάμνουσι	195/4 يصهم
ὁ καμπτήρ	09a32 τοῖς καμπτήρσιν	195/3 الانعطاف
τὸ καπηλεῖον	11a24 τὰ καπηλεῖα	201/II حانوت المطعم
κατακορής	06a13 κατακορή	181/13 يقيدن
καταλείπω	10a4 κατέλιπον	197/1 تركوهم
καταλύω	07a38 καταλύσει	187/1 أتلّف
καταπλήττω	08a25 καταπλήττουσι	190/5 يعجبون
καταστρέφω	09a26 κατεστραμμένην 09a34f κατεστραμμένη	194/17 فيه ... كرورا 195/5 الكرور
καταφεύγω	12a13f καταφεύγει	204/I يلجأ
τὸ κάτοπτρον	06b13 κάτοπτρον	183/12 المرآة
κείρω	11a32 κείρασθαι	201/17 تجز شعرها
κελεύω	11a15 ἐκέλευε 11a28f εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἐκέλευε	201/I أمر 201/14 أحذر
ὁ κῆρυξ	08b24 τῶν κηρύκων	192/II المنادي
Κηφισόδοτος	11a5 Κηφισόδοτος 11a23 Κηφισόδοτος 11a28 Κηφισόδοτος	200/10 قيقيسادوطوس 201/9 قيقيسادوطوس 201/14 ²⁶ قيقيسادوطوس
κινδυνεύω	11b9 κινδυνεύοντος	أحدث ... هولاً وذعراً 202/4f
ὁ κίνδυνος	11b5 τοὺς κινδύνους 11b5 τοῖς κινδύνοις	202/1 الأهوال 202/2 الأهوال
κινέω	04a20 κινήσαι 12a8 κινούμενα	173/20 يتحرك 203/21 افترقوا
ἡ κίνησις	12a9 κίνησις	203/21 حركة
Κλεοφῶν	08a15f Κλεοφῶν	189/18 قلاوفون
κλέπτω	04b24 κλέπτεται 05a28 τὸν κλέψαντα 05a31 κέκλεπται 08b5 κέκλεπται	176/5 يغر ويخيل 178/II من سرق 178/15 على اللصوص 191/7 يخيل
κοινός	07b20 οὐ κοινόν 07b21, 08b1 κοινόν 10a15 κοινή 10b30 κοινήν	188/4 ليس عامّاً 188/5, 191/2 عامّ 197/12 العامّ 199/22 العامّ
κολλάω	05b2 κολλήσαντα	179/5 خلل

²⁶ Margoliouth, Sālim: قيقيسادوطوس.

κολοβός	09a18 κολοβόν	194/8 قصيرا
κορδακικός	08b36 κορδακικώτερος	193/8 [أكثر] مدحا أو ...
κοσμέω	04a34 ἐκόσμου	174/15 يزِينونه ويزخرفونه
	05a14f κοσμείν	177/17 تحسّن
ὁ κόσμος	08a14 κόσμος	189/17 بالتهيأة
ἡ κραυγή	05a33 κραυγήν	178/17f صرخة وكشيشا
ἡ κρεμάθρα	12a14 κρεμάθραν	204/2 المعلاق
κρίνω	03b11 οἱ κρίνοντες	171/8 الحكام
Κροῖσος	07a38 Κροῖσος	186/21 قريسوس ²⁷
ἡ κτήσις	10a6 κτήσει	197/3 [المال]
ὁ κύκλος	07a35 κύκλω	186/18 بالكرة
	07b27 κύκλον	188/12 الدائرة
τὸ κυνίδιον	06b27f τοῖς ... κυνίδιαις	184/4 الجراء
	06b33 τοῖς κυνίδιαις	184/11 الكلاب
κύριος	04b6 τὰ κύρια	175/4 المستولية
	04b31 τὸ ... κύριον	176/14 المستولية
	04b35 τοῖς κυρίαις	176/16 المستوليات
	05a2 κύρια	177/3 مستوليتان
	05b11f κυριώτερον	179/15 المستولي
	10b12f τὰ ... κύρια	199/3 المحققة
ὁ Κύων	11a24 ὁ Κύων	201/10 قيون
τὸ κῶλον	09b13f κῶλοις	195/16 الوصل
	09b17, 10a23 τὰ κῶλα	195/19, 197/21 الوصول
	09b32 κῶλοις	196/14 الوصول
	09b36 τῶ κῶλω	196/17 الوصل
	10a25 τὸ κῶλον	198/1f الوصول
ἡ καμφδιά	08a14 καμφδιά	189/17 [عقومودية]
ὁ καμφδοποιός	06b7 οἱ καμφδοποιοί	الذین يصنعون القوموديات
		183/6

Λ

ὁ λαῖας	11b34 λαῖας	203/9 الحجر
οἱ Λακεδαιμό-	11a4 Λακεδαιμονίων	200/9 ²⁸ اللقدماتون

²⁷ Margoliouth, Sālim: قولسوس.

²⁸ Badawī: اللقدماتون.

<i>νιοι</i>		
<i>ὁ Λάκων</i>	08a28 Λάκων	190/9 [القونى]
<i>λαμβάνω</i>	03b32f λαμβάνουσιν	172/14 يأخذون
	05a9 λαβεῖν	177/10 أخذه
	05a28 λαβεῖν	178/12 أخذ
	05b5 λαβεῖν	179/8 استعمال
	10a9 ἔλαβον	197/6 استولوا
	10a28 ἔλαβεν	198/6 أخذت
<i>λανθάνω</i>	04b36 λανθάνειν	176/18 يضلّل ويغلظ
	08b3 οὐ λανθάνει	191/5 لا يجهل
	08b8 λανθάνει	191/11 تغلط
	09a9 λανθάνειν	193/19 يجهل أو يغلط
<i>λέγω</i>	03b9, 13 εἴρηται	171/5, 10 قيل
	03b12 τοὺς λέγοντας	171/9 المتكلمين
	03b15 εἶπεῖν	171/13 القول
	04a7 εἴρηται	173/6 يكون بالمقالة
	04a24 λέγοντες	174/4 يتكلمون
	04a38 λέγομεν	174/20 نتكلم
	04a38f εἴρηται	174/21 أنبأنا
	04b7 εἴρηται	175/6 لخصنا
	04b39 λέγω	177/2 قولك
	05a17 λέγω	177/20 قائل
	06a30 λέγοντες	182/12 [هم] نطقوا
	06b14 τὰ εἰρημένα	183/14 السبب الذي قيل
	07a31 λέγειν	186/12 الكلام
	07a34 λέγουσι	186/17 القول
	07a37 λέγωσιν	186/20 نطقوا
	07b2 λέγουσιν	187/2 يتكلم
	08a12f λέγεται	189/15 قول
	08a31 λέγη	190/12 ينطق
	08b4 τὸν λέγοντα	191/5 المتكلم
	08b5 λέγω	191/7 أزعم
	10b7 λεκτέον	198/20f ينبغي أن نخبر
	11b31 λέγει	203/6 المقال
<i>λείπω</i>	09a1fλείπεται	193/9 [ناقص]
<i>ἢ λέξις</i>	03b8, 05b34 τὴν λέξιν	171/3, 180/19 الألفاظ

03b15 τῆς λέξεως	171/13 اللفظ والمقالة
03b20 τῆ λέξει	171/20 اللفظ أو المقالة
03b36, 04a16 τὴν λέξιν	172/19, الخيلة في المقالة
	173/15
04a8 τῆς λέξεως	المقالة 173/7
04a19, 24, b10, 09a24 τὴν λέξιν	173/19, 174/5, المقالة
04a26 λέξις	175/9, 194/15
04a28 ἐτέρᾳ ... λέξις	174/5 الألفاظ
04a37 λέξεως	174/9 لأصناف آخر
04b1 λέξεως	174/19 الألفاظ
04b33 τὴν ... λέξιν	174/23 المقال
06a16 τὴν λέξιν	176/13 الكلام
06b1 ἢ ... λέξις	181/15 لفظا
07a19, b26 τῆς λέξεως	182/19 الألفاظ
08a10 ἢ λέξις	185/15, 188/10 الألفاظ
08a17 λέξις	189/13 اللفظ أو المقالة
08a20 ἢ ... λέξις	189/20 المقالة
08b21, 29, 09a34, b32 τῆς λέξεως	189/23 الألفاظ
08b34 ἢ λέξις	192/7, 16, المقالة
09a22 τὴν λέξιν	195/5, 196/14
09a27 ἢ ... λέξις	193/5 التي يقول بها
09a35 λέξιν	194/11 مقال
09b5 ἢ ... λέξις	194/18 المقالة
09b14 λέξις	195/6 المقال
10a20 ἢ ... λέξις	195/11 المقال
10b20 λέξιν	195/16 مقال
10b28 τὴν λέξιν	197/16 المقالة
11a4 Λεπτίνης	199/12 المقالات
λεπτός	199/21 اللفظ والمقالة
λευκός	200/9 لفظنس
ὁ λέων	185/5 الطويل القضيف
ἡ λήμη	181/11 الأبيض
ὁ ληστής	183/21 أسد
	183/23 أسدا
	201/1 البحيرة
	178/9 اللصوص

Λικύμνιος	05b7 Λικύμνιος	179/10 ليقومانيوس
λιλαίομαι	12a1 λιλαίομενα	203/11 بالدهن ²⁹
λίαν	09b31 λίαν	196/12 جدًا جدًا
ὁ λιβανωτός	07a9 λιβανωτῶ	185/5 بالأرزة
ὁ λίθος	06b34 τοὺς λίθους	184/12 [الحجارة]
	12a5 ὁ λίθος	203/16 الحجر
ὁ λιμήν	07b34 λιμένας	188/20 المرسيات
ὁ λογογράφος	08a34 οἱ λογογράφοι	190/16f كتبة الكلام
ὁ λόγος	03b8 τοῦ λόγου	171/4 القول
	03b18, 04a4, 08b30 τὸν λόγον	171/16, 173/1, الكلام 192/18
	04a18 οἱ ... λόγοι	173/18 الكلام
	04a28 λόγου	174/9 الكلام
	04b2 ὁ λόγος	174/24 الكلمة
	04b5 λόγῳ	175/3 كلاما
	04b14, 07a17 ὁ λόγος	175/13, 185/15 الكلام
	04b26 ὁ λόγος	176/8 القول
	04b33, 06a4, 09a6, 11b2 τῶν λόγων	176/13, 181/3, الكلام 193/15, 201/20
	04b37 τοῦ ... λόγου	176/19 الكلام
	05a4f λόγοις	177/6 الكلام
	05a6 λόγῳ	177/8 القول
	05a7 ὁ λόγος	177/8 الكلام
	05b9 τὸ ... λόγον	179/12 الكلمة
	06a13, b24 λόγῳ	181/12, 183/23 الكلام
	06a36 ὁ λόγος	182/17 كلام
	07a13 λόγου	185/10 كلام
	07b17, 29 τοῦ λόγου	187/22, 188/14 الكلمة
	07b27 λόγῳ	188/11 الكلمة
	07b30 τῷ λόγῳ	188/15 في الصفة
	07b31 τὸν λόγον	188/16 الصفة
λοιδορέω	06b18 ἐλοιδορήσεν	183/19 عَنَفَهَا
τὸ λοιδορημά- τιον	05b32 λοιδορημάτιον	180/15 شتيمة
ἡ λοιδορία	05b32 λοιδορίας	180/15 الشتيمة

²⁹ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

Λυκολέων	11b6 Λυκολέων	202/3 لوقالون
Λυκόφρων	05b35 Λυκόφρων	180/19 لوقفرون
	06a7f Λυκόφρων	181/6 [القيدامس] ³⁰
	10a17 Λυκόφρονα	197/13 لوقافرون
λυπέω	04a5 λυπεῖν	173/2 التحزين
λύω	05b9 λύει	179/12 ينقّص
	06b29 λυθέντα	184/6 أطلقت

M

ἡ μάθησις	10b12 μάθησιν	199/2 التعليم
	10b14 μάθησιν	199/5 تعليم وعلم
	10b21 μάθησιν	199/12 تعليما
	10b26 μάθησις	199/19 تعليم
μαιμάω	12a2 μαιμῶσα	203/12 لم يرث لابن أمّه ³¹
μακρόκωλος	09b30 τοὺς μακροκώλους	196/II الوصول الطوال
μακρός	06a11 μακροῖς	181/10 المطوّلات
	09a13 ἡ μακρά	194/5 بحرف طويل
	09a16 ἡ ... μακρά	194/6 الطويل
	09a19 τῆ μακρᾶ	194/9 الطوال
	09b18 μακράς	195/20 طوالا
	09b22 τὰ ... μακρά	196/3 الطوال
	09b25 αἱ μακραὶ	196/6 طوالا
	09b29 ἡ ... μακρά	196/II الطوال
	10b18 μακροτέρως	199/9 أطول
μάλα	05a9, 10b13, 11a1 μάλιστα	177/10, 199/4, 200/5 بزيادة
	05a12f μάλιστα	177/14 أخرى أن
	05b12, 17, 07b3 μάλλον	179/15, 21, 187/3 بالأكثر
	05b12 ὠμοιωμένον μάλλον	179/15f يتشبهه جداً
	08b34 μάλιστα	193/6 أكثر من
	09a9 μάλιστα	193/19 بالحري
	09b7 μάλλον	195/12f لا سيّما ما كان

³⁰ Badawī: [القوفرون].

³¹ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

μαλακός	ο8β9 τὰ μαλακά	191/12 اللينات
	ο8β9 μαλακῶς	191/13 لين
μανθάνω	ιοβ10 τὸ ... μανθάνειν	199/1 التعليم
ὁ μάντις	ο7α37 τοῖς μάντεσιν	186/19 الذين يتكهنون
	ο7β2 οἱ μάντιες	187/2 الكاهن
μάχομαι	ο7α4f τοὺς ... μαχομένους	184/20 يفني ... بالحرب
μέγας	ο3β21 μεγίστην	172/1 عظيمة
	ο3β28 μεγάλη	172/10 الكبرى
	ο4α7 μέγα	173/5 على العظام
	ο4β31 τὸ μεῖζον	الذي هو أعظم أو أفخم
	ο5α30 μεῖζον	176/12f
	ο6α16 μεῖζον	178/14 أمر كبير
	ο6α20 μεῖζοσι	181/16 المتصلة والكثيرة
	ο7α38 μεγάλη	181/20 الكبار
	π1β20 μεγάλας	187/1 عظيمة
τὸ μέγεθος	ο3β31 μέγεθος	202/17 العظیم
	ο9α36 μέγεθος	172/13 العظم
Μελανιππίδης	ο9β27 Μελανιππίδην	195/7 ذا قدر
μελετάω	π1β11 μελετῶντες	196/8 ميلانيفي
	π1β12 τὸ ... μελετᾶν	202/7 يحتال
μέλλω	ο7β22 μέλλων	202/8 الوصف
	ο7β22, 24 ἔμελλον	188/6 أردت
	ιοβ35 μέλλοντα	188/7, 9 مزمعا
	π1β15 μέλλοντα	200/3 يتوقعن
τὸ μέλος	ο8α7 μέλος	202/11 واقعتان
	ο8α9 μέλος	189/9 اللحون
τὸ μέρος	ο3β7 τὰ μέρη	189/12 لحن
μέσος	ο3β29, 30 μέση	171/4 أجزاء
	ο7β28 τοῦ μέσου	172/11, 12 الوسطى
	π1β2f διὰ μέσων	188/13 الوسط
	π1β4 διὰ μέσου	201/20 وسط
μεταβαίνω	ο4α31 μετέβησαν	201/21 الوسط
μεταφέρω	ο5α36 μεταφέρειν	174/10 صنعوا
	ι2α10 μεταφέρειν	179/2 تغير
ἡ μεταφορά	ο4β32 μεταφορά	203/22 التغيير
		176/14 التغيرات

04b34 μεταφοραῖς	176/16 التغيير
05a3 μεταφορᾶς	177/5 التغييرات
05a5 αἱ μεταφοραὶ	177/6 التغييرات
05a9, 06b3 ἡ μεταφορὰ	177/10, 183/2 التغيير
05a10, b17 τὰς μεταφορᾶς	177/12, التغييرات 179/21
05a16 τὴν μεταφορὰν	177/18 التغييرات
05a24 μεταφορὰ	178/8 [تغيير]
05a34 ἡ μεταφορὰ	178/18 تغيير
05b4 μεταφορᾶς	179/8 التغييرات
05b5, 06b6, 26, 07a13 μεταφοραὶ	179/8, 183/4, التغييرات 184/2, 185/9
06b5, 08a8 ταῖς μεταφο- ραῖς	183/3, 189/11 التغيير
06b7 μεταφοραῖς	183/6 التغييرات
06b20, 11a27f, b6, 30 μεταφορὰ	183/20, 201/13, تغيير 202/2, 203/6
06b22 μεταφορὰ	بالتغيير والاختلاف 183/22f
06b25 αἱ μεταφοραὶ	184/2 التغيير
07a11 μεταφορᾶς	185/7 التغيير
07a12 μεταφοραὶ	185/8 التغيير
07a14 τὴν μεταφορὰν	185/10 التغيير
07b31, 11a26, b3, 8, 27 μεταφορὰ	188/17, 201/12, التغيير 20, 202/4, 22
10b13 ἡ ... μεταφορὰ	199/4 التغيير
10b17f μεταφορὰ	199/8 التغييرات
10b31f μεταφορὰν	199/24 تغيير
10b35, 11b21 μεταφορᾶς	200/4, 202/18 التغيير
10b36 τῶν ... μεταφορῶν	200/5 التغييرات
11b32, 12a5 τῆς μεταφορᾶς	203/7, 15 التغيير
09b7f μετρεῖται	195/13 يوزن
09a7f μετρικοί	193/17 من طريق الأوزان
05b33 τὸ μέτριον	180/17 القصد
06a16 τοῦ μετρίου	181/16 القصد
τὸ μέτρον	04a32, 08b34 τῶν μέτρων 174/12, 193/6 الأوزان

04b12 τῶν μέτρων	175/12 [الأوزان]
05a8 τῶν μέτρων	177/8 الموزون
06b36 τὰ μέτρα	184/14 أشعار
08b27 μέτρῳ	192/14 وزن
08b30, 09a8 μέτρον	192/18, 193/19 وزن
09b6 τὰ μέτρα	195/12 الكلام الموزون
09b20 τὸ μέτρον	196/1 باعتدال
ὁ μητραγύρτης 05a20 μητραγύρτην	ميطراغروس، أي فحل 178/3
05a21 μητραγύρτην	178/5 فحلا
ὁ μητροφόντης 05b22f ὁ μητροφόντης	180/5 [ميطروفنطيس]
μίγνυμι 04b21 τοὺς μεμιγμένους	176/3 المزوجة بالغش
μικρός 03b29 μικρᾶ	172/11 الصغرى
04a9 μικρόν	173/7 يسير
05a7 ἔλαττόνων	177/9 [الخسيسية]
05b29, 07b1 ἔλαττον	180/13, 187/2 يسير
06b20 μικρόν	183/20 قليلا
09b19 μικρόν	195/20 القصار
10b25 μικρόν	199/18 قليلا
11b11 μικρόν	202/7 الصغير
Μιλτιάδης 11a10 Μιλτιάδου	200/15 ميلτιάديس
μιμέομαι 04a35 μιμῆσθαι	174/16 الاقتداء
τὸ μίμημα 04a21 μιμήματα	173/21 ممثلة
μιμητικός 04a22 μιμητικώτατον	174/1 مشبها أو ممثلا
μιμνήσκω 07a23 μέμνηται	186/3 يذكر
ὁ μισθός 05b24 μισθόν	180/8 الأجرة
μνημονεύω 09b7 μνημονεύουσι	195/12 يحفظه
Μοιροκλῆς 11a15 Μοιροκλῆς	201/2 موراقليس
μονόκωλος 09b17 τὴν μονόκωλον	ذات الشعبة الواحدة 195/19
τὸ μόριον 04a22 τῶν μορίων	174/2 لجزء من الأجزاء
09b16 μόριον	195/18 الجزء
ἡ μοχθηρία 03b35 τὴν μοχθηρίαν	172/18 صعوبة
04a8 τὴν ... μοχθηρίαν	173/6 تخيب
ὁ μύλων 11a24 μύλωνας	201/10 بيت الطحان
μύουρος 09b18 μυσούρους	195/20 قصارا

N

ὁ ναύκληρος	ο6b35 ναυκλήρω	184/13 الملاح
ὁ ναύτης	ο7a6 τοῖς ... ναυτιῶσιν	185/2 الملاح
νέος	ο5a13 νέω	177/15 الغلام
ἡ νεότης	π1a2 τὴν νεότητα	200/7 الأحداث
νικάω	ο5b24f ὁ νικήσας	180/8 الذي غلب
ἡ νίκη	π1b19 νίκης	202/16 الغلبة أو النجاح
νομίζω	ι0b30 νομίζόντων	199/23 بشرّ
ὁ νόμος	ο6a22 νόμους	182/2 السنن
	ο6a23 τοὺς ... νόμους	182/2 السنن
	ο6b12 τῶν νόμων	183/11 السنن
	ι0a12 νόμω	197/10 سنن
ἡ νόσος	π1a22f πεντεσுρίγγω νόσω	201/8 سورنغو نوس
ὁ νοῦς	π1b12 τὸν νοῦν	202/9 العقل

Ξ

ξενικός	ο4b36 ξενικόν	176/18 غريبا
	ο5a8 τὸ ξενικόν	177/9 الغربية
	ο6a15 ξενικήν	181/15 غريبا
ὁ ξένος	ο4b9 τοὺς ξένους	175/10 الغرياء
	ο4b11 ξένην	175/11 غريبا
	ο8b11 τὰ ξένα	191/14 الغربية
Ξέρξης	ο6a8 Ξέρξην	181/7 ³² اخسيس

Ο

ὁ ὄγκος	ο7b26 ὄγκον	188/10 معونة
ἡ ὁδός	π1b2 ἡ ... ὁδός	201/20 طريق
ἡ Ὀδύσεια	ο6b12 τὴν Ὀδύσειαν	183/12 الكتابة الذي المال
οἶδα	ο8a34 οἶδεν	190/17 يعرف
	ο8a34 ἴσασιν	190/17 يعرفون
	ι0b13 ἴσμεν	199/3f معروفة ظاهرة

³² Badawī: اخيس.

οἰκεῖος	ο4b32 τὸ οἰκεῖον	176/14 الأهلِيَّة
	ο4b35 τοῖς οἰκεῖοις	176/16 الأهلِيَّات
	ο5b12 οἰκειότερον	179/16 جدّ أهلي
	ο8a31 οἰκεῖα	190/12 الأهلِيَّة
	12a10 οἰκείων	203/23 أهلِيَّات
ὁ οἰκέτης	10a14 οἰκέταις	197/12 عبيدا
οἴκοι	10a3 οἴκοι	196/21 في منازلهم
	10a3 οἴκοι	197/1 في مساكنهم
	10a18 οἴκοι	197/14 في بيوتكم
ὁ οἶνος	ο4b21 τοὺς οἶνους	176/2 الأشربة
οἶομαι	ο4a27 οἶονται	174/6 يظنّ
	10a30 ὡθήθης	198/7 ظننت
οἶστος	11b35 οἶστος	203/10 رمحه
ὀλίγος	ο5b24 ὀλίγον	180/8 القليلة
	ο7b10 ὀλίγα	187/12 القليل
ὅλος	ο7b1 τὸ ὅλος	187/1 في الكلِّيَّة
	ο7b11 ὅλος	187/14 الجملة
ὁ Ὀλυνθιακός	11a6f τὸν Ὀλυνθιακόν	200/12 ³³ بالونثوس
Ὀμηρος	11b31 Ὀμηρος	203/7 اوميروس
τὸ ὄμμα	ο5b13, 10b33f, 11a28, b4, 6, 8f, 24, 25 πρὸ ὀμμάτων	179/17, نصب العين 200/2, 201/14, 21f, 202/2, 5, 19, 20
ὁμογενής	ο7a15 τῶν ὁμογενῶν	185/12 متساوية في الجنس
ὁμοειδής	ο5a36 τῶν ὁμοειδῶν	179/2 المتقاربات في الصور
ὁμοιος	ο4a32 ὁμοιότατον	174/12 شبيها
	ο6b27 ὁμοιος	184/4 يشبه
	ο6b35, ο7a6 ὁμοιος	184/13, 185/2 يشبهون
	ο7a3 ὁμοιοι	184/19 يشبهون
	ο7b6 ὁμοια	187/6 متشابهة
	ο8a19, ο9b24 ὁμοίως	189/23, 196/5 كذلك
	ο8b18 ὁμοίως	192/3 شبيهه
	ο8b24 τῶ ὁμοίῳ	المشاكل أو [المشابهة] 192/9f
	ο9a26 ὁμοιαν	194/17 يشبه
	ο9b26 ὁμοιον	196/6 [أيضا] بهذه الحال

³³ Badawī: النثوس.

	10a24 ὅμοια	198/1 متساوية
	12a11 τὸ ὅμοιον	203/24 التشبيه
ὁμοιόω	05b12 ὁμοιωμένον μάλλον	179/15f يتشبه جداً
ὁμοιοτέλευτος	10b1 ὁμοιοτέλευτον	198/15 موافقا في النهاية
ὁμολογέω	08a34 ὁμολογεῖ	190/18 يقرّ
ὁμώνυμος	04b38 ὁμωνυμίαι	176/19 المتَّفقات الأسماء
ὀνήμι	10a1 ὠνησαν	196/19 [نفعوهم]
τὸ ὄνομα	04a21, 08a30f, b6, 10, 10b11	173/21, 190/12, الأسماء
	τὰ ... ὀνόματα	191/8, 14, 199/1
	04a33 τῶν ὀνομάτων	174/14 الأسماء أو الألفاظ
	04b5, 27, 37f, 07b7, 10b11	175/3, 176/9, الأسماء
	τῶν ὀνομάτων	20, 187/8, 199/2
	04b7 ὀνόματα	175/6 الأسماء
	04b26 ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων	176/8 الأسماء
	04b29 ὀνόμασι	176/10 الأسماء
	05b6f, 07b27 ὀνόματος	179/10, 188/12 الاسم
	05b35, 07a31, 10b31 τοῖς ...	180/19, 186/12, الأسماء
	ὀνόμασιν	199/24
	07b29, 10a34 ὄνομα	188/14, 198/10 الاسم
	07b30, 10a28 τὸ ὄνομα	188/16, 198/4 الاسم
	07b31 τῷ ὀνόματι	188/16 الاسم
	08a6 τὰ ὀνόματα	189/9 بأسماء
	08a14 τῷ ... ὀνόματι	189/16 الاسم
	10a26 τὰ ὀνόματα	198/3 [بالأسماء]
	10a27 ὀνόματος	198/4 الاسم
ὀνομάζω	05a36f ὀνομασμένως	179/3 التسمية
	05b37 ὀνόμαζε	181/1 يسمّي
	07b10 ὀνομάζειν	187/12 قيل
	11a16 ὀνομάσας	201/2 [سمّي]
ὁ ὄνος	05b27 τῶν ὄνων	180/12 الحمير
ὄξύς	03b29 ὄξεια	172/12 الحادة
ὄραω	05b1 εἶδον	179/5 رأى
	07b20 τὸ ... ἰδῶν	188/4 أبصرت
	10b34 ὄραῖν	200/2 ننظر
ἡ ὄρη	08b15 ὄρη	191/18 الغضب

ὀργίζω	08a16 ὀργιζομένου	189/21 للغضب
	08b12 ὀργιζομένω	191/16 الغضبان
ὀ ρεῦς	05b25 τοῖς ὀρεῦσιν	180/9 البغال
ὀρθός	04a3 ὀρθῶς	172/23 مستقيماً أو يعدل
	07b10 ὀρθῶς	187/12 بالمشقة
ὀρίζω	04b1 ὠρίσθω	174/23 نحدّ
ὀρμάω	09b20 ὀρμῶν	195/22 الحجاز إلى المرسى
ὀ ρενίς	06b17 ὀρنيθι	183/16 الطائر
ὀ ρεος	09b20f ἔχει ... ὄρον	195/22 تكون كاملة
ὀυρανομήκης	08b13 οὐρανόμεχες	الطويل الذهب نحو السماء 191/16
ὀ οὐρανός	05b35f τὸν ... οὐρανόν	180/19 السماء
ὀ χέω	07b9 ὠχετο	187/11 سلف
ἢ ὄψις	05b19 τῇ ὄψει	179/23 المنظر

Π

παθητικός	08a10 παθητικὴ	189/14 مضلّلة
	08a24 παθητικῶς	190/3 بالآليات
	08b12 παθητικῶς	191/15 بالآلية
τὸ πάθος	03b28 πάθος	172/10 الآلام
	05b2 τὸ πάθος	179/5 الألم
ὀ παιάν	09a3, 6 ὀ παιάν	193/13, 16 الفاون
	09a8 ὀ ... παιάν	193/18 فاون
	09a10 τῷ ... παιᾶνι	194/1 فاون
	09a11 παιᾶνος	194/3 الفاون
τὸ παιδίον	07a2 τοῖς παιδίοις	184/17 الولدان
	08b25 τὰ παιδία	192/11 الصبيان
	10a30 παιδίον	198/8 طفل
ὀ παις	08a28 παῖς	190/9 الغلام
παιδεύω	08a32 πεπαιδευμένος	190/15 [ذو أدب]
ὀ πανηγυρικός	08b15 τῷ πανηγυρικῷ	191/19 الأخریات
ἢ πανήγυρις	06a22 τὴν ... πανήγυριν	182/1 عيد
	09b34 τὰς πανηγύρεις	196/16 العيد
	11a31 ταῖς πανηγύρεσιν	201/16 الأعياد
ἢ παραγραφή	09a20f τὴν παραγραφὴν	194/10 الكتابة

παραιρέω	παι2 παρηρηῆσθαι	200/18 دعوا
παρακαλέω	πια8 παρακαλῶν	200/14 جعل يطلب
	πιβ5 παρακαλεῖν	202/1 يعزي
παράλιος	πια11 τὴν παραλίαν	200/17 ساحل البحر
παραλογίζομαι	ο8α20 παραλογίζεται	189/24 تضلّ وتغلط
παρατηρέω	ο5β33 παρατηρεῖν	180/16 نتوخّي
παρέρχομαι	ο3β23 παρήλθεν	172/3 فعلوا
ἡ παρθένος	ο6β18 παρθένω	183/18 للعدراء
πάρισιος	ιοβ1 παρίσον	198/15 مساويا
ἡ παρίσωσις	ιοα23 παρίσωσις	197/21 التدافع
ἡ παρομοίωσις	ιοα24 παρομοίωσις	198/1 المضارعة
πάσχω	ο3β11 πεπονθέναι	171/8 يعتري ... من الألم
	ο4β10 πάσχουσι	175/9 يعتريهم
	ο7α36 πάσχουσιν	186/19 يغلطون
	ο8α32f πάσχουσι ... τι	[يعرض] ... شيء من الألم
		190/15f
	ιοα35 ἔπαθες	198/13 نالك
	ιοβ33 ποιεῖ πάσχειν	200/1 يصير إلى الألم
ὁ πατήρ	ο5β23 πατρός	180/7 من أبيه
παύω	ο9β21 παυσαμένον	196/1 الألم
πεζεύω	ιοα10 πεζεῦσαι	197/7 السير رجّالة
Πειθόλαος	ιοα17 Πειθόλαον	197/13 فيثولاوس
	πια13 Πειθόλαος	200/18 فيثولاوس
πείθω	ο3β12 πείθονται	171/9 تثبت
Πειραιεύς	πια14, 15 τοῦ Πειραιέως	200/20, 201/1 فيرا
πελώριος	ο8β13 πελώριον	191/16 شجاعا
πεντεσυρίγγος	πια22f πεντεσυρίγγω νόσω	201/8 سورنغو نوس
περαίνω	ο8β27 πεπεράνθαι	192/14 متناها
	ο8β28 περαίνεται	192/16 يتناهي
τὸ πέρας	ο9α33 τὸ πέρας	195/4 النهاية
περίεργος	ο4α7 περίεργα	173/4 من ذوات المؤاربة
περιέχω	ο7α31 τοῖς περιέχουσιν	186/13 الجمعية المحيطة
Περικλῆς	ο7α1 ἡ Περικλέους	184/16 [فري]ـقليس ³⁴
	πια1 Περικλῆς	200/6 فرقليس
	πια14 Περικλῆς	201/1 فيرقليس

³⁴ Badawī: بيريقليس.

ἡ περίοδος	09a35 ἡ ἐν περιόδοις	195/5 التعاطف
	09a35 περίοδον	195/6 المتعاطف
	09b5 ἐν περιόδοις	195/11 المتعاطف
	09b8 τὴν περίοδον	195/14 العطف
	09b15 [ἡ περίοδος]	195/18 التعاطف
	09b18 τὰς περιόδους	195/20 الأعطاف
	09b25 αἱ περίοδοι	196/5 الأعطاف
	09b31 περίοδος	196/13 متعاطفة
	10b2 τῶν περιόδων	198/16 الأعطاف
περισσός	07b3 περισσά	187/3 الفرد
πέτομαι	06b15 πετομένη	183/15 تطير
	11b34 ἔπτατε	203/10 هزّ
πιθανός	03b20 τὸ πιθανόν	171/19 الإقناع
	04b20 πιθανόν	176/1 مقنع
	08a19f πιθανοί	189/24 مقنعة
πίπτω	11b35 ἐπιπτέσθαι	203/10 رمى
ἡ πίστις	03b7 αἱ πίστεις	171/3 التصديقات
	03b9 τῶν πίστεων	171/5 التصديقات
πλάττω	04b19 πεπλασμένως	175/19 بالفيوئية
	08b22 πεπλάσθαι	192/8 مختلق
Πλάτων	06b32 τῆ Πλάτωνος	184/9 فلاطون
πλέω	10a10 πλεῦσαι	197/6f ركوب السفن
τὸ πλοῖον	07a6 τοῖς πλοίοις	185/2 السفن
ποιέω	04a13 ποιήσει	173/12 ستفعل
	04a29 ποιούντες	174/10 صنعوا
	04a35 ποιοῦντες	174/15 الذين يصنعون
	04b3 ποιήσει	174/24 يستعمل
	04b35 εὖ ποιῆ	176/17 أجاد فعل
	05b22 ποιῆσθαι	180/4 يضع
	07b32 πολλὰ ποιεῖν	188/18 الإكثار
	08a15 ποιεῖ	189/17 مقالة
	08b3 ὁ ποιεῖ τὸν λέγοντα	191/5 المتكلم
	09b19, 23 ποιεῖ	195/20, 196/3 تصير
	10b33 ποιεῖ πάσχειν	200/1 يصير إلى الألم
τὸ ποίημα	06a31 ποίημα	مستوخما مستشعنا
		182/10

	ο8β31 <i>ποίημα</i>	193/1	فيوئطي
ἡ <i>ποίησις</i>	ο4α28, β28 <i>ποίησεως</i>	174/9, 176/9	الفيوئطيّة
	ο5α4 <i>ποίησει</i>	177/5	على أن تفعل
	ο5α34 <i>τὴν ποίησιν</i>	178/18	الفيوئطي
	ο6αι2, ο7α34 <i>ποίησει</i>	181/11, 186/17	الفيوئطيّة
	ο6αι4 <i>ποίησις</i>	181/14	فوئطيّات
	ο8β18 <i>τῇ ποίησει</i>	192/4	الفيوئطيّة
	ο8β19 <i>ἡ ποίησις</i>	192/4	الفيوئطيّة
ὁ <i>ποιητής</i>	ο3β24 <i>οἱ ποιηταί</i>	172/5	الفيوئطي
	ο3β33f, ο6β36, ο9α26 <i>τῶν ποιητῶν</i>	172/17, 184/14, 194/17	الفيوئطين
	ο4α20, ο7β33 <i>οἱ ποιηταί</i>	173/21, 188/19	الفيوئطين
	ο4α24 <i>οἱ ποιηταί</i>	174/3	الفيوئطين
	ο4β39 <i>τῷ ποιητῇ</i>	177/1	الفيوئطيّة
	ο8α6 <i>οἱ ποιηταί</i>	189/8	الفيوئطيّون
<i>ποιητικός</i>	ι0β16 <i>τῶν ποιητῶν</i>	199/7	الفيوئطيّون
	ο3β25f <i>τὴν ποιητικὴν</i>	172/6	الفيوئطيّة
	ο4α25 <i>ποιητικὴ</i>	174/6	فيوئطيّة
	ο4α39, β8, ο5α6 <i>ποιητικῆς</i>	174/21, 175/6, 177/6f	الفيوئطيّة
	ο4β4 <i>ἡ ... ποιητικὴ</i>	175/2	الفيوئطيّة
	ο6α6 <i>ποιητικᾶ</i>	181/4	فيوئطيّة
	ο6α32 <i>ποιητικῶς</i>	182/12	بالفيوئطيّة
	ο6α37f <i>ποιητικόν</i>	182/18f	على حال الفيوئطيّة
	ο6β10 <i>ποιητικῶς</i>	183/10	مقالة فيوئطيّة
	ο6β25 <i>ποιητικόν</i>	184/1 [فيوئطي]	
ὁ <i>πόλεμος</i>	ο7β32 <i>τὸ ποιητικόν</i>	188/17	الكلام الفيوئطي
	ι0β30 <i>πόλεμον</i>	199/23	الحرب
	ι0β31 <i>πόλεμος</i>	199/23	الحرب
	ι1α2 <i>τῷ πολέμῳ</i>	200/7	الحرب
	ι1α6f <i>τὸν ... πόλεμον</i>	200/12	الحرب
	ι1αι2, ι1β18 <i>τοῦ πολέμου</i>	200/18, 202/15	الحرب
	ι1β14 <i>τοὺς πολέμους</i>	202/10	الحرب
	ι1β17 <i>τοῖς πολέμοις</i>	202/13f	الحرب

ἡ πόλις	ο6α22f τῶν πόλεων	182/2 المدائن
	10α12, 11α3, 11β10 τῆς πόλεως	197/10, 200/8, 202/6 المدينة
	11α25 τὴν πόλιν	201/12 المدينة
	11β19 αἱ πόλεις	202/16 المدائن
ἡ πολιτεία	ο3β35 τῶν πολιτειῶν	172/18 الفيوليطية
	ο6β32 τῆ πολιτεία	184/10 الفيوليطية
ὁ πολίτης	ο4β9f τοὺς πολίτας	175/10 أهل المدينة
	10α12 πολίτας	197/9 أهل المدينة
πολιτικός	ο3β34 πολιτικούς	172/17 الفيوليطية
Πολύευκτος	11α21 τὸ Πολυεύκτου	فولودقطوس ... فوليقطوس 201/7
πολύθυρος	ο7β34 πολύθυροι	188/21 كثيرة الأبواب
πολυπρόσωπος	ο5β35f τὸν πολυπρόσωπον	180/20 كثيرة الوجوه
πολύς	ο4α4, 10α3 πλείω	173/1, 196/21 أكثر
	ο4α26, ο7β12 οἱ πολλοί	174/7, 187/16 كثير
	ο6α37 πολὺ	182/18 بأكثر
	ο7α29 πολὺ	186/9 كثير
	ο7α35 πολὺ	186/18 كثيرا
	ο7β9f τὰ πολλὰ	187/12 الكثير
	ο7β22 πολλὰ	188/7 كلاما كثيرا
	ο7β32 πολλὰ ποιεῖν	188/18 الإكتار
	ο8α24 πολλοί	190/4 كثير من الناس
	ο8β34 τῶν πολλῶν	193/5 كثير من الناس
	ο9α29 πολλοί	194/16 كثيرا منهم
	10α9 πολὺ	197/6 كثير منهم
	10α15 πολλοὺς	197/12 كثير
	11β16 πολὺ κάλλιον	202/13f أفضل ... جداً
	12α11 πολὺ	203/24 جداً
πονηρεύομαι	11α17 πονηρεύεσθαι	201/4 شريير
πονηρός	11α16 πονηρότερος	201/3 شرّ
πορεύω	ο5α1 τὸ πορεύεσθαι	177/2 يسير
	ο7β23, 24 πορεύεσθαι	188/8, 9 أشخاص
	ο8α1 πορευθεῖς	189/3 ذهب
πορθέω	ο5α28 πορθῆσαι	178/12 أغار
πορίζω	ο4α25 πορίσασθαι	174/4 يكتسبون

ὁ ποριστής	05a26 ποριστάς	178/10 محتالين
ὁ πούς	11b30 ποσίν	203/5 أقدامهم
τὸ πρᾶγμα	03b19 τὰ πράγματα	171/19 الأمور
	04a6, 08a11 τοῖς πράγμασιν	173/3, 189/14 الأمور
	05b13, 09a30 τὸ πρᾶγμα	179/16, 195/1 الأمر
	06b9 τὰ πράγματα	183/9 الأشياء
	07b2 τοῦ πράγματος	187/2 الأمور
	08a20 τὸ πρᾶγμα	189/23 الشيء
	08a23 τὰ πράγματα	190/2 أمورا
ἡ πραγματεία	04a2 τῆς πραγματείας	172/22 من شأن
πραγματεύομαι	03b6 πραγματευθῆναι	171/1 القول
	03b26 ἐπραγματεύθησαν	172/7 تكلفوا القول
πράττω	10b34 πραττόμενα	200/3 التي يفعلن
	11b3 τῶν ... πεπραγμένων	201/20 التي فعلت
πρέπω	04b4 πρέπουσαν	175/2 جميلة
	04b5 πρέπουσα	175/3 جميل
	04b17 τὸ πρέπον	175/15 مشاكا
	04b31 τοῦ πρέποντος	176/12 الجميل
	05a14, 06a12 πρέπει	177/16, 181/11 يجمل
	08a10 τὸ ... πρέπον	189/13 جميلة
προαιρέω	07b21 προαιρῆται	186/14 يوقعوا
προεπιπλήττω	08b2f προεπιπλήττειν	191/4 [يتوهم] ينب أو
ἡ πρόθεσις	10b18 προθέσει	199/9 الفروتاسيس
προλαμβάνω	08b24f προλαμβάνουσι	192/11 يسبقون
προοράω	09a33 προορῶντες	195/4 تقدموا فنظروا
προσαγορεύω	05a32f προσαγορεύει	178/17 يسمي
προσάπτω	12a4 προσήψε	203/15 أضيفت
προσέρχομαι	03b36 προσήλθεν	172/20 [بلغت]
προσέχω	08b23 προσέχειν	192/9f يحول لنا ... ملياً
ἡ πρόσθεσις	05b3 πρόσθεσις	179/6 تقديم وضع
πρόσκειμαι	07b15 προσκείται	187/19 تميل
προσκτάομαι	10a3 προσεκτήσαντο	196/21 حفظوهم
προσορίζω	07b5 προσορίζονται	187/5 يحدون أو يوقتون
προσποιέω	07a33f προσποιῶνται	186/16 يروا أو يظهر
προσπταίω	09b19 προσπταίειν	195/21 السهو

	09b21 προσπταίειν	196/2 الغفلة أو السهو
τὸ πρόσωπον	08b6 τῷ προσώπῳ	191/9 الوجه
πρότερος	07a21 πρότεροι	185/19 التقدم
	07b15 πρότερον	187/21 الأوّل
προτίθημι	07b21 προθείς	188/6 تتبعه
Πρωταγόρας	07b7 Πρωταγόρας	187/8 فروطاغوراس
ἡ πτώσις	10a27 πτώσις	198/4 تصاريف
	10a32 πτώσεις	198/9 التصريف
πτωχεύω	05a18 πτωχεύοντα	177/21 [طلب]
	05a18f πτωχεύειν	178/1 يطلب
ὁ πτωχομouσο- κόλαξ	05b37 πτωχομouσοκόλακας	181/1 [الملاق] [الصديق]
πυκνός	06a11 πυκνοῖς	181/10 المتصلات
	06a20 πυκνοῖς	181/20 المتصلة
πωλέω	12a4 ἐπώλουν	197/14 يبيعونكم
P		
ῥάδιος	07b13 ῥάδιον	187/17 تسعر
	10b10 ῥάδιως	199/1 يسر
ἡ ῥαψωδία	03b23 ῥαψωδῖαν	172/3 الرفسوديّات
	04a23 ἡ ῥαψωδία	174/2 الرفسوديّة
τὸ ῥῆμα	04b6 ῥημά-των	175/4 الكلم
	04b26 ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημά- των	176/8 الأسماء
ῥητορικός	03b25, 04a2 τὴν ῥητορικὴν	172/6, 22 الريطوريّة
	04b37 ῥητορικοῦ	176/19 الفيوثطي
ὁ ῥήτωρ	04a18 τοῖς ῥήτορσιν	173/17 الريطوريّون
	07a7 τοὺς ῥήτορας	185/3 الريطوريّون
ῥοδοδάκτυλος	05b19f ῥοδοδάκτυλος	180/2 وردية الأصابع
ὁ ῥυθμός	03b30 ῥυθμοῖς	172/12 النغم أو النبرات
	03b31f ῥυθμός	172/14 النبرة
	08b29 ῥυθμός	192/17 النغمة أو النبرة
	08b30 ῥυθμόν	192/18 [ب-]نبرات
	08b31 ῥυθμόν	193/1 النبرة
	08b32, 09a9 τῶν ... ῥυθμῶν	193/3, 18 النبرات

	09a1 <i>ῥυθμός</i>	193/9 نبرة
	09a21 <i>τὸν ῥυθμόν</i>	194/10f النبرة أو النغمة
	09a24 <i>ῥυθμοί</i>	194/13 النبرات
<i>ῥυπαίνω</i>	05a25 <i>ῥυπαίνόντων</i>	المستأنسين بالذمومات 178/8f
Σ		
<i>Σαλαμῖς</i>	11a32 <i>Σαλαμῖνι</i>	201/18 سلمنة
<i>ἢ σαλπίνγξ</i>	08a9 <i>τὴν σαλπίνγγα</i>	189/12 القرن أو البوق
<i>οἱ Σάμιοι</i>	07a1 <i>Σαμίους</i>	184/17 أهل ساموس
<i>σαφηνίζω</i>	04b36f <i>σαφηνεῖ</i>	176/18 محقق
<i>σαφής</i>	04b2 <i>σαφῆ</i>	174/23 يكون بالتعبير
	04b6 <i>σαφῆ</i>	175/4 محققة
	05a8 <i>τὸ σαφές</i>	177/9 المحققة
	06a35 <i>τὸ σαφές</i>	182/15 تبين
<i>σεμνός</i>	04b8 <i>σεμνοτέρων</i>	175/8 بزيادة الهيبة والحذر
	06b3 <i>σεμνόν</i>	183/1 التوقي
	06b7 <i>τὸ σεμνόν</i>	183/7 محققة أو سوقية
	08a13 <i>σεμνῶς</i>	189/16 بالتوقي
	08b32 <i>σεμνός</i>	193/3 [منتقصة]
<i>ἢ σεμνότης</i>	08b35 <i>σεμνότητα</i>	193/6 نتوقي
<i>σημαίνω</i>	05b8 <i>τῷ σημαينوμένῳ</i>	179/11 [يعبر]
	05b10 <i>σημαίνει</i>	179/14 يقول
	05b13 <i>σημαίνει</i>	179/17 يدل
	05b16 <i>σημαίνουσιν</i>	179/19 [يدل]
	10b11 <i>σημαίνει</i>	199/1 تبين
	11b26 <i>σημαίνει</i>	202/21 مع دلالتهم
	11b27 <i>σημαίνει</i>	203/1 يتبين
<i>τὸ σημεῖον</i>	04b2 <i>σημεῖον</i>	174/24 رسم
	04b33 <i>σημεῖον</i>	176/14 العلامة
	05a32 <i>ἡδείας ἢ σημεία</i>	لم [تقر] بالتحقيق أو 178/16 التفخيم
	08a26 <i>τῶν σημείων</i>	190/7 الرسوم
	11b19 <i>σημεῖα</i>	202/15 أعلام

Σηστός	IIA13 Σηστόν	سيسطوس ... ³⁵ سيسطوس 200/19f
Σικελία	IIA25 Σικελίαν	201/12 سقيلية
Σιμωνίδης	05b24 ὁ Σιμωνίδης	180/7 سيمونيدس
Σίσυφος	12a5 τὸν Σίσυφον	203/17 سيسيفوس
τὸ σκεῦος	07b8 σκεύη	187/9 وسطا بين ذلك
Σκίρων	06a8 Σκίρων	181/8 ³⁶ سقيرون
σκληρός	08b6 σκληρά	191/8 الشديدة
	08b9 σκληρῶς	191/12 [بشدة]
	08b9 τὰ σκληρά	191/13 الشديديات
σκοπέω	03b31 σκοποῦσιν	172/13 ³⁷ [...] يهزلون أو
	05a13 σκοπεῖν	177/14 ننظر
σκυλεύω	06b33 οἱ ... σκυλεύοντες	184/10 الذين ... يسلبون
σκώπτει	05b30 σκώπτει	180/14 يزري
	09b26 ἔσκωψε	196/7 [ذم]
σολοικίζω	07b18f σολοικίζεῖν	لحن أو خطأ في الكلام 182/2
σοφιστικός	05b9 σοφιστικόν	179/12 السوفسطية
ὁ σοφιστής	04b38 τῷ ... σοφιστῆ	176/20 السوفسطية
Σοφοκλῆς	09b9 [Σοφοκλέους]	195/15 سوفقليس
σπένδω	IIA10f σπεισαμένων	200/16 استولى ... واحتوا
Σπεύσιππος	IIA21 Σπεύσιππον	201/7 فوسيفوس
σπουδάζω	IIA6 σπουδάζοντος	200/II يبادر
στερέω	10A12f στéρεσθαι	197/9 يفقدوا
ἡ στέρησις	08a7 τῶν στέρησεων	189/10 الإعدام
τὸ στέρνον	12a1 στέρνοιο	203/12 صدره
στοχάζομαι	06a16 στοχάζεσθαι	181/16 يتوحي
	10b35 στοχάζεσθαι	200/3 نتوحي
συγγενής	05a35f τῶν συγγενῶν	179/2 المشاكلات
	05a37 συγγενές	179/4 بما هو أشكل
ἡ συγγνώμη	08b12 συγγνώμη	191/15 الصفح
τὸ σύγγραμ- μα	07b16 τοῦ συγγράμματος	187/21 كلامه

³⁵ Badawī: اسيسطوس.

³⁶ Om. Badawī.

³⁷ Mistranslation, perhaps due to the reading σκωπτοῦσιν.

σύγκειμαι	03b35 σύγκειται	172/19 تركَّب
	09b36 σύγκειται	196/18 مركبة
ή συλλαβή	05a31 ταῖς συλλαβαῖς	178/15 المقاطع
	10a27 τὰς ... συλλαβάς	198/4 المقاطع
	10a35 συλλαβῆς	198/13 المقاطع
ὁ συλλογισμός	10a21 συλλογισμῶ	197/18 السيلوجسموس
συμβαίνω	10a6f συμβαίνει	197/3 يعرض
συμβάλλομαι	03b17, 07b26 συμβάλλεται	171/16, 188/10 يشاكل
συμπαραινέω	07a37 συμπαραινέουσιν	186/20 تصرفت معهم
συμπεριπατέω	09b24 [τοὺς συμπεριπα- τοῦντας]	196/5 الذين يمشون معهم
συνάγω	09b34 τῶν ... συναγόντων	196/15 اجتمعوا
ή συναγωγή	10a22 συναγωγή	197/19 تجمع
ὁ σύνδεσμος	07a20 τοῖς συνδέσμοις	185/17 الرباطات المنطقية
	07a24, 28 σύνδεσμον	186/4, 9 رباطا
	07a25, b37 συνδέσμου	186/4, 189/1 رباط
	07a28f σύνδεσμοι	186/9 الرباط
	07a30 τοῖς συνδέσμοις	186/11 الرباطات
	07b12f σύνδεσμοι	187/16 الرباطات
	07b38 ἄνευ ... συνδέσμου	189/2 غير المربوطة
	09a24f τῶ συνδέσμῳ	194/16 الرباط
ή σύνδρομη	11a29 τὰς συνδρομάς	201/15 التوافي
ή συνθήκη	11b16 τὰς συνθήκας	التعاقد على السلم 202/12f
συνίστημι	04a22f συνέστησαν	174/2 حدثت
	04b27 συνέστηκεν	176/8 ركَّب
συντίθημι	04b25 συντιθῆ	176/6 يركَّب
	06b17 συντίθεται	185/15 تركيب
ή συντομία	07b28 συντομίαν	188/13 الإيجاز
σύντομος	07b36, 39 συντόμως	188/23, 189/2 الإيجاز
συντρέχω	11a30 τοὺς συντρέχοντας	201/16 يتوافقون
ή συνωνυμία	04b39 συνωνυμία	ذوات الاسم والحدّ [جميعا] 177/1f
συνώνυμος	05a2 συνώνυμα	ذوات الاسم والحدّ معا 177/3
τὸ σχῆμα	08b21 τὸ ... σχῆμα	192/7 شكل

	ο8b28f τοῦ σχήματος	192/16 شكل
	ιοb28f τῷ ... σχήματι	199/21 شكله
σῶζω	ιοa14 ἐσώθησαν	197/10 نجوا
τὸ σῶμα	ο6a28 τὸ σῶμα	182/8 البدن
	ο6a29 τοῦ σώματος	182/8 البدن
T		
ταπεινός	ο4b3 ταπεινήν	175/1 حقيرة دنيّة
	ο4b5 ταπεινήν	175/3 الحقير
	ο4b6 ταπεινήν	175/5 حقيرة
	ο8a19 ταπεινῶς	189/22 للهيمّ والخبز
τάττω	ο3b7 τάξαι	171/4 ننظّم أو ننسق
ὁ τάφος	πa32 τῷ τάφῳ	201/17 قبور
ταχύς	ιοb21 ταχεῖαν	199/13 خفيفا
	πb31 ταχύ	203/6 الخفة
τελειόω	ο9a31 τελειωθῆ	194/22 ينقض
	ο9b8 τετελειῶσθαι	195/14 منتهى
	ο9b14 ἢ τετελειωμένη	195/16 تامّ
τέλειος	πb27 τέλεια	202/22 يكمل
τελευταίω	ο9a14 τελευτῶσι	194/5 يتناهي
	ιοa16 τελευτήσαντας	197/12 الاموات
	πa32 τελευτησάντων	201/18 الذين هلكوا
ἢ τελευτή	ο9a11 τὴν τελευτήν	194/2 النهاية
	ο9a16 τελευτᾶ	194/6 يتناهي
	ο9a17 τελευτήν	194/7 المنتهى
	ο9a20 τὴν τελευτήν	194/9 المنتهى
	ο9a36 τελευτήν	195/6 آخره
	ιοa25 τελευτής	198/3 المنتهى
	ιοa26 ἢ ... τελευτή	198/4 النهايات
	ιοa30 ἐπὶ τελευτής	198/7 باشتقاق الكلم
τὸ τέλος	ο9a30 τέλος	194/22 انقضاء
	ο9a31 τὸ ... τέλος	195/2 النهاية
τὸ τέρμα	ο9b23 τοῦ τέρματος	196/4 الغاية
τετράγωνος	πb27 τετράγωνον	202/22 طاطراغونوس
τετραμέτρος	ο4a31 τῶν τετραμέτρων	174/12 الوزن المربع

	09a1 τὰ τετράμετρα	193/8 [...] الوزن
	09a1 τὰ τετράμετρα	193/9 الأوزان المربعة
τεύχω	09b28 τεύχει	196/9 يفعل
	09b28 τεύχων	196/9 يفعل
ἢ τέχνη	03b35 τέχνη	172/18 الصناعة أو الحيلة
	04a22 αἱ τέχναι	174/2 الصناعات
ὁ τεχνίτης	05a24 τεχνίτας	178/8 حدّاقا
Τήλεφος	05a28f ὁ Τήλεφος	178/12 طبلافوس
τίθημι	05b15 θετέον	179/19 ينبغي ... أن يضع
τίκτω	10a30f τετοκέμαι	198/8 يولد لي
τίμιος	05a23 τίμιον	178/7 شريف
τλάω	08b16 ἔτλησαν	192/1 صبروا
τμητός	08b30 τμητά	192/17 [أفنانها]
ὁ τόνος	03b29 τοῖς τόνοις	172/II الهاديات
ὁ τόπος	03b15 τὰ ... τόποι	171/12 موضع
τραγικός	03b22f τὴν τραγικὴν	172/3 الطراغوديات
	06b8 τραγικόν	183/8 الطراغوديات
ἡ τραγωδία	03b24, 04a29 τὰς τραγω- δίας	172/4, الطراغوديات 174/II
ἡ τριήρης	11a23 τὰς τριήρεις	السفينة ذات الثلاثة المجاذيف 201/9f
τρίτος	05b8 τρίτον	179/12 طرطعون
τὸ τρόπαιον	11b16 τὸ ... τρόπαιον	202/13 أعلام الغلبة
ὁ τρόπος	04a30 τὸν ... τρόπον	174/II النحو
	04a36 τῶ τρόπῳ	174/18 النحو
	11b11 πάντα τρόπον	202/7 بكلّ جهة
τροχαῖος	08b36 ὁ ... τροχαῖος	195/7 طروخاوس
τροχερός	09a1 τροχερός	195/9 طروخاوس
τυγχάνω	07b2 τύχοι	187/2f يعرض الخطأ
τύπτω	07b11 ἔτυπτον με	187/13 يضربونني
ἢ τύχη	11b18 τύχη	202/14 السعادة
Γ		
ἡ ὕβρις	08a16 ὕβρις	189/20f العار والمنقصة
ὕγρὸς	06a21 τὸν ὑγρὸν ἰδρωτα	182/I الرطوبة

ὑπάρχω	04a21 ὑπῆρξε 10b25 ὑπῆρχεν	173/21 يكون 199/18 يكون
ὑπερήμερος	11a20 ὑπερημεροί	أقمن ... على ما أقام 201/6
ὑποδείκνυμι	04b25 ὑπέδειξε	176/7 أظهره
ἢ ὑπερβολή	06a32 τὴν ... ὑπερβολήν	182/II [الـ... المفرط]
ὑπόκειμαι	08a11 ὑποκειμένοις	189/14 الموضوعه
ὑποκορίζομαι	05b28 ὑποκορίζεσθαι	180/12 التصغير
ὁ ὑποκοισμός	05b28f ὁ ὑποκοισμός	180/12 التصغير
ὑποκρίνομαι	03b23 ὑπεκρίνοντο	يستعملون الأخذ بالوجه 172/4
ἢ ὑπόκρισις	03b22 τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	الحيلة في الأخذ بالوجه 172/4f
	04a18 τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	173/18 الأخذ بالوجه
ὁ ὑποκριτής	03b34 οἱ ὑποκριταί 04b23 τῶν ἄλλων ὑποκρι- τῶν	172/16 ذوو الأخذ بالوجه 176/4 أولئك الآخرين
ὑποκριτικός	04a13 τῆ ὑποκριτικῆ 04a15 τὸ ὑποκριτικόν 04a23 ἡ ὑποκριτικὴ	173/12 الأخذ بالوجه 173/14 الأخذ بالوجه 174/3 الابقراطية
ὑπόκωφος	06b35 ὑποκώφω	184/13f أبكم لا يفقه
ὑπομένω	10a2 τοὺς ὑπομείναντας	196/20 الذين صبروا
τὸ ὑπόμνημα	11b10 τὸ ὑπόμνημα	202/6 الذكر
ὑστερίζω	10b25 ὑστερίζει	199/18 يبطل
ὑστερος	07a21 ὕστεροι 07b15 ὕστερον 10a9 ὕστερον	185/19 التأخر 187/21 إلى الآخر 197/6 بأخيرة
Φ		
Φαῖδρος	08b20 τῷ Φαίδρω	192/6 فادرس
φαίνομαι	03b17 τὸ φανῆναι 05a12 φανεῖται 05a13 φαίνεσθαι 06a18 φαίνεται 08a14 φαίνεται	171/16 يكون 177/13 يرى 177/14 تظهر 181/18 ترى 189/17 يكون

	10b16f φαίνεται	199/7 يرى
	12a3 φαίνεται	203/13 تقال
φανερός	04a36 φανερόν	174/18 معلوما
	06a14 φανερόν	181/13 ظاهرات
	08b7 φανερόν	191/10 معلوم
	12a11 φανερώων	203/23 معروفات
ή φαντασία	04a11 φαντασία	173/9f متخيل أو متوهم
φαῦλος	05a34 φαῦλη	178/19 رديء
	05b20f φαυλότερον	180/3 أقبح من ذلك
	05b22 ἀπό φαύλου	180/5 من الأمور القبيحة
φenaκίζω	07a35 φenaκίζει	186/18 يضلّل
φέρω	05a15f φέρει	177/17 تأتي
	05b18 οἰστέον	179/21f ينبغي أن تؤخذ
	08a6 φέρουσι	189/8 يأتي
φεύγω	07b36 φευκτέον	187/6 ينبغي أن يجتنب
φημί	05a29 φησί	178/13 يذكر
	07b16 φησί	187/22 يقول
	08a9 τὸ φάναι	189/12 [يقال]
	08b12 φάναι	191/15 يقال
	11a2, 16, 12a12 ἔφη	200/6, 201/2, قال
		203/25
	11a7, 12 φάσκων	200/12, 17 يقول
	11a9 ἔφη	200/14 يقول
	11a16 ἔφη	201/2 قال
	11b4f τὸ φάναι	202/1 قيل
	11b26 φάναι	202/21 يقول
	12a14 φαίη	204/1 قال
φθέγγομαι	08b17 φθέγγονται	192/2 بلغوا
	08b35 φθέγγονται	193/5 يقولون
τὸ φιδίτιον	11a25 τὰ ... φιδίτια	201/11 بيت الصديق
ή φιλία	08b15 φιλία	191/18 المحبة
Φιλομήλα	06b17 Φιλομήλα	183/16 الفيلوميلا
φιλοπονέω	05a6f φιλοπονείσθαι	رغبتنا في التعب والعناء
		177/7f
ή φιλοσοφία	06b11 τὴν φιλοσοφίαν	183/11 الفلسفة
	12a11 φιλοσοφία	203/23 الفلسفة

φοινικοδάκτυ- λος	05b20 φοινικοδάκτυλος	180/2f حمراء الأصابع
φορτικός	04a1 φορτικόν	172/20 شيء من التثقيب
φρονέω	11b1 φρονεῖν	202/7 لتفكير
φρόνιμος	10a7 τούς φρονίμους	197/4 العقلاء
ἡ φύσις	03b19f κατὰ φύσιν	171/17 على مجرى الطبيعة
	04a15 φύσεως	173/14 طبيعي
	10a12 φύσει	197/9 بالطباع
φύω	03b19 πέφυκε	171/18 متهية في الطباع
	04a20 πέφυκεν	على مجرى الطبيعة
		173/2of
	04b19 πεφυκότως	175/19 بالموافقة
	07a21 πεφύκασι	185/18 متهية
ἡ φωνή	03b27, 05b18 τῆ φωνῆ	172/9, 179/22 الصوت
	04a21 ἡ φωνή	174/1 الصوت
	04b22 ἡ ... φωνή	176/3 صوت
	05a34 φωναί	178/18 اللفظتين
	05a35 ταῖς ... φωναῖς	178/19 الألفاظ
	08b6 τῆ φωνῆ	191/9 في الصوت
τὸ φῶς	11b12 φῶς	202/9 نورا
X		
Χαβρίας	11b6 Χαβρίου	202/3 كبريوس
χαίρω	05b26 χαίρετε	180/10f كان مسرورا
χαλεπός	06b29 χαλεπόν	184/6 [أسيغت] وأشرت
	10b32 χαλεπόν	199/25 يصعب
ὁ χαλλός	05b1 χαλλόν	179/5 بالنحاس الأحمر
χαλλοῦς	05a33 ὁ χαλλοῦς	178/17 النحاسي
	10a33 χαλλοῦς	198/10 النحاس
	10a33 χαλλοῦ	198/10 النحاس
	11b7f τὴν χαλλῆν	202/4 النحاس
Χάρις	11a6 Χάριτος	200/11 خارييس
	11b3 Χάρις	201/20 امتنان ³⁸
ἡ χελιδόν	06b15 τὴν χελιδόνα	183/15 خطافة

³⁸ Name erroneously translated.

ὁ Χῖος	09b26 ὁ Χῖος	196/7 من أهل كIOS
χλωρός	06b9 χλωρά	183/9 يكرمون ³⁹
χρᾶομαι	11b31 κέχρηται	203/6 يستعملها
τὸ χρῆμα	10a5 χρημάτων	197/2 المال
χρησιμολόγος	07b5 οἱ χρησιμολόγοι	187/4f ذوو الكهانة والأنبياء
χρονοτριβέω	06a37 τὸ χρονοτριβεῖν	ليستمرّ على طول الزمان 182/17f
τὸ χρυσιδάριον	05b31 χρυσιδάριον	180/15 ذهبيا
τὸ χρυσίον	05b31 χρυσίου	180/15 الذهب
ὁ χρῶς	12a1 χρῶς	203/11 أجساده
χύδην	09b7 τῶν χύδην	195/13 منترا مفرقا

Ψ

τὸ ψεῦδος	05b11 ψεῦδος	179/14 كذب
	10b3 ψευδεῖς	198/17 كواذب
τὸ ψήφισμα	11a10 τὸ Μιλτιάδου ψήφισμα	200/15 ناحية ميلتياديس
ψιλός	04b33 ψιλῶν	176/13 المرسل
ὁ ψόγος	08b14 ψόγοις	191/18 الذمّ
	11b19 τῶ ψόγω	202/17 هجاء
ὁ ψόφος	05b7 τοῖς ψόφοις	179/10f [...] أو التصريح
ψοφωδεής	06b2 ψοφώδεις	182/20f ميسطة أو ممددة
ἡ ψυχή	06a24, 26, 30 τῆς ψυχῆς	182/3, 5, 9 النفس
	08a21, 10b19 ἡ ψυχή	189/24, 199/11 النفس
	11b13 τῆ ψυχῆ	202/9 النفس
ψυχρός	05b34 τὰ ... ψυχρά	180/18 الأسماء الباردة
	06a18 ψυχρά	181/18 باردة
	06a33 τὸ ψυχρόν	182/13 البارد
	06b5 τὸ ψυχρόν	183/3 الباردة
ὁ ψωμός	07a2 τὸν ψωμόν	184/18 الخبز

Ω

ἠνέομαι	10a19 ἑώνηται	197/15 يبعوا
---------	---------------	--------------

³⁹ Lyons suggests a confusion of two Syriac roots behind this translation.

ARABIC-GREEK

04a23 ἡ ὑποκριτικὴ	174/3	الابقراطية	ابقراطية
05b23 πατρός	180/7	من أبيه	أبو
05a15f φέρει	177/17	تأتي	أتي
08a6 φέρουσι	189/8	يأتي	
08a7 ἐπιφέρουσιν	189/10	يأتون	
08b24 ἤξει	192/10	يأتي	
08a17 ἀσεβῆ	189/21	الإثم	أثم
11a9 τοὺς Ἀθηναίους	200/14 ⁴⁰	الاثنيون ⁴⁰	اثيني
11a11 Ἀθηναίων	200/16	الاثنيون	
05b24 μισθόν	180/8	الأجرة	أجر
11a14 τὴν Αἴγιναν	201/1	اجينة	اجينة
09a12 ἀντικείμενα	194/3	يُضدّ أحدهما الآخر	أحد
09a12 ἀντικείμενα	194/3	يُضدّ أحدهما الآخر	
03b32f λαμβάνουσιν	172/14	يأخذون	أخذ
05a28 λαβεῖν	178/12	أخذ	
05b18 οἰστέον	179/21f	ينبغي أن تؤخذ	
10a28 ἔλαβεν	198/6	أخذت	
03b22 τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	172/1f	الحيلة في الأخذ بالوجه	
03b23 ὑπεκρίνοντο	172/4	يستعملون الأخذ بالوجه	
03b34 οἱ ὑποκριταί	172/16	ذوو الأخذ بالوجه	
04a13 τῆ ὑποκριτικῆ	173/12	الأخذ بالوجه	
04a15 τὸ ὑποκριτικόν	173/14	الأخذ بالوجه	
04a18 τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	173/18	الأخذ بالوجه	
05a9 λαβεῖν	177/10	أخذه	
09a36 τελευτατὴν	195/6	آخره	آخر
10a9 ὕστερον	197/6	بأخيرة	
04a28 ἑτέρα ... λέξις	174/9	لأصناف آخر	
04b23 τῶν ἄλλων ὑποκρι- τῶν	176/4	أولئك الآخرين	
07b15 ὕστερον	187/21	إلى الآخر	
08a19 τῶν ἄλλων	189/23	سائر الآخر	
10a24 τὰ ἔσχατα	198/1	أواخر	

⁴⁰ Badawī: الاثنيون.

10b29 τοῖς ἄλλοις	199/23 الآخرون	
07a21 ὕστεροι	185/19 التأخّر	
08b15 τῶ πανηγυρικῶ	191/19 الأخرى	
06a8 Ξέρξην	181/7 ⁴¹ اخسیرس	اخسیرس
06b21 τὸν Ἀχιλλέα	183/21 اخیلوس	اخیلوس
06b24 τὸν Ἀχιλλέα	183/22 اخیلوس	
04a27 τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν	174/7 الذين لا أدب لهم	أدب
08a32 πεπαιδευμένος	190/15 [ذو أدب]	
05a21 ἀμύντον	178/4 غير أديب	
06b34 δάκνει	184/11 تؤذي	أذى
04a7 περιεργα	173/4 من ذوات المؤاربة	أرب
06b30 Ἀρχίδαμον	184/7 ارخدامس	ارخدامس
06b31f Ἀρχίδαμος	184/9 ⁴² ارخيداموس	
12a12 Ἀρχύτας	203/25 ارخوطيس	ارخوطيس
09a27f [Ἡροδότου]	194/18 ⁴³ اردطوس	اردطوس
07a9 λιβανωτῶ	185/5 بالأرزة	أرز
05b30 Ἀριστοφάνης	180/13 ⁴⁴ ارسطوفانيس	ارسطوفانيس
05b36 τῆς ... γῆς	180/20 الأرض	أرض
11b35 γαίη	203/11 الأرض	
07b13f τὰ Ἡρακλείτου	187/18 ⁴⁵ [اراقليطوس]	ارقليطس
07b14 τὰ ... Ἡρακλείτου	187/18 ارقليطس	
06a21 Ἴσθμια	182/1 ⁴⁶ اسثاموس	اسثاموس
06a22 τῶν Ἴσθμίων	182/1 اسثامانة	
06b21 λέων	183/21 أسد	أسد
06b22 λέων	183/23 أسدا	
11b21 τὰ ἀστυεῖα	202/18 اسطيون حسنا	اسطيون
11a25 Αἰσίωv	201/11 اسيون	اسيون
06b2 τοῖς ἐποποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى افي	افي
10b3f Ἐπίχαρμος	182/21f افي 198/18 افبخارموس	افبخارموس

⁴¹ Badawī: اخسیرس.

⁴² Badawī: ارخداموس.

⁴³ Margoliouth, Sālim: اردطوس, Badawī: اردطوس.

⁴⁴ Badawī: ارسطوفانيس.

⁴⁵ Hermannus Alemannus transcribes "Abruclytis".

⁴⁶ Badawī: اسثمايوس.

π1α11 Ἐπίδαυρον	200/16 ⁴⁷	افيدارووس
07α2 δέχεται	184/18	يأكلون
π1α5 τὴν Ἑλλάδα	200/10	الاذة
π1α27 τὴν Ἑλλάδα	201/13	الاذة
π1α33 τὴν Ἑλλάδα	201/17	الاذة
06α1 Ἀλκιδάμας	181/2	القيداميس
06α7f Λυκόφρων	181/6 ⁴⁸	[القيدامس]
06α18 τὰ Ἀλκιδάμαντος	181/18	أقاويل [القيداماس]
06β11 Ἀλκιδάμας	183/11	القيدامس
07β34 Ἀχαϊκούς	188/20	[القيادلطوس]
03β11 πεπονθέναι	171/8	من الألم ... يعتري
03β28 πάθος	172/10	الآلام
05β2 τὸ πάθος	179/5	الألم
08α32f πάσχουσι ... τι		[يعرض ... شيء من الألم]
	190/15f	
09β21 ἀντισπασθῆ	196/1	لكيما يسلموا من الألم
09β21 παυσαμένον	196/1	الألم
10β33 ποιεῖ πάσχειν	200/1	يصير إلى الألم
08α24 παθητικῶς	190/3	بالألميات
08β12 παθητικῶς	191/15	بالألمية
05α22 περὶ θεόν	178/6	ما يتنسك به لله
π1β12 ὁ θεός	202/9	الله
π1α6f τὸν Ὀλυμπιακόν	200/12 ⁴⁹	بالونثوس
10α11 τὸν ... Ἑλλήσποντον	197/7f ⁵⁰	أليس بونطوس
12α2 μαιμώνωσα	203/12 ⁵¹	لم يرث لابن أمه
π1α15 ἐκέλευε	201/1	أمر
03β19 τὰ πράγματα	171/19	الأمور
04α6, 08α11 τοῖς πράγμασιν	173/3, 189/14	الأمور
05α30 μείζον	178/14	أمر كبير
05β13, 09α30 τὸ πρᾶγμα	179/16, 195/1	الأمر
05β22 ἀπὸ φαύλου	180/5	من الأمور القبيحة
07β2 τοῦ πράγματος	187/2	الأمور

⁴⁷ Badawī: افيداروس.

⁴⁸ Badawī: [الغوفرون].

⁴⁹ Badawī: النثوس.

⁵⁰ Badawī: emend. الالاسيونطوس.

⁵¹ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

08a23 τὰ πρᾶγματα	190/2 أمورا	
07a35 Ἐμπεδοκλῆς	186/18 امفيدوقليس	امفيدوقليس
10a32 ἐλπίσιν	198/9 بالأمل	أمل
07b8 θήλεα	187/9 [مؤنثا]	أنث
06b27 Ἀνδροτίων	184/3 اندروطيون	اندروطيون
06a35 οἱ ... ἄνθρωποι	182/16 الناس	أنس
06b12 ἀνθρωπίνου	183/12 الناس	
08a24 πολλοί	190/4 كثير من الناس	
08b34 τῶν πολλῶν	193/5 كثير من الناس	
11b19f τῶν ἀνθρώπων	202/17 الناس	
07a9 Ἀντισθένης	185/5 انطيسثانيس	انطيسثانيس
08a1f ἀντιμάχου	189/4 انطيماتخوس	انطيماتخوس
06b18 ἐλοιδόμεν	183/19 عنفها	أنف
11a18 Ἀναξανδρίδου	201/5 ⁵² انكساندريدوس	انكساندريدوس
10a32 ἄξιος	198/9 تتأهل	أهل
04b9f τοὺς πολίτας	175/10 أهل المدينة	
05b30 τοῖς Βαβυλωνίοις	180/14 ⁵³ أهل [بابل]	
07a4 τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς	184/20 أهل بويطية	
10a12 πολίτας	197/9 أهل المدينة	
04b32 τὸ οἰκεῖον	176/14 الأهلية	
04b35 τοῖς οἰκείοις	176/16 الأهليات	
05b12 οἰκειότερον	179/16 جدّ أهلي	
07a31 ἰδίους	186/12 الأهلية الخاصة	
08a31 οἰκεῖα	190/12 الأهلية	
12a10 οἰκείων	203/23 أهليات	
11a9 Εὐβοίαν	200/15 أوبوا	أوبوا
06b30 Θεοδάμας	184/6 ⁵⁴ اوبيموس	اوبيموس
08b26 τὸ ... ἄρρηθμον	192/13 الاورا (ط)مون	اورا (ط)مون
04b25 Εὐριπίδης	176/7 ⁵⁵ اوريفدس	اوريفدس
05a29 Εὐριπίδου	178/13 ⁵⁶ اورفيدس	
06b30 Εὐξένω	184/7 ⁵⁷ اوسخينوس	اوسخينوس

⁵² Margoliouth, Sālim: انكساندرينوس.

⁵³ Badawī: بابل.

⁵⁴ Badawī: [ثيوداموس].

⁵⁵ Badawī: اوريفيدس.

⁵⁶ Badawī: اوريفيدس.

⁵⁷ Badawī: emend. اواخسينوس.

ο6β31 ὁ Εὐξένος	184/9 ⁵⁸ اوسبخينوس	
ο7β15 πρότερον	187/21 الأوّل	أول
π1β31 Ὀμηρος	203/7 اوميروس	اوميروس
ο6β3 [τοῖς ἰαμβείοις]	183/2 الوزن الذي يسمّى ايامبو	ايامبو
ο6β27 Ἰδριέα	184/4 ايدران	ايدران
ο8β15 Ἴσοκράτης	191/19 ايسقراطيس	ايسقراطيس
π1α30 Ἴσοκράτης	201/15 ايسقراطوس	
ο9β26 ὅμοιον	196/6 [أيضاً] بهذه الحال	أيض
ο5α33 τοῖς ἐλεγείοις	178/17 بيت الياغاس	اياغاس
ο5α20 Ἴφικράτης	178/2 ايفيقراطيس	ايفيقراطيس
π1α10 Ἴφικράτης	200/15 ايفيقراطيس	
π1β2 Ἴφικράτης	201/19 ايفيقراطيس	
ب		
ο5β30 τοῖς Βαβυλωνίοις	180/14 ⁵⁹ [بابل] أهل	بابل
ο6αι3 τὰ ... ἀπρεπέστερα	181/12f لا تحسن البيت	بتّ
ο6α5, 10α9, 10f τῆς θαλάτ- της	181/3, 197/6, 7 البحر	بحر
π1α11 τὴν παραλίαν	200/17 ساحل البحر	
π1α15 τὴν λήμην	201/1 البحيرة	
10α25 ἀνάγκη	198/2 لا بدّ	بدّ
ο4αι3 ἐγκχεχειρήκασι	173/12 يبدأ	بدء
ο4αι9 ἤρξαντο	173/20 ابتدؤوا	
ο9αι10 ἀρχόμενοι	194/1 ابتدؤوا	
ο9αι6 ἀρχουσι	194/6 يبتدئ	
ο7αι9 ἀρχή	185/16 بدو	
ο9αι11 τῆς ἀρχῆς	194/2 البدو	
ο9αι2, 10α25 ἀρχῆ	194/3f, 198/2 البدو	
ο9αι3 ἀρχει	194/4 بدوه	
ο9α36 ἀρχήν	195/6 بدوه	
10β9 ἀρχή	198/23 البدو	
10α26 ἀρχή	198/3 المبادئ	
10α28 ἀρχῆ	198/5 المبادئ	

⁵⁸ Badawī: emend. اواخسينوس.

⁵⁹ Badawī: بابل.

10b2 <i>αἰ ... ἀρχαί</i>	198/16	مبادئ	
11a6 <i>σπουδάζοντος</i>	200/11	يبادر	بدر
06a15 <i>ἐξάλαττει</i>	181/14	تبدّل	بدل
04b8 <i>τὸ ... ἐξαλλάξαι</i>	175/7	التبديل والتغيير	
04b31 <i>ἐξάλαττει</i>	176/12	تبدّل	
06a28 <i>τὸ σώμα</i>	182/8	البدن	بدن
06a29 <i>τοῦ σώματος</i>	182/8	البدن	
10a10 <i>τῆς ἠπείρου</i>	197/7	البرّ	برّ
05b34 <i>τὰ ... ψυχρά</i>	180/18	الأسماء الباردة	برد
06a18 <i>ψυχρά</i>	181/18	باردة	
06a33 <i>τὸ ψυχρόν</i>	182/13	البارد	
06b5 <i>τὸ ψυχρόν</i>	183/3	الباردة	
05a14 <i>ἐσθής</i>	177/17	البزة	بزّ
04a24 <i>εὐήθη</i>	174/4	البيسيطة والعاميّة	بسط
06b2 <i>ψοφῶδεις</i>	182/20f	مبسّطة أو ممدّدة	
10b30 <i>νομιζόντων</i>	199/23	بشّر	بشر
06b34 <i>γιγνώσκοντι</i>	182/15	يبصر	بصر
07b20 <i>τὸ ... ἰδῶν</i>	188/4	أبصرت	
10b25 <i>ὑστερίζει</i>	199/18	يبطئ	بطء
10a36 <i>ἀργόν</i>	198/13	بطّالا	بطل
06a17 <i>κακόν</i>	181/17	[باطلا]	
07a24 <i>ἀπαρτᾶν</i>	186/4	يباعد	بعد
04b11 <i>τῶν ἀπόντων</i>	175/11	البعيدات	
05b25 <i>τοῖς ὀρεῦσιν</i>	180/9	البغال	بغل
05b25f <i>εἰς ἡμιόνους</i>	180/10	بالبغال	
04a5 <i>δίκαιον ... αὐτοῖς</i>	173/2	ينبغي لهم	بغى
04a37 <i>ἀκριβολογητέον</i>	174/19f	ينبغي ... أن نتكلّم	
05b15 <i>θετέον</i>	179/19	ينبغي ... أن يضع	
05b18 <i>οἰστέον</i>	179/21f	ينبغي أن تؤخذ	
07a11 <i>ἔξεστι</i>	185/7	ينبغي	
07b36 <i>φευκτέον</i>	187/6	ينبغي أن يجتنب	
09a24, b19 <i>ἀνάγκη</i>	194/15, 195/22	ينبغي	
10b7 <i>λεκτέον</i>	198/20f	ينبغي أن نخبر	
11a31 <i>ἄξιον</i>	201/17	ينبغي	
06b35 <i>ὑποκώφω</i>	184/13f	أبكم لا يفقه	بكم
03b36 <i>προσηλθεν</i>	172/20	[بلغت]	بلغ

08b17 φθέγγονται	192/2 بلغوا	
10a8f ἠξιώθησαν	197/5 بلغوا	
05b27 θύγατρεις	180/II بنات	بن
05b27f θυγατέρες	180/12 بنات	
12a2 μαιμώωσα	203/12 لم يرث لابن أمه ⁶⁰	
11b28 τὴν ἀκμήν	203/2 ذوات الزهرة أو البهجة	بهج
07b34 πολύθυροι	188/2I كثيرة الأبواب	بوب
08a9 τὴν σαλπύγγα	189/12 القرن أو البوق	بوق
10a11 τὸν ... Ἑλλησποντον	197/7f أليس بونطوس ⁶¹	أليس بونطوس
07a3 Βοιωτούς	184/18f أهل بووطية	بووطية
07a4 τοὺς Βοιωτούς	184/20 أهل بووطية	
05a33 τοῖς ἐλεγείοις	178/17 بيت الایغاس ⁶²	بيت
10a18 οἴκοι	197/14 في بيوتكم	
11a24 μύλωνας	201/10 بيت الطحان	
11a25 τὰ ... φιδίτια	201/II بيت الصديق	
06a12 λευκόν	181/II الأبيض	بيض
12a4 ἐπώλουν	197/14 يبيعونكم	بيع
10a19 ἐώνηται	197/15 بيعوا	
04a10 τὸ δηλώσαι	173/8 فيما بين	بين
04b27f τεθεώρηται	176/9 بين	
10b11 σημαίνει	199/1 تبين	
06a35 τὸ σαφές	182/15 تبين	
09a28 ἀπόδειξις	194/14 تبين	
11b27 σημαίνει	203/1 يتبين	
08a26 ἢ ... δείξις	190/6 تستبين	
07b8 σκεύη	187/9 وسطا بين ذلك	
07b17 ἄδηλον	187/23 ليس بينا	
10b23 τὰ ... δήλα	199/14f مكشوفة بينة	
07b21 προθείς	188/6 تتبعه	ت
10a2 τοὺς ἀκολουθήσαντας	196/20 الذين تبعوا	تبع

⁶⁰ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

⁶¹ Badawī: emend. الالاسيونطوس.

⁶² Badawī: الاليجيس.

04a33, 35 ἀφείκασιν	174/13, 16 تركوا	ترك
10a4 κατέλιπον	197/1 تركوهم	
09b22 ἀπολείπεσθαι	196/3 الترك أو المفارقة	
09a7 ἀφετέοι	193/17 متروكة	
05a6f φιλοπονεῖσθαι	177/7f رغبتنا في التعب والعناء	تعب
07a38 καταλύσει	187/1 أٌتلف	تلف
09b14 ἡ τετελειωμένη	195/16 تامّ	تمّ

ث

05b23 ὁ ... ἀμύντωρ	180/6 الذي أثار	ثار
10b2 τοῖς Θεοδεκτείοις	198/17 أقاويل ثاودقطوس	ثاودقطوس
04b22 Θεοδώρου	176/3 ثاودوروس	ثاودوروس
09b26 Δημόκριτος	196/7 ثاوقريطس	ثاوقريطس
03b12 πείθονται	171/9 تثبّت	ثبّت
09b35 καταστησάντων	196/16 الذين تثبتوا	
03b12 τῷ ἀποδεδείχθαι	171/10 التثبيت المنع	
04a6 τοῦ ἀποδείχαι	173/4 التثبيت	
10b8 δεῖξαι	198/22 التثبيت	
08a29 Θετταλός	190/10 ⁶³ التثليل	تثليل
04a14 Θρασύμαχος	173/12 ثرسوماخوس	ثرسوماخوس
09a2 Θρασυμάχου	193/10 ثرسوماخوس	
03b30 βαρεία	172/12 الثقيلة	ثقل
04a1 φορτικόν	172/20 شيء من التثقيب	
11a23 τὰς τριήρεις	السفينة ذات الثلاثة المجاذيف	ثلث
	201/9f	
05b31 ἱματίου	180/15 الثوب	ثوب
05b31 ἱματιδάριον	180/15 ثوبيا	
09a28 Θουρίου	194/19 الثوري	ثوري

ج

05b12 οἰκειότερον	179/16 جدّ أهلي	جدّ
04a3 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν	172/24 العناية والجدّ	
05b12 ὠμοιωμένον μᾶλλον	179/15f يتشبهه جدّاً	

⁶³ Om. Badawī.

ο6b8 ἄγαν	جدّ 183/7	
ο6b11 ἄγαν	جدّاً 183/11	
ο9b31 λίαν	جدّاً 196/12	
11b16 πολὺ κάλλιον	أفضل ... جدّاً 202/13f	
12a11 πολὺ	جدّ 203/24	
11a23 τὰς τριήρεις	السفينة ذات الثلاثة المجاذيف	جذف
	201/9f	
ο5a23 διονυσοκόλακας	الجرابزة 178/7	جرينز
ο4a26 ἡ Γοργίου	جرجياس 174/6	جرجياس
ο5b37 Γοργίας	جرجياس 181/1	
ο6b8f Γοργίας	جرجاس ⁶⁴ 183/9	
ο6b14f Γοργίου	جرجياس 183/14	
ο8b20 Γοργίας	جرجياس 192/5	
ο6b27f τοῖς ... κυνίδιαις	الجراء 184/4	جرو
ο3b19f κατὰ φύσιν	على مجرى الطبيعة 171/17	جري
ο4a20 πέφυκεν	على مجرى الطبيعة 173/20f	
ο4a33 τὴν διάλεκτον	الكلام الجاري 174/14	
ο4b24f διαλέκτου	الكلام الجاري 176/6	
ο6a15 τὸ εἰωθός	الجاري المتعود 181/15	
11a32 κείρασθαι	تجزّ شعرها 201/17	جزّ
ο3b7 τὰ μέρη	أجزاء 171/4	جزأ
ο4a22 τῶν μορίων	لجزء من الأجزاء 174/2	
ο9b16 μόριον	الجزء 195/18	
ο8a19 ταπεινῶς	للهمّ والجزع 189/22	
12a1 χρός	أجساده 203/11	جسد
ο4b1 τεθεορημένα	لنجعل القول 174/22	جعل
ο7a15 ἀνταποδιδόναι	نجعل 185/10	
11a7f ἡγανάκτει	جعل يتعسرّ 200/12	
11a8 παρακαλῶν	جعل يطلب 200/14	
11a11f ἡγανάκτει	جعل يتمعض 200/17	
10a17 τῷ δικαστηρίῳ	مجلس الحكومة 197/14	جلس
10a22 συναγωγή	تجمع 197/19	جمع
ο9b34 τῶν ... συναγόντων	اجتمعوا 196/15	
11a29f [ἐκκλησίας]	التوافي جموعاً 201/15	
ο4b39 συνωνυμίας	ذوات الاسم والحدّ [جميعاً]	

⁶⁴ Badawī: جرجياس.

	177/If	
07a31 τοῖς περιέχουσιν	186/13	الجمعية المحيطة
09b6 εὐμνημονευτότατον	195/II	يحفظ أكثر من جميع
05a14, 06a12 πρέπει	177/16, 181/II	يجمل
06a33 τῇ ἀπρεπείᾳ	182/12	غير ما يجمل
07b11 ὅλως	187/14	الجملة
04b4 πρέπουσαν	175/2	جميلة
04b5 πρέπουσα	175/3	جميل
04b31 τοῦ πρέποντος	176/12	الجميل
05a12 ἀπρεπές	177/13	غير جميل
05b6 καλῶν	179/9	الجميل
06b6 ἀπρεπεῖς	183/4	ما ليس بجميل
07b29 ἀπρεπές	188/14f	قبيحا أو غير جميل
08a10 τὸ ... πρέπον	189/13	جميلة
07b36 φευκτέον	187/6	ينبغي أن يجتنب
10a14 τοῖς βαρβάροις	197/II	الأجنبيين
05a15 γένει	177/18	الجنس
05a17 τῷ ... γένει	177/21	الجنس
07a15 τῶν ὁμογενῶν	185/12	متساوية في الجنس
07b1 τῶν γενῶν	187/2	أجناس
07b7 τὰ γένη	187/8	أجناس
08a27 γένει	190/8	جنس
08a27 γένος	190/8	الجنس
10b15 τοῦ γένους	199/6	الجنس
04a17 ἄθλα	173/16f	منازعين أو مجاهدين
08b3 οὐ λανθάνει	191/5	لا يجهل
09a9 λανθάνειν	193/19	يجهل أو يغلط
10b12 ἀγνώτες	199/3	مجهولة خفية
07a20 ἄν ἀποδιδῶ	185/18	جاد
03b37 καλῶς	172/20	أجيد
04b35 εὖ ποιῆ	176/17	أجاد فعل
06b12 καλόν	183/12	الجيدة
09b23f ἀπολείπουσι	196/5	[يتجاوزون]
05b5 ἐπεικειῖς	179/8	المجازة
09b20 ὄρμαῶν	195/22	المجاز إلى المرسى
04b4 ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα		مجازة للقدر الذي يستوجب

07b9 ἐλθοῦσα	175/If	
07bio οἱ ἐλθόντες	187/10 جاءت 187/13 الذين جاؤوا	جاءت الذين جاؤوا
ح		
11a24 τὰ καπηλεῖα	201/11	حانوت
08b15 φιλία	191/18	حبّ
06b34 τοὺς λίθους	184/12 [الحجارة]	حجر
11b34 λαας	203/9	الحجر
12a5 ὁ λίθος	203/16	الحجر
04b1 ὠρίσθω	174/23	حدّ
07b5 προσορίζονται	187/5	يحدّون أو يوقّتون
10b6 διώρισταί	198/20	حدّدنا ... وفصّلناها
04b39 συνωνυμῖαι	ذوات الاسم والحدّ [جميعاً]	
177/If		
05a2 συνώνυμα	177/3	ذوات الاسم والحدّ معا
08a4 ἀπειρον	189/7	غير ذي حدّ أو نهاية
03b29 ὄξεια	172/12	الحادّة
04a22f συνέστησαν	174/2	حدثت
11b9 κινδυνεύοντος	202/4f	أحدث ... هولا وذعرا
11a2 τὴν νεότητα	200/7	الأحداث
09a28 ιστορίης	194/14	الحديث
11a28f εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἐκέλευε	201/14	أحذّر
04b8 σεμνοτέρων	175/8	بزيادة الهيبة والحذر
09b34f γυμνικούς	196/16	النجدة أو الحدق
05a24 τεχνίτας	178/8	حدّاقا
07a23 ἀνταποδιδόναι	186/3	يحاذي
07a25 ἀποδιδόναι	186/5	المحاذاة
11a16 τῶν ἐπεικῶν	201/2	الأحرار
11a34 τῆς ἐλευθερίας	201/18	حرّية
11b29 [ἐλεύθερον]	منسوباً إلى الحرّية أو الكرم 203/4	
07a4f τοὺς ... μαχομένους	184/20	يفني ... بالحرب
10b30 πόλεμον	199/23	الحرب
10b31 πόλεμος	199/23	الحرب

11a2 τῶ πολέμῳ	200/7	الحرب	
11a6f τὸν ... πόλεμον	200/12	الحرب	
11a12, 11b18 τοῦ πολέμου	200/18, 202/15	الحرب	
11b14 τοὺς πολέμους	202/10	الحرب	
11b17 τοῖς πολέμοις	202/13f	الحرب	
09a13 ἡ μακρὰ	194/5	بحرف طويل	حرف
12a9 κίνησις	203/21	حركة	حرك
04a20 κινήσαι	173/20	بتحريك	
04b4 ἴσως	175/2	بالجرى	حري
09a9 μάλιστα	193/19	بالحري	
05a12f μάλιστα	177/14	أحرى أن	
10a20 γνωριμώτατα	197/17	أحرى أن تعرف	
04a5 λυπεῖν	173/2	التحزين	حزن
07b21 τὸ ... αισθόμενος	188/5	أحسست	حسّ
05b19 αισθήσει	179/23	الإحساس	
06b10 ἐθέρισας	183/10	حصدتها	حسد
06a13 τὰ ... ἀπρεπέστερα	181/12f	لا تحسن البتة	حسن
05a14f κοσμεῖν	177/17	تحسّن	
12a12 εὐστόχου	الذي يحسن أن يتوخّي الغرض		
	203/24f		
05b6 κάλλος	179/9	حسن	
05b16 καλόν	179/20	الحسن	
05b18 ἀπὸ καλῶν	179/22	من الحسن	
08a7 εὐδοκιμεῖ	189/10f	يظنّ ... حسنا	
09a21, 23 εὐρυθμον	194/11f, 12f	حسن النبرات	
10b7 τὰ ἀστεῖα	198/21	المقالة الحسان	
10b16 ἀστεῖον	199/7	حسنا	
10b20 ἀστεῖα	199/11	الحسان	
11b21 τὰ ἀστεῖα	202/18	اسطيون حسنا	
10b2f ἐξηρίθμηνται	198/16	أحصي	حصي
10a11f διορύξας	197/8	حفر	حفر
09b6 εὐνημονευτότατον	195/11	يحفظ أكثر من جميع	حفظ
09b7 μνημονεύουσι	195/12	يحفظه	
10a3 προσεκτήσαντο	196/21	حفظوهم	
09b4f εὐνημόνευτος	195/10	يسهل حفظه	
04a35 γελοῖον	ما يستحقّ أن يضحك منه		حقّ

	174/17	
08a21 ἀληθῶς	190/1 يقول الحقّ	
08b3 ἀληθές	191/4 حقّ	
08b1 ἄκος	191/2 الصحة والحقيقة	
05a32 ἡδέϊας ἢ σημεία	لم [تقرّر] بالتحقيق أو التفخيم	
	178/16	
04b6 σαφῆ	175/4 محقّقة	
04b36f σαφηνιῆ	176/18 محقّق	
05a8 τὸ σαφές	177/9 المحقّقة	
05a37 δῆλον	179/3 محقّقًا	
07a30 ἀσαφές	186/10 ليس ... محقّقًا	
08b31 ἀκριβῶς	193/1 محقّقة	
10b12f τὰ ... κύρια	199/3 المحقّقة	
04b3 ταπεινήν	175/1 حقيرة دنيّة	حقر
04b5 ταπεινήν	175/3 الحقير	
04b6 ταπεινήν	175/5 حقيرة	
05a16 ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων	177/19 من الحقيرات	
06b7 τὸ σεμνόν	183/7 محقّرة أو سوقية	
03b11 οἱ κρίνοντες	171/8 الحكّام	حكم
10a17 τῶ δικαστηρίῳ	197/14 مجلس الحكومة	
10a13 κακῶς	197/10 ⁶⁵ محمودين	حمد
05b27 τῶν ὄνων	180/12 الحمير	حمر
05b1 χαλκόν	179/5 بالنحاس الأحمر	
05b20 φοινικοδάκτυλος	180/2f حمراء الأصابع	
10a8 τοὺς ἀφρονας	197/4 الحمق	حمق
03b16 ἀνάγκη	171/15 يحتاج باضطرار	حوج
07a31 τοῖς περιέχουσιν	186/13 الجمعية المحيطة	حوط
08b23 προσέχειν	192/9f يحولّ لنا ... ملياً	حول
11b11 μελετῶντες	202/7 يحتال	
06a37f ποιητικόν	182/18f على حال الفيوتطية	
09b26 ὅμοιον	196/6 [أيضاً] بهذه الحال	
11b5 τοὺς κινδύνους	202/1 الأهوال	
11b5 τοῖς κινδύνους	202/2 الأهوال	
03b22 τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	172/1f الحيلة في الأخذ بالوجه	
03b35 τέχνη	172/18 الصناعة أو الحيلة	

⁶⁵ Perhaps misread by the translator as καλῶς.

03b36, 04a16 τὴν λέξιν	الحيلة في المقالة 172/19, 173/15	
04b39 κακουργεῖ	الحيل والحديعة 177/1	
05a26 ποριστάς	محتالين 178/10	
π1a10f σπεισαμένων	استولى ... واحتوا 200/16	حوي
π1b7 αἰσχυρθέντες	استحيى 202/3	حي
12a6 ὁ ἀναισχυρτῶν	الذي لا يستحيى 203/17	
12a6 τὸν ἀναισχυρτούμενον	الذي لا يستحيا منه 203/17f	
10a16 ζῶντας	الأحياء 197/12	
12a9 ζῶντα	أحياء 203/21	
10a34 ζῶντα	في حياته 198/11	
08a35 αἰσχυρόμενος	استحياء 190/18	
12a3 τὸ ἀναισχυρτεῖν	الاستحياء والوقاحة 203/14	

خ

π1a6 Χάρητος	خاريس 200/11	خاريس
10b7 λεκτέον	ينبغي أن نخبر 198/20f	خبر
07a2 τὸν ψωμόν	الخبز 184/18	خبز
04b39 κακουργεῖ	الحيل والحديعة 177/1	خدع
π1a3f τις ... ἐξέλοι	مخرجا أخرج 200/8	خرج
10a28 ἀγρόν	الخراج 198/5	
09b23 ἐξωτέρω	إلى خارج 196/4	
π1a3f τις ... ἐξέλοι	مخرجا أخرج 200/8	
08a13 εὐτελῶν	الخصائص 189/16	خسّ
05a7 ἐλαττόνων	[الخصيصة] 177/9	خشّ
06b26 διαφέρουσαι	أقرب وأخصّ 184/2	خصّ
07a31 ἰδίαις	الأهليّة الخاصّة 186/12	
10a14 ἰδίᾳ	في الخاصّ 197/11	
05a31 ἀμαρτία	خطأ 178/16	خطء
07b18f σολοικίξειν	لحن أو خطأ في الكلام 182/2	
07b1 ἀμαρτημα	الخطأ 187/1	
07b2 τύχοι	يعرض الخطأ 187/2f	
06b15 τὴν χελιδόνα	خطافة 183/15	خطف
π1b31 ταχύ	الخفة 203/6	خفّ
10b21 ταχεῖαν	خفيفا 199/13	

06b8	ἀσαφές	183/8	خفية	خفي
07b21	ἀσαφῆ	188/5	خفياً	
08b27	ἀγνωστων	192/15	خفيّ مشكل	
10b12	ἀγνώτες	199/3	مجهولة خفية	
05b2	κολλήσαντα	179/5	خلّل	خلّ
04a9f, 05b19	διαφέρει	173/7, 180/1	يختلف	خلف
06b20	διαφέρει	183/20	يختلفان	
10b18	διαφέρουσα	199/8	تختلف	
09a15	ἐξ ἐναντίας	194/5f	خلاف هذا	
09b2	τὸ ἐναντίως ἔχειν	195/8f	على خلاف ما	
10a22f	ἀντίθεσις	197/20	الموضوعة بالخلاف	
09b2	τὸ ἐναντίως ἔχειν	195/8f	على خلاف ما	
10b1	ἀντίθεσιν	198/15	موضوعاً بالخلاف	
10b3	ἀντιθέσεις	198/17	موضوعات بالخلاف	
10b29	ἀντικειμένως	199/22	بالخلاف	
10b30f	ἀντίκειται	199/23	خلاف	
10b36	ἀντιθέσεως	200/4	الوضع بالخلاف	
11b1	ἀντίθεσιν	201/19	الوضع بالخلاف	
09a11	διαφέρειν	194/2	اختلف	
09b22	τὴν ἀντίκρουσιν	196/2	الصدمة المخالفة	
09b35	ἀντικειμένη	196/17	المخالفة	
10a6	ἀντίκειται	197/2	[مخالف]	
12a15	διαφέρει	204/3	مختلفان	
08a11	ἠθική	189/14	خلاقية	خلق
08a25	ἠθική	190/6	الخلقيات	
08a31	τὸ ἦθος	190/13	الخلاقية	
08b22	πεπλάσθαι	192/8	مختلق	
04a8	τὴν ... μοχθηρίαν	173/6	تخيب	خيب
05b29	τὸ ἀγαθόν	180/13	الخير	خير
08a4	ἀγαθῶν	189/7	في الخيرات	
04b24	κλέπτεται	176/5	يغرّ ويخيل	[a] خيل
08b5	κέκλεπται	191/7	يخيل	
04a11	φαντασία	173/9f	متخيل أو متوهم	
05b27	ἵππων	180/11	الخيل	[b] خيل

07b22 ἐμβάλλειν	188/6	تدخل
10b8 τοῦ γεγυμνασμένου	198/22	مدرباً
08a18 ἀγαμένως	189/22	للاستدراج ⁶⁶
07b15 ἄδηλον	187/20	لا ندري
11a12 παρεξησθαι	200/18	دعوا
10a23 παρξίσωσις	197/21	التدافع
05b13 σημαίνει	179/17	يدلّ
05b16 σημαίνουσιν	179/19	[يدلّ]
08b36 δηλοῖ	195/8	يدلّ
11b26 σημαίνει	202/21	مع دلالتهم
06b9 ἄναιμα	183/9	فيه دم ⁶⁷
05a25 ῥύπαινοντων	178/8f	المستدّسين بالمذمومات
04b3 ταπεινήν	175/1	حقيرة دنية
08a13 εὐτελεῖ	189/16	الدني
12a1 λιλαίομενα	203/11	بالدهن ⁶⁸
11a3 τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ	200/8	من دور السنة
07b27 κύκλον	188/12	الدائرة
05a32 Διονύσιος	178/17	ديانوسوس
06b1f τοῖς διθυραμβοποιοῖς		الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى [ديثورامبو] 182/19f
09a25 τοῖς διθυράμβοις		الذي يكون في وزن الدثرامبو 194/16
07a5 Δημοσθένης	185/1	ديموستانس
07a7 Δημοκράτης	185/2	ديموقراطيس
11a6 εὐθύνας δοῦναι	200/11	يتنصّل من دينه
		ذ
08a19, 09b24 ὁμοίως	189/23, 196/5	كذلك
12a13 βωμόν	203/25	المذبح
11b9 κινδυνεύοντος	202/4f	أحدث ... هولا وذعرا
05a29 φησί	178/13	يذكر
07a23 μέμνηται	186/3	يذكر
10a34 κακῶς	198/12	أسوء الذكر

⁶⁶ The translator misunderstood Aristotle's quotation.

⁶⁷ According to Lyons, the word was apparently misread as ἔναιμα.

⁶⁸ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

11a31 τῶ ἐπιταφίῳ	201/16f ذكر الموارات	
11b10 τὸ ὑπόμνημα	202/6 الذكر	
07b7 ἄρρενα	187/8 [ذكرًا]	
08b14 ψόγοις	191/18 الذمّ	ذمّ
09b26 ἔσκωψε	196/7 [ذمّ]	
05a25 ἑυπαινότων	178/8f المستندسين بالمذمومات	
08a1 πορευθεῖς	189/3 ذهب	ذهب
05b31 χρυσίου	180/15 الذهب	
05b31 χρυσιδάριον	180/15 ذهبيا	
08b13 οὐρανόμηνες	الطويل الذهب نحو السماء	
	191/16	
04b39 συνωνυμῖαι	ذوات الاسم والحدّ [جميعا]	ذو
	177/1f	
03b32 τὰ ... ἄθλα	172/14 ذوو المنازعة	
03b34 οἱ ὑποκριταί	172/16 ذوو الأخذ بالوجه	
04a7 περιεργα	173/4 من ذوات المؤاربة	
04a15 τοῖς ἐλέοις	173/14 ذوات الهمّ	
05a2 συνώνυμα	177/3 ذوات الاسم والحدّ معا	
05a30 κατ' ἀξίαν	178/15 ذو قدر	
05b2 ἀνώνυμον	179/6 غير ذي اسم	
07b5 οἱ χρησιμολόγοι	187/4f ذوو الكهانة والأنباء	
07b35 διαπτυσχαί	188/21 ذوات وجهين	
08a4 ἄπειρον	189/7 غير ذي حدّ أو نهاية	
08a32 πεπαιδευμένος	190/15 [ذو أدب]	
08b14 ἐπαίνοις	191/18 [بذوات] المدح	
08b22 ἄρρυθμον	192/7 غير ذي وزن ولا عدد	
09a36 μέγεθος	195/7 ذا قدر	
09b1 εὐσύνοπτον	195/7 ذا قدر معتدل	
09b17 τὴν μονόκωλον	195/19 ذات الشعبة الواحدة	
11a5 ἑτερόφθαλμον	200/10 ذات عين واحدة	
11a23 τὰς τριήρεις	السفينة ذات الثلاثة المجاذيف	
	201/9f	
11b10 ἔμφυχον	202/5f ذي النفس	
11b28 τὴν ἀκμήν	203/2 ذوات الزهرة أو البهجة	
12a2 ἔμφυχα	203/13 ذوي الأنفس	

07a38 ἀρχήν	187/1	رياسة	رأس
05a12 φανείται	177/13	يرى	رأى
05b1 εἶδον	179/5	رأى	
06a18 φαίνεται	181/18	ترى	
07a33f προσποιῶνται	186/16	يروا أو يظهر	
10b16f φαίνεται	199/7	يرى	
04a2 δόξαν	172/21f	الظنون أو الآراء	
06b13 κάτοπτρον	183/12	المراة	
07b39 ἀσύνδετα	189/2	[رباط] بلا	ربط
07a20 τοῖς συνδέσμοις	185/17	الرباطات المنطقية	
07a24, 28 σύνδεσμον	186/4, 9	رباطا	
07a25, b37 συνδέσμου	186/4, 189/1	رباط	
07a28f σύνδεσμοι	186/9	الرباط	
07a30 τοῖς συνδέσμοις	186/11	الرباطات	
07b12f σύνδεσμοι	187/16	الرباطات	
09a24f τῶ συνδέσμῳ	194/16	الرباط	
07b38 ἀνευ ... συνδέσμου	189/2	غير المربوطة	
11a3 τὸ ἔαρ	200/8	الربيع	ربيع
04a31 τῶν τετραμέτρων	174/12	الوزن المربع	
09a1 τὰ τετράμετρα	193/9	الأوزان المربعة	
10a8 τῶν ἀριστείων	197/5	المراتب العاطمية	رتب
05b1, 10a36 ἄνδρα	179/5, 198/13	رجلا	رجل
05b2 ἀνέρι	179/5	رجلا	
07b17 ἀνθρωποι	187/22	الرجل	
08a28, 28, 09b28 ἀνήρ	190/9, 9, 196/9	الرجل	
10a36 ἄνδρα	198/13	رجلا	
11b26 ἄνδρα	202/22	الرجل	
10a10 πεξέῦσαι	197/7	السير رجالة	
11b13f διαλυόμεθα	202/10	نتراخي	رخي
05a34 φαύλη	178/19	ردية	ردء
05b22 [ἀπό] αἰσχροῦ	180/5	[من الأمور] الرديفة	
04b33 ψιλῶν	176/13	المرسل	رسل
04b2 σημείον	174/24	رسم	رسم
08a26 τῶν σημείων	190/7	الرسوم	

09b20 ὀσμῶν	195/22	المجاز إلى المرسى	رسو
07b34 λιμένας	188/20	المرسيات	
06a21 τὸν ὑγρὸν ἰδρῶτα	182/1	الرطوبة	رطب
05a6f φιλοπονεῖσθαι	177/7f	رغبنا في التعب والعناء	رغب
03b23 ῥαψῳδῖαν	172/3	الرفسوديّات	رفسودية
04a23 ἡ ῥαψῳδία	174/2	الرفسوديّة	
08a12 περὶ εὐόγκων	189/15	ترتفع إلى قول العظام	رفع
08a6 ἄχορδον	189/9f ⁶⁹	لا زفنيّة ولا رقصيّة	رقص
03b35 σύγκειται	172/19	تركّب	ركب
04b25 συντιθῆ	176/6	يركّب	
04b27 συνέστηκεν	176/8	ركّب	
06a36f εὐσύνθετος	182/17	يركّب	
10a10 πλεῦσαι	197/6f	ركوب السفن	
06b17 συντίθεται	185/15	تركيب	
09b36 σύγκειται	196/18	مركّبة	
12a1 διέσσυτο	203/12	ركّز	ركز
10b8 τοῦ εὐφροῦς	198/22	ركينا	ركن
11b35 οἴστος	203/10	رمحه	رمح
05b1 τῶ αἰνίγματι	179/4	الرمز	رمز
11b35 ἐπιπτέσθαι	203/10	رمى	رمي
05a15 βούλη	177/17	أردت	رود
07b22 μέλλων	188/6	أردت	
08b23 ἐξίστησιν	192/9	يراد به التعجيب	
11b14 ἀναβαλλόμεθα	202/II	نريثهم	ريث
11b15 ἡ ἀναβολή	202/II	الريث	
04a18 τοῖς ῥήτορσιν	173/17	الريطوريون	ريطوروي
07a7 τοὺς ῥήτορας	185/3	الريطوريون	
03b25, 04a2 τὴν ῥητορικὴν	172/6, 22	الريطوريّة	
ز			
04a34 ἐκόσμου	174/15	يزيّنونه ويزخرفونه	زخرف
04a27 κάλλιστα	174/8	مزينا أو مزخرفا	
05b30 σκώπτει	180/14	يزري	زري
08b5 λέγω	191/7	أزعم	زعم

⁶⁹ Lyons suspects the reading *ἀχορον* behind the translation of the term.

11b18 <i>τύχης</i>	202/14 السعادة	سعد
07b13 <i>ῥάδιον</i>	187/17 تسعر	سعر
12a15 <i>τῶ ἄνωθεν</i>	204/3 إلى أسفل	سفل
07a6 <i>τοῖς πλοίοις</i>	185/2 السفن	سفن
10a10 <i>πλεύσαι</i>	197/6f ركوب السفن	
11a23 <i>τὰς τριήρεις</i>	السفينة ذات الثلاثة المجاذيف 201/9f	
06a8 <i>Σκίρων</i>	181/8 ⁷¹ سقيرون	سقيرون
11a25 <i>Σικελίαν</i>	201/12 سقيلية	سقيلية
10a3 <i>οἴκοι</i>	197/1 في مساكنهم	سكن
06b33 <i>οἱ ... σκυλεύοντες</i>	184/10 الذين ... يسلبون	سلب
10a9 <i>τὴν ἀρχὴν</i>	197/6 سلطان	سلط
07b9 <i>ῥῆξετο</i>	187/11 سلف	سلف
09b21 <i>ἀντισπασθῆ</i>	196/1 لكيما يسلموا من الألم	سلم
10b30 <i>τὴν ... εἰρήνην</i>	199/22 السلم	
10b31 <i>εἰρήνη</i>	199/24 السلم	
11b16 <i>τὰς συνθήκας</i>	202/12f التعاقد على السلم	
11a32 <i>Σαλαμῖνι</i>	201/18 سلمنة	سلمنة
04a21, 08a30f, b6, 10, 10b11 <i>τὰ ... ὀνόματα</i>	173/21, 190/12, 191/8, 14, 199/1 الأسماء	سم
04a33 <i>τῶν ὀνομάτων</i>	174/14 الأسماء أو الألفاظ	
04b5, 27, 37f, 07b7, 10b11 <i>τῶν ὀνομάτων</i>	175/3, 176/9, 20, 187/8, 199/2 الأسماء	
04b7 <i>ὀνόματα</i>	175/6 الأسماء	
04b26 <i>ὀνομάτων καὶ ἡμερά- των</i>	176/8 الأسماء	
04b29 <i>ὀνόμασι</i>	176/10 الأسماء	
04b38 <i>ὀμωνυμῖαι</i>	176/19 المتفقات الأسماء	
04b39 <i>συνωνυμῖαι</i>	ذوات الاسم والحدّ [جميعاً] 177/1f	
05a2 <i>συνώνυμα</i>	177/3 ذوات الاسم والحدّ معاً	
05a36 <i>τὰ ἀνώνυμα</i>	179/2f التي لا أسماء لها	
05b2 <i>ἀνώνυμον</i>	179/6 غير ذي اسم	
05b6f, 07b27 <i>ὀνόματος</i>	179/10, 188/12 الاسم	
05b34 <i>τὰ ... ψυχρά</i>	180/18 الأسماء الباردة	

⁷¹ Om. Badawī.

05b35, 07a31, 10b31 τοῖς... ὀνόμασιν	180/19, 186/12, 199/24 الأسماء	
06a19 τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	181/19	الأسماء الموضوعة
07b29, 10a34 ὄνομα	188/14, 198/10	الاسم
07b30, 10a28 τὸ ὄνομα	188/16, 198/4	الاسم
07b31 τῷ ὀνόματι	188/16	الاسم
08a6 τὰ ὀνόματα	189/9	بأسماء
08a14 τῷ ... ὀνόματι	189/16	الاسم
10a26 τὰ ὀνόματα	198/3	[بالأسماء]
10a27 ὀνόματος	198/4	الاسم
07a36 οἱ ἀκροαταί	186/19	الذين يسمعون
04a8 τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ	173/6	السامع
04a12, 09b19, 32 τὸν ἀκροατήν	173/10, 195/21, 196/13	السامع
06a27 τῶν ἀκουόντων	182/6	السامعين
08a23, 35 ὁ ἀκούων	190/3, 18	السامع
08a25 τοὺς ἀκροατάς	190/5	السامعين
08a33 οἱ ἀκροαταί	190/15	السامعين
08b5 [ὁ ἀκροατής]	191/7	السامع
08b14 τοὺς ἀκροατάς	191/17	السامع
05b35f τὸν ... οὐρανόν	180/19	السماء
08b13 οὐρανόμενες	الطويل الذهب نحو السماء 191/16	سمو
05a24, 26 καλοῦσι	178/7, 10	يسمّون
05a32f προσαγορεύει	178/17	يسمّي
05b37 ὀνόμαζε	181/1	يسمّي
11a16 ὀνομάσας	201/2	[سمّى]
11a24 ἐκάλει	201/9	يسمّي
05a36f ὀνομασμένως	179/3	التسمية
06a35 ἀνώνυμον	182/17	غير مسمّى
06b1f τοῖς διθυραμβοποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّي 182/19f [ديثورامبو]	
06b2 τοῖς ἐποποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّي 182/21f	افي
06b3 [τοῖς ἱαμβείοις]	183/2	الوزن الذي يسمّي ايامبو
11a3 τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ	200/8	من دور السنة

06a22 νόμους	182/2 السنن	سنّ
06a23 τούς ... νόμους	182/2 السنن	
06b12 τῶν νόμων	183/11 السنن	
10a12 νόμῳ	197/10 سنن	
08a27 καθ' ἡλικίαν	190/8 مثل السنن	
07b11 εὐανάγνωστον	187/14f ممّا تسهل قراءته	سهل
07b12 εὐφραστον	187/15 ممّا يسهل تفسيره	
09b4f εὐμνημόνευτος	195/10 يسهل حفظه	
09b14f εὐανάπνευστος	195/17 يسهل التنفّس	
09b19 προσπταίειν	195/21 السهو	سهو
09b21 προσπταίειν	196/2 الغفلة أو السهو	
05a27 ἀμαρτάνειν	178/11 أساء	سوء
05a27 ἀμαρτάνοντα	178/11 أساء	
06b29 χαλεπὸν	184/6 [أسيئت] وأشرّت	
10a34 κακῶς	198/12 أسوء الذّكر	
10a35 κακῶς	198/12 أسوء الكتب	
06b11 ἐπιτείχισμα	183/11 سور	سور
11a22f πεντεσευρίγγω νόσῳ	201/8 سورنغو نوس	سورنغو
10b24 ἅμα	199/17 من ساعته	سوع
11b29 ἄφετον	203/3 ينزل أو يسوّغ	سوغ
04b38 τῷ ... σοφιστῇ	176/20 السوفسطيّة	سوفسطيّة
05b9 σοφιστικόν	179/12 السوفسطيّة	
09b9 [Σοφοκλέους]	195/15 سوفقليس	سوفقليس
11a7f τὸν δῆμον	200/13 السوقة	سوق
06b7 τὸ σεμνόν	183/7 محقرّة أو سوقية	
09b7 μᾶλλον	195/12f لا سيّما ما كان	سوي
06b31 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	184/8 استواء المقادير واعتدالها	
10b1 πάρισον	198/15 مساويا	
07a15 τῶν ὁμογενῶν	185/12 متساوية في الجنس	
07b28 ἴσον	188/12 المتساوي	
10a24 ἴσα	197/21f متساوية	
10a24 ὅμοια	198/1 متساوية	
10a33 ἄξιός	198/10 مستو	
04a9 μικρόν	173/7 يسير	سير
05a1 τὸ πορεύεσθαι	177/2 يسير	
05b29, 07b1 ἔλαττον	180/13, 187/2 يسير	

09b1 <i>εὐμαθής</i>	195/8	يسير التعليم	
09b4 <i>εὐμαθής</i>	195/9f	[التعلم] يسير	
10a10 <i>πεζεῦσαι</i>	197/7	السير رجالة	
11a13 <i>Σηστόν</i>	200/19f	سيسطوس ⁷² ... سيسطوس	سيسطوس
12a5 <i>τὸν Σίσυφον</i>	203/17	سيسيفوس	سيسيفوس
12a1 <i>αἰχμή</i>	203/12	السيف	سيف
10a21 <i>συλλογισμῶ</i>	197/18	السيلوجسموس	سيلوجسموس
05b24 <i>ὁ Σιμωνίδης</i>	180/7	سيمونيدس	سيمونيدس

04a2 <i>τῆς πραγματείας</i>	172/22	من شأن	شأن
06b30 <i>εἴκαλε</i>	184/7	[يشبهه]	شبهه
07a7, 10 <i>εἴκασε</i>	185/2, 5	يشبهه	
06b27 <i>ὅμοιος</i>	184/4	يشبهه	
06b35, 07a6 <i>ὅμοιος</i>	184/13, 185/2	يشبهون	
06b36 <i>ἔοικε</i>	184/15	يشبهون	
07a2 <i>ἐοικέναι</i>	184/17	يشبهون	
07a3 <i>ὅμοιοι</i>	184/19	يشبهون	
09a26 <i>ὅμοια</i>	194/17	يشبهه	
04b23 <i>ἔοικεν</i>	176/5	يتشبهه	
05b12 <i>ὁμοιωμένον μάλλον</i>	179/15f	يتشبهه جداً	
04a32 <i>ὁμοιότατον</i>	174/12	شبيها	
05b13 <i>ὁμοίως ἔχον</i>	179/17	شبيهه	
08b18 <i>ὁμοίως</i>	192/3	شبيهه	
12a11 <i>τὸ ὅμοιον</i>	203/24	التشبيهه	
08b24 <i>τῶ ὁμοίῳ</i>	192/9f	المشاكل أو [المشابهة]	
04a22 <i>μιμητικώτατον</i>	174/1	مشبها أو ممثلاً	
10a21 <i>ἔοικε</i>	197/18	مشبهه	
07b6 <i>ὅμοια</i>	187/6	متشابهه	
05b32 <i>λοιδορίας</i>	180/15	الشتمه	شتم
05b32 <i>λοιδορημάτιον</i>	180/15	شتمه	
08b13 <i>πελώριον</i>	191/16	شجاعا	شجع
07b23, 24 <i>πορεύεσθαι</i>	188/8, 9	أشخص	شخص

⁷² Badawī: امسيسطوس.

08b9 σκληρῶς	191/12 [بشدة]	شدّ
08b6 σκληρά	191/8 الشديدة	
08b9 τὰ σκληρά	191/13 الشديديات	
06b29 χαλεπὸν	184/6 [أسيئت] وأشرّت	شرّ
05b29 τὸ κακόν	180/13 الشرّ	
06b10 κακῶς	183/10 بشرّ	
08a5 κακῶν	189/7 الشرور	
08b12 κακόν	191/16 شرّ	
09b28 κακά	196/9 شرّاً	
09b28 κακά	196/9 الشرّ	
09b29 κακίστη	196/10 الشرّ	
10a35 δεινόν	198/13 شرّ	
11a16 πονηρότερος	201/3 شرّ	
06b10 αἰσχυρῶς	183/10 بشرة	
11a17 πονηρεύεσθαι	201/4 شرير	
04b21 τοὺς οἴνους	176/2 الأشرية	شرب
08b25 αἰρείται	192/11 شرف	شرف
05a23 τίμιον	178/7 شريف	
05a23 ἄτιμον	178/7 غير شريف	
07a16 Διονύσου	185/13 المشتري	شري
09b17 τὴν μονόκωλον	195/19 ذات الشعبة الواحدة	شعب
11a32 κείρασθαι	201/17 تجزّ شعرها	شعر
06b36 τὰ μέτρα	184/14 أشعار	
11b7 τὴν ἰκετηρίαν	202/3 الشفاعة	شفع
10a30 ἐπὶ τελευτῆς	198/7 باشتقاق الكلم	شقّ
07b10 ὀρθῶς	187/12 بالمشقة	
07a32 ἀμφιβόλοις	186/14 المشككات والمتصرفات	شكّ
07a37 ἀμφιβόλα	186/20 المشككات	
03b17, 07b26 συμβάλλεται	171/16, 188/10 يشاكل	شكل
07a25, b19f, 09a12, b30	186/5, 188/3, يشاكل	
ἀρμόττει	194/3, 196/11	
08a26 ἡ ἀρμοττούσα	190/7f يلزم أو يشاكل	
08b7 ἀρμόττουσιν	191/9 يشاكل	
08b19 ἤρμωσεν	192/3 يشاكل	
09a4 ἐχόμενος	193/15 يلزم أو يشاكل	
09a12 ἀρμόττει	194/3 يشاكل	

09b30 ἀρεμόττει	196/11	يشاكل
08b21 τὸ ... σχῆμα	192/7	شكل
08b28f τοῦ σχήματος	192/16	شكل
10b28f τῶ ... σχήματι	199/21	شكله
05a37 συγγενές	179/4	بما هو أشكل
04b17 τὸ πρέπον	175/15	مشاكلا
05a11 ἀρεμοττούσας	177/12	كان مشاكلا
05a35f τῶν συγγενῶν	179/2	المشاكلات
08b24 τῶ ὁμοίῳ	192/9f	المشاكل أو [المشابهة]
08b27 ἄγνωστων	192/15	خفيّ مشكل
08a17 αἰσχροῖα	189/21	[ب]الشنة
06a31 ποιήμα	182/10	مستوخما مستشعنا
06a30 τὴν ... ἐπιθυμίαν	182/9	الشهوة
06a23 βασιλεῖς	182/2	مشورات
09a32 βούλονται	195/2	يتشوقّ
10b19 ζητεῖ	199/11	تشوقّ
10a6 βουλομένοις	197/2	المشتاقين
04a1 φορτικόν	172/20	شيء من التثقيب
06b9 τὰ πράγματα	183/9	الأشياء
08a20 τὸ πρᾶγμα	189/23	الشيء
08a32f πάσχουσι ... τι	[يعرض ... شيء من الألم]	
	190/15f	
05a14 γέροντι	177/16	الشيخ
08a28 γέρων	190/9	الشيخ
10b14 τὸ γῆρας	199/5	الشيخوخة
ص		
05a22 δαδούχον	178/5f	صاحب المصباح
08b16 ἔτλησαν	192/1	صبروا
10a2 τοὺς ὑπομείναντας	196/20	الذين صبروا
05b19f ῥοδοδάκτυλος	180/2	وردية الأصابع
05b20 φοινικοδάκτυλος	180/2f	حمراء الأصابع
05b21 ἔρυθροδάκτυλος	180/3	قرمزية الأصابع
08b25 τὰ παιδία	192/11	الصبيان
08b1 ἀκος	191/2	الصحة والحقيقة

05a20 δαδοῦχον	[...] أي صاحب الكلام 178/3f	صحب
05a22 δαδοῦχον	178/5f صاحب الصباح	
12a1 στέρνοιο	203/12 صدره	صدر
05b37 πτωχομουσοκόλακας	181/1 [الصيديق] الملاق	صدق
11a25 τὰ ... φιδίτια	201/11 بيت الصيديق	
03b7 αἱ πίστεις	171/3 التصديقات	
03b9 τῶν πίστειων	171/5 التصديقات	
09b22 τὴν ἀντίκρουσιν	196/2 الصدمة المخالفة	صدم
05b7 τοῖς ψόφοις	179/10f [...] أو التصريح	صرح
11a27 βοῆσαι	201/13 تصرخ	صرخ
05a33 κραυγὴν	178/17f صرخة وكشيشا	
07a37 συμπαραινέουσιν	186/20 تصرفت معهم	صرف
10a27 πτωῶσις	198/4 تصارييف	
10a32 πτωῶσεις	198/9 التصريف	
07a32 ἀμφιβόλοις	186/14 المشككات والمتصرفات	
10b32 χαλεπόν	199/25 يصعب	صعب
03b35 τὴν μοχθηρίαν	172/18 صعوبة	
09b31 βραχύκωλοι	196/12 التي صغرت وصولها	صغر
11b11 μικρόν	202/7 الصغير	
03b29 μικρᾶ	172/11 الصغرى	
05b28 ὑποκορίζεσθαι	180/12 التصغير	
05b28f ὁ ὑποκοισμός	180/12 التصغير	
08b12 συγγνώμη	191/15 الصفح	صفح
11b15 ἢ ... εἰρήνη	202/12 الصلح	صلح
11b26 τὸν ἀγαθόν	202/22 الصالح	
11a22 ἡσυχίαν ἀγειν	201/8 لزوم الصمت	صمت
04a29 ποιούντες	174/10 صنعوا	صنع
04a31 μετέβησαν	174/10 صنعوا	
04a35 ποιούντες	174/15 الذين يصنعون	
06b1f τοῖς διθυραμβοποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى [ديثورامبو] 182/19f	
06b2 τοῖς ἐποποιοῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى افي 182/21f	
06b7 οἱ κωμωδοποιοί	الذين يصنعون القوموديات 183/6	

03b35 τέχνη	172/18	الصناعة أو الحيلة	
04a22 αἱ τέχναι	174/2	الصناعات	
04a16 ἀτεχνότερον	173/14f	بزيادة غير صناعي	
04a16 ἐντεχνον	173/15	صناعية	
04a28 ἑτέρα ... λέξις	174/9	لأصناف آخر	صنف
04b27 εἶδη	176/9	أصناف	
11b7 τὴν εἰκόνα	202/4	صنمه	صنم
11b9 ἡ εἰκάν	202/5	الصنم	
03b27, 05b18 τῆ φωνῆ	172/9, 179/22	الصوت	صوت
04a21 ἡ φωνή	174/1	الصوت	
04b22 ἡ ... φωνή	176/3	صوت	
08b6 τῆ φωνῆ	191/9	في الصوت	
05a36 τῶν ὁμοειδῶν	179/2	المتقاربات في الصور	صور
10b33 ποιεῖ πάσχειν	200/1	يصير إلى الألم	صير
09b19, 23 ποιεῖ	195/20, 196/3	تصير	
09b23 ποιεῖ	196/3	تصير	

04a35 γελοῖον	ما يستحق أن يضحك منه	ضحك	
	174/17		
06a33 τὸ γελοῖον	182/13	[...] يضحك منه	
06b6 τὸ γελοῖον	183/5	ما يضحك منه	
09a12 ἀντικείμενα	194/3	يضاد أحدهما الآخر	ضد
05a25 τοῦναντίον	178/9	ضد ذلك	
07b28 τὸ ἐναντίον	188/13	ضد ذلك	
07b36 τοῦναντίον	188/23	ضد ذلك	
07a32 τάναντία	186/15	على الإضداد	
05a11 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	177/12	المضادات	
05a12 τὰ ἐναντία	177/13	المضادات	
08a19 ἐλεεινά	189/22	بالمضاد	
09b36 ἐναντίον	196/18	المضادة	
10a1 τοῖς ἐναντίοις	196/19	المضادة	
05a17 τὰ ἐναντία	177/20	المتضادات	
10a20 τάναντία	197/17	المتضادات	
10a22 τῶν ἀντικειμένων	197/19	المتضادات	

04a3 ἀναγκαίου	172/24 يضطرّ	ضَرّ
07a25 τοῦ ἀναγκαίου	186/5 يضطرّ	
11b20 βλάβη	202/17 مضرة	
03b16 ἀνάγκη	171/15 يحتاج باضطرار	
10b20 ἀνάγκη	199/11 من الاضطرار	
04a9 ἀναγκαῖον	173/7 اضطراري	
07b11 ἔτυπτον με	187/13 يضربونني	ضرب
05a18 εὐχέσθαι	177/21 يتضرّع	ضرع
05a18 εὐχόμενον	177/21 يتضرّع	
10a24 παρομοίωσις	198/1 المضارعة	
04b29 διπλοῖς	176/11 المضاعفة	ضعف
08b10 διπλᾱ	191/14 المضاعفة	
05b35 διπλοῖς	180/19 المضعّفة	
06a36 τοῖς διπλοῖς	182/16 المضعّفات	
06b1 διπλῆ	182/19 المضعّفة	
06a6 τὴν δίπλωσιν	181/4 مضاعفة	
06a30f διπλοῦν	182/9 مضاعف	
08a20 παραλογίζεται	189/24 تضلّ وتغلط	ضلّ
04b36 λανθάνειν	176/18 يضلّل ويغلظ	
07a35 φενακίζει	186/18 يضلّل	
08a10 παθητικὴ	189/14 مضلّلة	
12a4 προσήψε	203/15 أضيفت	ضيف

ط

11b27 τετράγωνον	202/22 طاطراغونوس	طاطراغونوس
10a12 φύσει	197/9 بالطباع	طبع
03b19 πέφυκε	171/18 متهيأة في الطباع	
03b19f κατὰ φύσιν	171/17 على مجرى الطبيعة	
04a20 πέφυκεν	173/20f على مجرى الطبيعة	
04a15 φύσεως	173/14 طبيعي	
11a24 μύλωνας	201/10 بيت الطحنان	طحن
03b22f τὴν τραγικὴν	172/3 الطراغوديات	طراغودية
03b24, 04a29 τὰς τραγω- δίας	172/4, 174/11 الطراغوديات	
06b8 τραγικόν	183/8 الطراغوديات	
05b8 τρίτον	179/12 طرطعون	طرطعون

09a7f <i>μετρικοί</i>	193/17	من طريق الأوزان	طرق
11b2 <i>ή ... ὁδός</i>		طريق 201/20	
08b36 <i>ὁ ... τροχαῖος</i>		طروخاوس 195/7	طروخاوس
09a1 <i>τροχερός</i>		طروخاوس 195/9	
11a24 <i>τὰ καπηλεῖα</i>		حانوت المطعم 201/11	طعم
10a30 <i>παιδίον</i>		طفل 198/8	طفل
05a18 <i>πτωχεύοντα</i>		[طلب] 177/21	طلب
05a18f <i>πτωχεύειν</i>		يطلب 178/1	
11a8 <i>παρακαλῶν</i>		جعل يطلب 200/14	
06b29 <i>λυθέντα</i>		أطلقت 184/6	طلق
06a37 <i>τὸ χρονοτριβεῖν</i>		ليستمرّ على طول الزمان 182/17f	طول
07a9 <i>τὸν λεπτόν</i>		الطويل القضيّف 185/5	
08b13 <i>οὐρανόμενκες</i>		الطويل الذهيب نحو السماء 191/16	
09a13 <i>ἡ μακρὰ</i>		بحرف طويل 194/5	
09a16 <i>ἡ ... μακρὰ</i>		الطويل 194/6	
09a19 <i>τῆ μακρᾶ</i>		الطوال 194/9	
09b18 <i>μακρᾶς</i>		طوالا 195/20	
09b22 <i>τά ... μακρὰ</i>		الطوال 196/3	
09b25 <i>αἱ μακραί</i>		طوالا 196/6	
09b29 <i>ἡ ... μακρὰ</i>		الطوال 196/11	
09b30 <i>τοὺς μακροκώλους</i>		الوصول الطوال 196/11	
10b18 <i>μακροτέρως</i>		أطول 199/9	
06a11 <i>μακροῖς</i>		المطوّلات 181/10	
06b15 <i>πετομένη</i>		تطير 183/15	طير
06b17 <i>ὄρνιθι</i>		الطائر 183/16	
05a28f <i>ὁ Τήλεφος</i>		طيلافوس 178/12	طيلافوس
ظ			
05a26 <i>τὸν ἀδικήσαντα</i>		من ... ظلم 178/10f	ظلم
05a27 <i>ἀδικῆσαι</i>		ظلم 178/11	
12a13 <i>τὸ ἀδικούμενον</i>		المظلوم 204/1	
04a24 <i>ἐδόκουν</i>		يظنون 174/4	ظنّ
04a27 <i>οἶονται</i>		يظنّ 174/6	

04b19 δοκεῖν	175/18	يظنّ
08a7 εὐδοκιμεῖ	189/10f	يظنّ ... حسنا
08b3, 23 δοκεῖ	191/4, 192/8	يظنّ
10a30 ὡήθης	198/7	ظننت
04a2 δόξαν	172/21f	الظنون أو الآراء
03b21f ἐπικεχειρήσεται	172/2	تظهر
05a13 φαίνεσθαι	177/14	تظهر
04b25 ὑπέδειξε	176/7	أظهره
07a33f προσποιῶνται	186/16	يروا أو يظهر
06a14 φανερόν	181/13	ظاهرات
10b13 ἴσμεν	199/3f	معروفة ظاهرة

ظهر

10a14 οἰκέταις	197/12	عبيدا
07a38 διαβάς	186/21	عبر
05b8 τῷ σημαينوμένῳ	179/11	الذي [يعبر]
04b2 σαφῆ	174/23	يكون بالتعبير
03b16 τὸ ἔχειν	171/14	يكون ... عتيدا
08a25 καταπλήττουσι	190/5	يعجبون
04b11 θαυμασταί	175/11	العجبية
08b23 ἐξίστησιν	192/9	يراد به التعجب
11a8 τὰς εὐθύνας ... δοῦναι	200/13	[يكشفوا عدّات]
11a12 τὰ ἐφόδια	200/18	عدّة
07b3 τοῖς ἀρτιασμοῖς	187/3	الأعداد
08b21 ἔμμετρον	192/7	ذي وزن و... عدد
08b22 ἀρρυθμον	192/7	غير ذي وزن ولا عدد
08b28 ἀριθμῶ	192/16	عدد ونهاية
09b5, 7 ἀριθμόν	195/10, 13	عددا
04a3 ὀρθῶς	172/23	مستقيما أو يعدل
04a4 τὸ ... δίκαιον	172/24	العدل
06b33 εὐκασι	184/11	عدل
07a14 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	185/11	المعادلة والوزن
08a8 ταῖς ἀνάλογον	189/11	المعادلة
11a1 κατ' ἀναλογίαν	200/6	المعادلة أو التكافؤ
11b3f, 12a4f κατὰ ἀναλο-	201/21, 203/16	المعادلة

ع

عبد

عبر

عتد

عجب

عدّ

عدل

<i>γίαν</i>			
06b31 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	184/8	استواء المقادير واعتدالها	
08a12 τὸ ... ἀνάλογον	189/14	الاعتدال	
09b20 τὸ μέτρον	196/1	باعتدال	
11b21 δικαία	202/17	عادلة	
08b4 τοῖς ἀνάλογον	191/6	المتعادلة	
08a11 ἀνάλογον	189/14	معتدلة	
09b1 εὐσύνοπτον	195/7	ذا قدر معتدل	
08a7 τῶν στερήσεων	189/10	الإعدام	عدم
08a2 ἐξ ὧν μὴ ἔχει	189/4f	بما ليس أو بالمعدوم	
06b18 παρθένω	183/18	للعدراء	عذر
11a18f τῶν θυγατέρων	201/5	العداري	
07b2 τύχοι	187/2f	يعرض الخطأ	عرض
08a32f πάσχοισι ... τι		[يعرض] ... شيء من الألم	
	190/15f		
10a6f συμβαίνει	197/3	يعرض	
08a34 οἶδεν	190/17	يعرف	عرف
08a34 ἴσασιν	190/17	يعرفون	
10a20 γνωριμώτατα	197/17	أخرى أن تعرف	
12a12 θεωρεῖν	203/24	معرفة	
10b13 ἴσμεν	199/3f	معروفة ظاهرة	
10b24 ἢ γνωῖσις	199/17	يكون معروفا	
12a11 φανερωῶν	203/23	معروفات	
06a20 ιδρωῶτα	181/20	العرق	عرق
03b11 πεπονθέναι	171/8	يعتري ... من الألم	عرو
04b10 πάσχοισι	175/9	يعتريهم	
08a16 ὕβρις	189/20f	العار والمنقصة	عري
08a7 ἄλυρον	189/9	لا [معرفيّة]	عزف
08a9 ἄλυρον	189/12	غير معرّفي	
11b5 παρακαλεῖν	202/1	يعزي	عزي
11a7f ἠγανάκτει	200/12	جعل يتعسر	عسر
09b8 τὴν περίοδον	195/14	العطف	عطف
09b18 τὰς περιόδους	195/20	الأعطاف	
09b25 αἱ περίοδοι	196/5	الأعطاف	
10b2 τῶν περιόδων	198/16	الأعطاف	
09a35 ἢ ἐν περιόδοις	195/5	التعاطف	

09b15 [ἡ περίοδος]	195/18	التعاطف	
09a32 τοῖς καμπτήρσιν	195/3	الانعطاف	
09a35 περίοδον	195/6	المتعاطف	
09b5 ἐν περίοδοις	195/11	المتعاطف	
09b31 περίοδος	196/13	متعاطفة	
05b24 ἐδίδου	180/8	يؤطيهها	عطو
03b31 μέγεθος	172/13	العظم	عظم
03b21 μεγίστην	172/1	عظيمة	
04a7 μέγα	173/5	على العظام	
07a38 μεγάλη	187/1	عظيمة	
08a12 περι εὐόγκων	189/15	ترتفع إلى قول العظام	
10a8 τῶν ἀριστείων	197/5	المراتب العظيمة	
11b20 μεγάλας	202/17	العظيم	
04b31 τὸ μείζον	176/12f	الذي هو أعظم أو أفخم	
11b12 αὐξέειν	202/8	التكبير أو التعظيم	
11b16 τὰς συνθήκας	202/12f	التعاقد على السلم	عقد
11b12 τὸν νοῦν	202/9	العقل	عقل
10a7 τοὺς φρονίμους	197/4	العقلاء	
06a7 αἰτία	181/5	العلل	علّ
12a14 κρεμάθραν	204/2	المعلاق	علق
07a19 τὸ ἐλληνίζειν	185/16	تعلم اليونانية	علم
10b14 γνῶσιν	199/5	علم	
10b14 μάθησιν	199/5	تعليم وعلم	
11b16 τὸ ... τρόπαιον	202/13	أعلام الغلبة	
11b19 σημεία	202/15	أعلام	
08a29 τῷ βίῳ	190/10	العالم	
04b33 σημείον	176/14	العلامة	
04a9 διδασκαλία	173/7	تعليم	
09b1 εὐμαθής	195/8	يسير التعليم	
10b10 τὸ ... μανθάνειν	199/1	التعليم	
10b12 μάθησιν	199/2	التعليم	
10b14 μάθησιν	199/5	تعليم وعلم	
10b21 μάθησιν	199/12	تعلّيمًا	
10b26 μάθησις	199/19	تعليم	
09b4 εὐμαθής	195/9f	يسير [التعلم]	
03b24, 04b35, 07a12 δῆλον	172/5, 176/17, 185/8	معلوم	

04a36 φανερόν	174/18 معلوما	
06a14 ἐξελέγχει	181/13 معلومات	
06a20 ἐπιδήλοις	181/20 المعلوم	
08b7 φανερόν	191/10 معلوم	
10a21 μᾶλλον γνώριμα	197/18 بزيادة معلومة	
06b35, 07a5 τὸν δῆμον	184/13, 185/1 العامّة	عمّ
07b20 οὐ κοινόν	188/4 ليس عامّا	
07b21, 08b1 κοινόν	188/5, 191/2 عامّ	
10a15 κοινή	197/12 العامّ	
10b30 κοινήν	199/22 العامّ	
04a24 εὐήθη	174/4 البسيطة والعاميّة	
11b34 δαπεδόνδε	203/10 القاع العميق	عمق
03b23 ὑπεκρίνοντο	172/4 يستعملون الأخذ بالوجه	عمل
04b3 ποιήσει	174/24 يستعمل	
07b19 ἀποδιδόναι	188/2 يستعمل	
11b31 κέχρηται	203/6 يستعملها	
04b3 τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον	175/1 عمله	
07b14 ἔργον	187/19 موضع عمل	
05b5 λαβεῖν	179/8 استعمال	
07b8 ἀποδιδόναι	187/9 استعمال	
05a6f φιλοπονεῖσθαι	177/7f رغبتنا في التعب والعناء	عنى
04a3 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν	172/24 العناية والجدّ	
04a19, 10b27 τὴν διάνοιαν	173/19, 199/20 المعنى	
09b8 τῆ διανοία	195/14 المعنى	
04b24 τῆς εἰωθυίας	176/6 المتعودّ	عود
06a15 τὸ εἰωθός	181/15 الجاري المتعودّ	
07a33 μηθὲν ... ἔχωσι	186/15 أعوذهم	
06a29 τὴν ... αἰσχύνην	182/8 عورة	عور
07b26 ὄγκον	188/10 معونة	عون
06a22 τὴν ... πανηγυρίαν	182/1 عيد	عيد
09b34 τὰς πανηγύρεις	196/16 العيد	
11a31 ταῖς πανηγύρῃσιν	201/16 الأعياد	
06b12 βίου	183/12 معاش	عيش
05b13, 10b33f, 11a28, b4, 6, 8f, 24, 25 πρὸ ὁμμάτων	179/17, 200/2, 201/14, 21f, 202/2, 5, 19, 20	نصب العين

11α5 ἐτερόφθαλμον

200/10 ذات عين واحدة

04b20 ἐπιβουλεύοντα

176/2 الغشّ والمغيبون

غ
غبن

04b24 κλέπτεται

176/5 يغرّ ويخيل

غرّ

04b9 τούς ξένους

175/10 الغرباء

غرب

04b11 ξένην

175/11 غريبا

04b23f αἱ ... ἀλλότριαι

176/5 غريبا

04b36 ξενικόν

176/18 غريبا

05a8 τὸ ξενικόν

177/9 الغريبة

06a15 ξενικήν

181/15 غريبا

08b11 τὰ ξένα

191/14 الغريبة

10b32 ἀλλότριαν

199/25 غريبا أو مهملًا

12a12 εὐστόχου

الذي يحسن أن يتوخّي الغرض

غرض

203/24f

11b20 διδόασιν

202/16 نغرم

غرم

11b20 ἢ ... εὐθυνα

202/17 الغرم

11b20 εὐθύνας

202/17 الغرم

04b20 ἐπιβουλεύοντα

176/2 الغشّ والمغيبون

غشّ

04b21 τούς μεμιγμένους

176/3 المزوجة بالغشّ

08a16 ὀργιζομένου

189/21 للغضب

غضب

08b12 ὀργιζομένω

191/16 الغضبان

08b15 ὀργῆ

191/18 الغضب

09b21 προσπταίειν

196/2 الغفلة أو السهو

غفل

05b24f ὁ νικήσας

180/8 الذي غلب

غلب

05b26 ἔδωκεν

180/10 غلب

11b16 τὸ ... τρώπαιον

202/13 أعلام الغلبة

11b19 νίκης

202/16 الغلبة أو النجاح

07a36 πάσχουσιν

186/19 يغلطون

غلط

08a20 παραλογίζεται

189/24 تضلّ وتغلط

08b8 λανθάνει

191/11 تغلط

09a9 λανθάνειν

193/19 يجهل أو يغلط

04b36 λανθάνειν

176/18 يضلّ ويغلط

غلط

04b14 δούλος

175/15 غليم

غلم

05a13 νέω

177/15 الغلام

08a28 παῖς	190/9	الغلام	
03b26f Γλαύκων ὁ Τηΐος	172/7	غلقون	غلقون
06a34 τὸ ἀσαφές	182/14	الغامض	غمذ
06a35 τῶ ἐπισκοτεῖν	182/15	الغامض	
09b23 τοῦ τέρματος	196/4	الغاية	غِيّ
05a36 μεταφέρειν	179/2	تغيّر	غير
05a28 πορθῆσαι	178/12	أغار	
04a16 ἀτεχότερον	173/14f	زيادة غير صناعي	
05a12 ἀπρεπές	177/13	غير جميل	
05a21 ἀμύντον	178/4	غير أديب	
05a23 ἄτιμον	178/7	غير شريف	
05b2 ἀνώνυμον	179/6	غير ذي اسم	
06a33 τῇ ἀπρεπείᾳ	182/12	غير ما يجمل	
06a35 ἀνώνυμον	182/17	غير مسمّي	
06b14 ἀπίθانا	183/14	غير مقنع	
07b29 ἀπρεπές	188/14f	قبيحا أو غير جميل	
07b38 ἀνευ ... συνδέσμου	189/2	غير المربوطة	
08a4 ἄπειρον	189/7	غير ذي حدّ أو نهاية	
08a9 ἄλυρον	189/12	غير معرّفي	
08a36 μὴ εὐκαίρως	191/1	[في الوقت] غير الموافق	
08b22 ἄρρυθμον	192/7	غير ذي وزن ولا عدد	
08b22 ἀπίθανον	192/8	غير مقنع	
09a31 ἀηδής	195/1	غير لذيث	
09b13 ἀφελής	195/16	غير منفرج	
12a7 τῶν ἀψύχων	203/19	غير النفسانيّات	
04b8 τὸ ... ἐξαλλάξαι	175/7	التبديل والتغيير	
04b34 μεταφοραῖς	176/16	التغيير	
05a3 μεταφορᾶς	177/5	التغييرات	
05a5 αἰ μεταφοραί	177/6	التغييرات	
05a9, 06b3 ἡ μεταφορά	177/10, 183/2	التغيير	
05a10, b17 τὰς μεταφορᾶς	177/12, 179/21	التغييرات	
05a16 τὴν μεταφορὰν	177/18	التغييرات	
05a24 μεταφορὰ	178/8	[تغيير]	
05a34 ἡ μεταφορὰ	178/18	تغيير	
05b4 μεταφορᾶς	179/8	التغييرات	
05b5, 06b6, 26, 07a13	179/8, 183/4,	التغييرات	

μεταφοραί	184/2, 185/9	
06b5, 08a8 ταῖς μεταφο- ραῖς	183/3, 189/II	التغيير
06b7 μεταφοραῖς	183/6	التغييرات
06b20, 11a27f, b6, 30 μεταφορά	183/20, 201/13, 202/2, 203/6	تغيير
06b22 μεταφορά	183/22f	بالتغيير والاختلاف
06b25 αἱ μεταφοραί	184/2	التغيير
07a11 μεταφορᾶς	185/7	التغيير
07a12 μεταφοραί	185/8	التغيير
07a14 τὴν μεταφορὰν	185/10	التغيير
07b31, 11a26, b3, 8, 27 μεταφορά	188/17, 201/12, 20, 202/4, 22	التغيير
10b13 ἡ ... μεταφορὰ	199/4	التغيير
10b17f μεταφορὰ	199/8	التغييرات
10b31f μεταφορὰν	199/24	تغيير
10b35 μεταφορᾶς	200/4	التغيير
10b36 τῶν ... μεταφορῶν	200/5	التغييرات
11b21 μεταφορᾶς	202/18	التغيير
11b32, 12a5 τῆς μεταφορᾶς	203/7, 15	التغيير
12a10 μεταφέρειν	203/22	التغيير
04b32 μεταφορὰ	176/14	التغييرات
08b20 τῶ Φαίδρω	192/6	فادرس
09a3, 6 ὁ παιᾶν	193/13, 16	الفاون
09a8 ὁ ... παιᾶν	193/18	فاون
09a10 τῶ ... παιᾶνι	194/1	فاون
09a11 παιᾶνος	194/3	الفاون
07b16 τῇ ἀρχῇ	187/2I	فاتحة
04a4 ζητεῖ	173/1	يفحص
10b23 ζητῆσαι	199/15	يفحص
05a20 μητραγύρτην	178/3	ميظراغرطوس، أي فحل
05a21 μητραγύρτην	178/5	فحلا
04b31 τὸ μείζον	176/12f	الذي هو أعظم أو أفخم
05a32 ἡδείας ἢ σημεία	لم [تقرّر] بالتحقيق أو التفخيم 178/16	فخم

ف

فادرس

فاون

فتح

فحص

فحل

فخم

09b16 ἀφελή	195/18 لا ينفرج	فرج
09b13 ἀφελής	195/16 غير منفرج	
04a5 εὐφραίνειν	173/2 التفریح	فرح
11a14 ἀφελεῖν	201/1 يفرّدوا	فرد
07b3 περισσά	187/3 الفرد	
06a32 τὴν ... ὑπερβολὴν	182/11 [الـ... المفرط]	فرط
12a8 κινούμενα	203/21 افترقوا	فرق
09b7 τῶν χυδῶν	195/13 منترًا مفرقًا	
09b22 ἀπολείπεσθαι	196/3 الترك أو المفارقة	
07a1 ἡ Περικλέους	184/16 [فريد]قلبيس ⁷³	فرقليس
11a1 Περικλῆς	200/6 فرقليس	
11a14 Περικλῆς	201/1 فيرقليس	
10b18 προθέσει	199/9 الفروتاسيس	فروتاسيس
07b7 Πρωταγόρας	187/8 فروطاغوراس	فروطاغوراس
07b12 εὐφραστον	187/15 ممًا يسهل تفسيره	فسر
10b6 διώρισται	198/20 حدّدنا ... وفضلّناها	فصل
09b15 τῇ διαιρέσει	195/17 فصوله أو أقسامه	
09a14 βραχεῖαι	194/5 مفصّلة	
09a24 εἰρομένην	194/15 مفصّلة أو مقطّعة	
09a27 εἰρομένη	194/18 المفصّلة	
09a29 εἰρομένην	194/21f المفصّل	
09a34 ἡ ... εἰρομένη	195/4 المفصّل	
09b32f διηρημένη	196/14 مفصّلة	
09a16 βραχεῖαι	194/6 منفصلة	
09b14 διηρημένη	195/17 منفصل	
10a13 αἰσχεῶς	197/11 مفتضحين	فضح
04b2 ἀρετή	174/23 فضيلة	فضل
04b37 ἡ ἀρετή	176/19 فضيلة	
11a33 τῇ ἀρετῇ	201/18 فضيلتهم	
05a15, b23 τοῦ βελτίονος	177/18, 180/6 أفضل	
05b14 κάλλιον	179/18 أفضل	
11b16 πολὺ κάλλιον	202/13f أفضل ... جدًّا	
03b23 παρῆλθεν	172/3 فعلوا	فعل
04a13 ποιήσει	173/12 ستفعل	
05a4 ποιήσει	177/5 على أن تفعل	

⁷³ Badawī: بيرقليس.

09b28 τεύχει	196/9	يفعل	
09b28 τεύχων	196/9	يفعل	
10b34πραπτόμενα	200/3	التي يفعلن	
11b3 τῶν ... πεπραγμένων	201/20	التي فعلت	
04b35 εὖ ποιῆ	176/17	أجاد فعل	
12a9 ἢ ... ἐνέργεια	203/21	الفعل	
10b36 ἐνεργείας	200/4	الفعّال	
11b26, 12a3 ἐνεργοῦντα	202/21, 203/14	فواعل	
11b28, 33 ἐνεργειαν	203/1, 8	الفعّال	
11b28, 29 ἐνεργεια	203/2, 3	الفعّال	
11b30 ἐνεργεια	203/5	فعّال	
12a4 ἐνεργεια	203/15	فواعل	
06a26 δημιουργός	182/6	الفاعل	
10a12f στέρεσθαι	197/9	يفقدوا	فقد
11a2f ἠφανίσθαι	200/7	فقدوا	
06b35 ὑποκώφω	184/13f	أبكم لا يفقه	فقهه
10b26 ἡ διάνοια	199/18	الفكر	فكر
03b13 τὰ ἐνθυμήματα	171/11	التفكيرات	
03b14, 10b22, 28 τῶν ἐν- θυμημάτων	171/11, 199/13, 21	التفكيرات	
10b20 ἐνθυμήματα	199/12	التفكيرات	
10b21 τὰ ἐπιπόλαια	199/14	التفكيرات السخيفة	
11b11 φρονεῖν	202/7	لتفكير	
06b32 τῆ Πλάτωνος	184/9	فلاطون	فلاطون
06b11 τὴν φιλοσοφίαν	183/11	الفلسفة	فلسف
12a11 φιλοσοφία	203/23	الفلسفة	
08b30 τμητὰ	192/17	[أفنانها]	فنّ
07a4f τοὺς ... μαχόμενους	184/20	يفتني ... بالحرب	فتني
10b24 ἀγνωσόμενά ἐστιν	199/16	لم يفهم	فهم
11a21 Σπεύσιππον	201/7	فوسيفوس	فوسيفوس
11a21 τὸ Πολυεύκτου	فولودقطوس ... فوليقطوس	فولودقطوس	فولودقطوس
	201/7		
10a17 Πειθόλαον	197/13	فيثولاوس	فيثولاوس
11a13 Πειθόλαος	200/18	فيثولاوس	
11a14 τοῦ Πειραιέως	200/20	فيرا	فيرا
11a15 τοῦ Πειραιέως	201/1	فيرا	

06b17 Φιλομήλα	183/16	الفيلومىلا	فيلومىلا
03b24 οἱ ποιηταί	172/5	الفىوئطى	فىوئطى
03b33f, 06b36, 09a26 τῶν ποιητῶν	172/17, 184/14,	الفىوئطىين	
	194/17		
04a20, 07b33 οἱ ποιηταί	173/21, 188/19	الفىوئطىين	
04a24 οἱ ποιηταί	174/3	الفىوئطين	
04b37 ῥητορικοῦ	176/19	الفىوئطى	
05a34 τὴν ποιήσιν	178/18	الفىوئطى	
06b25 ποιητικόν	184/1	[فىوئطى]	
07b32 τὸ ποιητικόν	188/17	الكلام الفىوئطى	
08a6 οἱ ποιηταί	189/8	الفىوئطىون	
08b31 ποίημα	193/1	فىوئطى	
10b16 τῶν ποιητῶν	199/7	الفىوئطىون	
03b25f τὴν ποιητικὴν	172/6	الفىوئطىة	
04a25 ποιητικὴ	174/6	فىوئطىة	
04a28, b28 ποιήσεως	174/9, 176/9	الفىوئطىة	
04a39, b8, 05a6 ποιητικῆς	174/21, 175/6,	الفىوئطىة	
	177/6f		
04b4 ἡ ... ποιητικὴ	175/2	الفىوئطىة	
04b19 πεπλασμένως	175/19	بalfىوئطىة	
04b39 τῷ ποιητῇ	177/1	الفىوئطىة	
06a6 ποιητικά	181/4	فىوئطىة	
06a12, 07a34 ποιήσει	181/11, 186/17	الفىوئطىة	
06a14 ποιήσις	181/14	فوئطىيات	
06a32 ποιητικῶς	182/12	بalfىوئطىة	
06a37f ποιητικόν	182/18f	على حال الفىوئطىة	
06b10 ποιητικῶς	183/10	مقالة فىوئطىة	
08b18 τῇ ποιήσει	192/4	الفىوئطىة	
08b19 ἡ ποιήσις	192/4	الفىوئطىة	
03b34 πολιτικούς	172/17	الفىوئطىة	فىوئطى
03b35 τῶν πολιτειῶν	172/18	الفىوئطىة	
06b32 τῇ πολιτείᾳ	184/10	الفىوئطىة	

05b8 αἴσχος

179/11 [القبح]

ق

قبح

05a35 <i>ἀσήμοις</i>	178/19 القبيحة	
05b10 <i>αἰσχρολογεῖν</i>	179/3 يتكلم بالقبيح	
05b16 <i>αἰσχρόν</i>	179/20 القبيح	
05b22 <i>ἀπὸ φαύλου</i>	180/5 من الأمور القبيحة	
06b18, 07b29, b30 <i>αἰσχρόν</i>	183/17, 188/14, 15 قبيحا	
06b18 <i>αἰσχρόν</i>	183/18 قبيح	
07b29 <i>ἀπρεπέες</i>	188/14f قبيحا أو غير جميل	
05b20f <i>φαυλότερον</i>	180/3 أفتح من ذلك	
06b17 <i>αἰσχρόν</i>	183/16 ما أفتح	
11a32 <i>τῷ τάφῳ</i>	201/17 قبور	قبر
08b18 <i>ἀποδέχονται</i>	192/2 يقبل	قبل
04a7 <i>δύνανται</i>	173/4 يقدر	قدر
04a17 <i>τοῖς ... δυναμένοις</i>	173/16 الذين يقدرون	
04b36 <i>ἐνδέχεται</i>	176/18 يقدر	
09a3 <i>εἶχον</i>	193/11 يقدرون	
11a22 <i>δύνασθαι</i>	201/8 يقدر	
04b4 <i>ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα</i>	مجاوزه للقدر الذي يستوجب 175/1f	
05a30 <i>κατ' ἀξίαν</i>	178/15 ذو قدر	
09a36 <i>μέγεθος</i>	195/7 ذا قدر	
09b1 <i>εὐσύννοπτον</i>	195/7 ذا قدر معتدل	
03b33 <i>μειζον δύνανται</i>	172/15f [كانوا] أقوى وأقدر	
06b31 <i>τοῦ ἀνάλογον</i>	184/8 استواء المقادير واعتدالها	
05a4 <i>δύνανται</i>	177/5 قادرة على	
03b18 <i>ἐζητήθη</i>	171/17 قدّمنا النظر	قدم
09a33 <i>προορῶντες</i>	195/4 تقدّموا فنظروا	
11b30 <i>ποσίν</i>	203/5 أقدامهم	
09a26 <i>ἀρχαίων</i>	194/17 القدماء	
09a27 <i>ἢ ἀρχαία</i>	194/18 القديمة	
05b3 <i>πρόσθεσις</i>	179/6 تقديم وضع	
06b23 <i>αὐθαδεις</i>	183/1 الإقدام	
07a21 <i>πρότεροι</i>	185/19 التقدّم	
04a35 <i>μμεῖσθαι</i>	174/16 الافتداء	
06a29f <i>ἀντίμμον</i>	182/9 الافتداء المنقوس	
05a32 <i>ἡδίας ἢ σημεία</i>	لم [تقرّر] بالتحقيق أو التفخيم 178/16	قرّ

08a34 ὁμολογεῖ	190/18	يقرّ
07b11 εὐανάγνωστον	187/14f	مما تسهل قراءته قرأ
06b26 διαφέρουσαι	184/2	أقرب وأخصّ قرب
10b30 ἰδίοις	199/23	أقاربهم
05a36 τῶν ὁμοειδῶν	179/2	المقاربات في الصور
10a29 ἀργόν	198/6	القراح قرح
05b21 ἐρυθροδάκτυλος	180/3	قرمذية الأصابع قرمذ
08a9 τὴν σαλπίγγα	189/12	القرن أو البوق قرن
10a1 ἐπέξευγται	196/18	التي ... مقرونة
07a38 Κροῖσος	186/21 ⁷⁴	قريسوس قريسوس
07b7 διήρει	187/8	قسّم قسم
09b15 τῇ διαιρέσει	195/17	فصوله أو أقسامه
05b33 τὸ μέτριον	180/17	القصّد قصد
06a16 τοῦ μετρίου	181/16	القصّد
09a18 κολοβόν	194/8	قصيرا قصر
09b18 μούρους	195/20	قصارا
09b19 μικρόν	195/20	القصار
07a9 τὸν λεπτόν	185/5	الطويل القضيّف قضف
09a31 τελειωθῆ	194/22	ينقضّ قضّي
09a32 καθορᾶν	195/3	ينقضي
07a22 ἀπαιτεῖ	186/2	يقتضي
09a30 τέλος	194/22	انقضاء
09a19 ἀποκόπτεσθαι	194/9	تقطع قطع
09b9 διακόπτεσθαι	195/15	يتقاطعان
09a33 ἐκλύονται	195/3	ينقطع
05a31 ταῖς συλλαβαῖς	178/15	المقاطع
10a27 τὰς ... συλλαβάς	198/4	المقاطع
10a35 συλλαβῆς	198/13	المقاطع
09a24 εἰρομένην	194/15	مفصلة أو مقطعة
06a5 τὸ ... ἔδαφος	181/3	قعر قعر
05b24 ὀλίγον	180/8	القليلة قلّ
06b20 μικρόν	183/20	قليلًا
07b10 ὀλίγα	187/12	القليل
10b25 μικρόν	199/18	قليلًا
04b15 ἀπρεπέστερον	175/14	أقلّ أو أنقص

⁷⁴ Margoliouth, Sālim: قولسوس.

05b17 ἦπτον	179/21 [ب]الأقلّ	
10b18 ἦπτον ἠδύ	199/9 أقلّ لئاذة	
10a32 ἐλαχίσταις	198/8 مقلاً	
08a15f Κλεοφῶν	189/18 قلاوفون	قلاوفون
09a18 ἡ ... βραχεῖα	194/7 المتقلص	قلص
08a25 θορυβοῦντες	190/5 يقلقونهم	قلق
05a20 Καλλίαν	178/2 قلياس	قلياس
05a20f ὁ δὲ [sc. Καλλίας]	178/4 اقلياس ⁷⁵	
03b20 τὸ πιθανόν	171/19 الإقناع	قنع
03b12 τῷ ἀποδεδείχθαι	171/10 التثبيت المقنع	
04b20 πιθανόν	176/1 مقنع	
06b14 ἀπίθانا	183/14 غير مقنع	
08a19f πιθανοί	189/24 مقنعة	
08b10 ἀπίθανον	191/13 مقنعة ⁷⁶	
08b22 ἀπίθανον	192/8 غير مقنع	
08a27 ἔξει	190/8 [قنية]	قني
11b34 δαπεδόνδε	203/10 القاع العميق	قوع
03b9, 13 εἴρηται	171/5, 10 قيل	قول
07b9 διαλεχθεῖσα	187/10 قالت	
08a21 ἀληθῶς	190/1 يقول الحقّ	
10b9 διαριθμησώμεθα	198/23 نقول	
04b1 τεθεορημένα	174/22 لنجعل القول	
08a12 περὶ εὐόγκων	189/15 ترتفع إلى قول العظام	
04a7 εἴρηται	173/6 يكون بالمقالة	
10b7 τὰ ἀστειᾶ	198/21 المقالة الحسان	
05b10 σημαίνει	179/14 يقول	
06b14 τὰ εἰρημένα	183/14 السبب الذي قيل	
07b10 ὀνομάζειν	187/12 قيل	
07b16 φησί	187/22 يقول	
08a9 τὸ φάναι	189/12 [يقال]	
08b12 φάναι	191/15 يقال	
08b34 ἡ λέξις	193/5 التي يقول بها	
08b35 φθέγγονται	193/5 يقولون	
11a2, 16, 12a12 ἔφη	200/6, 201/2, 203/25 قال	

⁷⁵ Badawī: emend. قالياس.

⁷⁶ The *a* *privativum* has not been translated.

11a7, 12 φάσκων	200/12, 17 يقول
11a9 ἔφη	200/14 يقول
11a16 ἔφη	201/2 قال
11b4f τὸ φάναι	202/1 قيل
11b26 φάναι	202/21 يقول
12a3 φαίνεται	203/13 تقال
12a14 φαίη	204/1 قال
03b6 πραγματευθῆναι	171/1 القول
03b8 τοῦ λόγου	171/4 القول
03b15 εἰπεῖν	171/13 القول
03b26 ἐπραγματεύθησαν	172/7 تكلفوا القول
04b26 ὁ λόγος	176/8 القول
04b39 λέγω	177/2 قولك
05a6 λόγῳ	177/8 القول
06a18 τὰ Ἀλκιδάμαντος	181/18 [القيداماس]
07a34 λέγουσι	186/17 القول
08a12f λέγεται	189/15 قول
03b15 τῆς λέξεως	171/13 اللفظ والمقالة
03b20 τῇ λέξει	171/20 اللفظ أو المقالة
03b36, 04a16 τὴν λέξιν	172/19, الحيلة في المقالة
	173/15
04a8 τῆς λέξεως	173/7 المقالة
04a19, 24, b10, 09a24 τὴν λέξιν	173/19, 174/5, المقالة
	175/9, 194/15
04b1 λέξεως	174/23 المقال
06b10 ποιητικῶς	183/10 مقالة فيوئطية
08a10 ἢ λέξις	189/13 اللفظ أو المقالة
08a15 ποιεῖ	189/17 مقالة
08a17 λέξις	189/20 المقالة
08b21, 29, 09a34, b32 τῆς λέξεως	192/7, 16, 195/5, المقالة
	196/14
09a22 τὴν λέξιν	194/11 مقال
09a27 ἢ ... λέξις	194/18 المقالة
09a35 λέξιν	195/6 المقال
09b5 ἢ ... λέξις	195/11 المقال
09b14 λέξις	195/16 مقال

10a20 ἡ ... λέξις	197/16	المقالة	
10b20 λέξιν	199/12	المقالات	
10b28 τὴν λέξιν	199/21	اللفظ والمقالة	
11b31 λέγει	203/6	المقال	
05a17 λέγω	177/20	قائل	
08a14 καμωδία	189/17	[قوموديّة]	قومودية
06b7 οἱ καμωδοποιοί		الذين يصنعون القوموديات	
	183/6		
10a33 σταθῆναι	198/10	تقوم	قوم
11a20 ὑπερημεροί	201/6	أقمن ... على ما أقام	
11b35 ἴσταντο	203/11	كانوا قِيَامًا	
04a3 ὀρθῶς	172/23	مستقيماً أو بعدل	
08a28 Λάκων	190/9	[القوني]	قوني
03b21 δύναμιν	172/1	قوة	قوي
05b18 τῇ δυνάμει	179/23	القوة	
06b35 ἰσχυρῶ	184/13	قوي	
03b33 μείζον δύνανται	172/15f	[كانوا] أقوى وأقدر	
04a18f μείζον ἰσχύουσι	173/18f	يكون أقوى	
06a13 κατακορηῆ	181/13	يقيدن	قيد
11a23 δεδεμένον	201/8	قيده	
11a5 Κηφισόδοτος	200/10	قيفيسادوطوس	قيفيسادوطوس
11a23 Κηφισόδοτος	201/9	قيفيسودوطوس	
11a28 Κηφισόδοτος	201/14 ⁷⁷	قيفيسادوطوس	
11a24 ὁ Κύων	201/10	قيون	قيون
ك			
05a30 μείζον	178/14	أمر كبير	كبير
06a20 μείζοσι	181/20	الكبار	
03b28 μεγάλη	172/10	الكبرى	
11b12 αὐξέειν	202/8	التكبير أو التعظيم	
11b6 Χαβρίου	202/3	كبريوس	كبريوس
04a18 γραφόμενοι	173/18	الذي يكتب	كتب
10a35 κακῶς	198/12	أسوء الكتب	
06b12 τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν	183/12	الكتابة الذي المال	

⁷⁷ Margoliouth, Sālim: قيفيسودودوطوس.

09a20f τὴν παραγραφὴν	194/10 الكتابة	
08a34 οἱ λογογράφοι	190/16f كتبة الكلام	
09a20 τὸν γραφέα	194/10 الكاتب	
07b11f τὸ γεγραμμένον	187/14 الكلام المكتوب	
04a26, 07b12 οἱ πολλοί	174/7, 187/16 كثير	كث
05b35f τὸν πολυπρόσωπον	180/20 كثيرة الوجوه	
06a16 μείζον	181/16 المتصلة والكثيرة	
07a29 πολὺ	186/9 كثير	
07a35 πολὺ	186/18 كثيرا	
07b9f τὰ πολλά	187/12 الكثير	
07b22 πολλά	188/7 كلاما كثيرا	
07b34 πολύθυροι	188/21 كثيرة الأبواب	
08a24 πολλοί	190/4 كثير من الناس	
08b34 τῶν πολλῶν	193/5 كثير من الناس	
09a29 πολλοί	194/16 كثيرا منهم	
10a9 πολὺ	197/6 كثير منهم	
10a15 πολλοὺς	197/12 كثير	
04a4, 10a3 πλείω	173/1, 196/21 أكثر	
05b12, 17, 07b3 μάλλον	179/15, 21, 187/3 بالأكثر	
06a37 πολὺ	182/18 بأكثر	
08b34 μάλιστα	193/6 أكثر من	
08b36 κορδακικώτερος	195/8 أكثر [مدحا أو ...]	
09b6 εὐνημιονευτότατον	195/11 يحفظ أكثر من جميع	
07b32 πολλὰ ποιεῖν	188/18 الإكثار	
05b11 ψεύδος	179/14 كذب	كذب
10b3 ψευδεῖς	198/17 كواذب	
08a12 αὐτοκαβδάλως	189/15 بالتكذيب	
09a26 κατεστραμμένην	194/17 فيه ... كرورا	كّر
09a26f ταῖς ἀντιστρόφοις	194/17 كرور	
09a34f κατεστραμμένη	195/5 الكرور	
09b27 τῶν ἀντιστρόφων	196/8 الكرور	
06b9 χλωρά	183/9 ⁷⁸ يكرمون	كرم
11b29 [ἐλεύθερον]	منسوبا إلى الحرّية أو الكرم	
	203/4	
05b25 οὐκ ἤθελε	180/9 كان كالتكّرّه	كره

⁷⁸ Lyons suggests a confusion of two Syriac roots behind this translation.

07a35 κύκλω	186/18 بالككرة	كرو
04a25 πορίσασθαι	174/4 يكتسبون	كسب
05a33 κραυγήν	178/17f صرخة وكشيشا	كشّ
11a8 τὰς εὐθύνας ... δοῦναι	200/13 [يكشفوا عدّات]	كشف
10b23 τὰ ... δήλα	199/14f مكشوفة بيّنة	
11a1 κατ' ἀναλογίαν	200/6 المعادلة أو التكافؤ	كفأ
08a30 καθ' ἅπασαν ἔξιν	190/11 في كلّ همة من الهمم	كلّ
09a6 ὁ ἡμιόλιος	193/15f نصف الكلّ	
11b11 πάντα τρέπον	202/7 بكلّ جهة	
07b1 τὸ ὄλωσ	187/1 في الكلّيّة	
06b33 τοῖς κυνιδίοις	184/11 الكلاب	كلب
12a14 ἄγκυραν	204/2 الكلّوب	
03b26 ἐπραγματεύθησαν	172/7 تكلفوا القول	كلف
04a24 λέγοντες	174/4 يتكلّمون	كلم
04a37 ἀκριβολογητέον	174/19f ينبغي ... أن نتكلّم	
04a38 λέγομεν	174/20 نتكلّم	
05b10 αἰσχρολογεῖν	179/3 يتكلّم بالقبيح	
07b2 λέγουσιν	187/2 يتكلّم	
07b23, 24, 08a1 διαλεχθείς	188/7, 9, 189/3 تكلمت	
04b2 ὁ λόγος	174/24 الكلمة	
04b6 ῥημάτων	175/4 الكلم	
05b9 τὸ ... λόγον	179/12 الكلمة	
07b17, 29 τοῦ λόγου	187/22, 188/14 الكلمة	
07b27 λόγῳ	188/11 الكلمة	
10a30 ἐπὶ τελευτῆς	198/7 باشتقاق الكلم	
03b18, 04a4, 08b30 τὸν λόγον	171/16, 173/1, 192/18 الكلام	
04a18 οἱ ... λόγοι	173/18 الكلام	
04a28 λόγου	174/9 الكلام	
04a33 τὴν διάλεκτον	174/14 الكلام الجاري	
04b5 λόγῳ	175/3 كلاما	
04b14, 07a17 ὁ λόγος	175/13, 185/15 الكلام	
04b24f διαλέκτου	176/6 الكلام الجاري	
04b33 τὴν ... λέξιν	176/13 الكلام	
04b33, 06a4, 09a6, 11b2 τῶν λόγων	176/13, 181/3, 193/15, 201/20 الكلام	

04b37 τοῦ ... λόγου	176/19 الكلام	
05a4f λόγοις	177/6 الكلام	
05a7 ὁ λόγος	177/8 الكلام	
05a20 δαδούχον	178/3f [...] أي صاحب الكلام	
06a13 λόγῳ	181/12 الكلام	
07b18f σολοικίζειν	182/2 لحن أو خطأ في الكلام	
06a36 ὁ λόγος	182/17 كلام	
06b24 λόγῳ	183/23 الكلام	
07a13 λόγου	185/10 كلام	
07a31 λέγειν	186/12 الكلام	
07b11f τὸ γεγραμμένον	187/14 الكلام المكتوب	
07b16 τοῦ συγγράμματος	187/21 كلامه	
07b22 πολλά	188/7 كلاما كثيرا	
07b32 τὸ ποιητικόν	188/17 الكلام الفيثوتي	
08a34 οἱ λογογράφοι	190/16f كتابة الكلام	
09a18 ἀτελής	194/8 ليس كلاما	
09b6 τὰ μέτρα	195/12 الكلام الموزون	
03b12 τοὺς λέγοντας	171/9 المتكلمين	
08b3 ὁ ποιεῖ τὸν λέγοντα	191/5 المتكلم	
08b4 τὸν λέγοντα	191/5 المتكلم	
11b27 τέλεια	202/22 يكمل	كمل
09b20f ἔχει ... ὄρον	195/22 تكون كاملة	
07a37 τοῖς μάντεσιν	186/19 الذين يتكهنون	كهن
07b5 οἱ χρησιμολόγοι	187/4f ذوو الكهانة والأنباء	
07b2 οἱ μάντεις	187/2 الكاهن	
03b16 τὸ ἔχειν	171/14 يكون ... عتيذا	كون
03b17 τὸ φανῆναι	171/16 يكون	
03b33 μείζον δύνανται	172/15f [كانوا] أقوى وأقدر	
04a7 εἴρηται	173/6 يكون بالمقالة	
04a18f μείζον ἰσχύουσι	173/18f يكون أقوى	
04a21 ὑπήρξε	173/21 يكون	
04b2 σαφή	174/23 يكون بالتعبير	
05a11 ἀρμωστούσας	177/12 كان مشاكلا	
05b25 οὐκ ἤθελε	180/9 كان كالتكره	
05b26 χαίρετε	180/10f كان مسرورا	
05b34 γίνεταί	180/18 تكون من ... أوجه	

08a14 φαίνεται	189/17 يكون	
09a25 τοῖς διθυράμβοις	الذي يكون في وزن الدثرامبو	
	194/16	
09b7 μάλλον	195/12f لا سيّما ما كان	
09b20f ἔχει ... ὄρον	195/22 تكون كاملة	
10b24 ἡ γνώσις	199/17 يكون معروفا	
10b25 ὑπήρχεν	199/18 يكون	
11b35 ἴσταντο	203/II كانوا قيّاما	
09b26 ὁ Χίος	196/7 من أهل كيوس	كيوس
ل		
06a11 ἀκαίροις	181/10 اللازميّات	لازمين
09a25 αἰ ... ἀναβολαί	194/17 فيه تلبّثا	لبث
09b25 ἀναβολῆ	196/6 [التلبّث]	
09b27 ἀναβολάς	196/8 تلبّثا	
09b29 ἀναβολή	196/10 التلبّث	
06a12 γάλα	181/II اللبن	لين
12a13f καταφεύγει	204/I يلجأ	لجأ
07b18f σολοακίζειν	182/2 لحن أو خطأ في الكلام	لحن
08a7 μέλος	189/9 اللحون	
08a9 μέλος	189/12 لحن	
04b7 εἴρηται	175/6 لخصنا	لخص
06a27 τῆς ... ἡδονῆς	182/6 اللذة	لذّ
05a8 τὸ ἡδύ	177/9 اللذيذة	
06a19 ἡδύσματι	181/19 اللذيذة	
09a31 ἀηδῆς	195/1 غير لذيد	
09b1 ἡδεῖα	195/8 لذيدا	
09b1 ἡδεῖα	195/8 [لذيدا]	
10a19 ἡδεῖα	197/17 لذيدة	
10b10 ἡδύ	199/1 لذيد	
10b12 ἡδιστα	199/3 لذيد	
10b18 ἥττον ἡδύ	199/9 أقلّ لذادة	
08b27 ἀηδές	192/15 ليس بلذّي	
08a26 ἡ ἀρμωττούσα	190/7f يلزم أو يشاكل	لزم
09a4 ἐχόμενος	193/15 يلزم أو يشاكل	

11a22 ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν	201/8 لزوم الصمت	
06a7 γλώτταις	181/6 الألسن واللغات	لسن
06b2 αἰ ... γλώτται	182/21 الألسن أو اللغات	
05a25 οἱ λησταί	178/9 اللصوص	لصّ
05a31 κέκλεπται	178/15 على اللصوص	
04b28 γλώτταις	176/10 اللغات	لغو
06a7 γλώτταις	181/6 الألسن واللغات	
06b2 αἰ ... γλώτται	182/21 الألسن أو اللغات	
10b12 αἰ ... γλώτται	199/3 اللغات	
04b21 διαβάλλονται	176/1 يلقون	لفّ
11a4 Λεπτίνης	200/9 لفطنس	لفطنس
03b8, 05b34 τὴν λέξι	171/3, 180/19 الألفاظ	لفظ
03b15 τῆς λέξεως	171/13 اللفظ والمقالة	
03b20 τῆ λέξει	171/20 اللفظ أو المقالة	
04a26 λέξις	174/5 الألفاظ	
04a33 τῶν ὀνομάτων	174/14 الأسماء أو الألفاظ	
04a37 λέξεως	174/19 الألفاظ	
05a34 φωναί	178/18 اللفظتين	
05a35 ταῖς ... φωναῖς	178/19 الألفاظ	
06a16 τὴν λέξιν	181/15 لفظا	
06b1 ἡ ... λέξις	182/19 الألفاظ	
07a19, b26 τῆς λέξεως	185/15, 188/10 الألفاظ	
08a10 ἡ λέξις	189/13 اللفظ أو المقالة	
08a20 ἡ ... λέξις	189/23 الألفاظ	
10b28 τὴν λέξιν	199/21 اللفظ والمقالة	
11a4 Λακεδαιμονίαν	200/9 ⁷⁹ اللقدماتون	لقدمن
10a6 ἀπόλαυσις	197/2 اللهو	لهو
10a5 ἀπολαῦσαι	197/2 اللهو	
05b35 Λυκόφρων	180/19 لوقفرون	لوقفرون
10a17 Λυκόφρονα	197/13 لوقافرون	
11b6 Λυκολέων	202/3 لوقالون	لوقالون
11a10 ἐξέναι	200/15 [نلتوي]	لوي
06b6 ἀπρεπεῖς	183/4 ما ليس بجميل	ليس
07a30 ἀσαφές	186/10 ليس ... محققا	
07b17 ἄδηλον	187/23 ليس بينا	

⁷⁹ Badawī: اللقدماتون.

07b20 οὐ κοινόν	ليس عامًا 188/4	
08a2 ἐξ ἧν μὴ ἔχει	بما ليس أو بالعدوم 189/4f	
08b27 ἀηδές	ليس بلذّي 192/15	
09a18 ἀτελής	ليس كلامًا 194/8	
04b13 ἀρμόττει	يستولي ويلىق 175/12	لىق
05b7 Λακύνιος	ليقومانيوس 179/10	ليقومانيوس
08b9 μαλακῶς	لين 191/13	لين
08b9 τὰ μαλακά	اللّينات 191/12	

08a27 καθ' ἡλικίαν	مثل السنن 190/8	م
06b20, 24, 10b17 ἡ εἰκῶν	المثال 183/20, 23, 199/7	مثل
06b26f εἰκόνες	المثال 184/3	
07a11 εἰκόνας	المثال 185/7	
07a13 εἰκόνες	مثال 185/9	
07a13, 10b16 αἱ εἰκόνες	المثال 185/9, 199/6	
12a7 ταῖς ... εἰκόσιν	المثال 203/18	
04a21 μιμήματα	ممثلة 173/21	
04a22 μιμητικώτατον	مشبهها أو ممثلاً 174/1	
06b2 ψοφῶδεις	مبسطة أو ممددة 182/2of	مدّ
04a25 τὴν ... δόξαν	المدح 174/4	مدح
08b14 ἐπαίνοις	[بذوات] المدح 191/18	
08a18 ἐπαινετά	بالمدائح 189/22	
08b36 κορδακικώτερος	أكثر [مدحا أو ...] 195/8	
04b9f τοὺς πολίτας	أهل المدينة 175/10	مدن
06a22f τῶν πόλεων	المدائن 182/2	
10a12 πολίτας	أهل المدينة 197/9	
10a12, 11a3, 110 τῆς πόλεως	المدينة 197/10, 200/8, 202/6	
11a25 τὴν πόλιν	المدينة 201/12	
11b19 αἱ πόλεις	المدائن 202/16	
06a37 τὸ χρονοτριβεῖν	ليستمرّ على طول الزمان 182/17f	مرّ
07b36 τῆς γυναικός	الامرأة 188/2	مرء
08a28 γυνή	المرأة 190/9	

07a17 ἄρεως	185/14	المريخ	مرخ
04b21 τοὺς μεμιγμένους	176/3	المزوجة بالغش	مزج
08b20 εἰρωνείας	192/5	مزاح أو هزل	مزح
12a1 ἄσαι	203/II ⁸⁰	مسحوا	مسح
05a1 τὸ βαδίξειν	177/2	يمشي	مشي
09b24 [τοὺς συμπεριπα- τοῦντας]	196/5	الذين يمشون معهم	
11a1f ἡγανάκτει	200/17	جعل يمتعض	معض
06b35 ναυκλήρω	184/13	الملّاح	ملح
07a6 τοῖς ... ναυτιῶσιν	185/2	الملّاح	
05b37 πτωχομουσοκόλακας	181/1	الملاّق [الصدّيق]	ملق
08b23 προσέχειν	192/9f	يحوّل لنا ... ملّيّاً	ملو
11b3 Χάρης	201/20 ⁸¹	امتنان	منّ
06b33 τοὺς τεθνεῶτας	184/10	الموتى	موت
10a16 τελευτήσαντας	197/12	الأموات	
11a15 Μοιροκλής	201/2	موراقليس	موراقليس
06b12 τὴν Ὀδύσειαν	183/12	الكتابة الذي المال	مول
10a5 χρημάτων	197/2	المال	
10a6 κτήσει	197/3	[المال]	
05a20 μητραγύρετην	178/3	ميطراغرتوس، أي فحل	ميطراغرتوس
05b22f ὁ μητροφόντης	180/5	[ميطروفنطيس]	ميطروفنطيس
07b15 προσκείται	187/19	تميل	ميل
09b23 οἱ ... ἀποκάμπτοντες	196/4	الذين [يميلون]	
09b27 Μελανιππίδην	196/8	ميلانيفي	ميلانيفي
11a10 τὸ Μιλτιάδου ψή- φισμα	200/15	ناحية ميلتياديس	ميلتياديس
ن			
08b14 ἐνθουσιάσαι	191/17	ينبئ	نبأ
04a38f εἴρηται	174/2I	أنبأنا	
07b5 οἱ χρησιμολόγοι	187/4f	ذوو الكهانة والأنباء	
08b17 ἐνθουσιάζοντες	192/2	على جهة النبأ	
08b19 ἐνθεον	192/4	بمنزلة النبأ	

⁸⁰ Aristotle's quotation has been misunderstood.

⁸¹ Name erroneously translated.

03b30 ἔϑμοῖς	172/12 النغم أو النبرات	نبر
03b31f ἔϑμός	172/14 النبرة	
08b29 ἔϑμός	192/17 النغمة أو النبرة	
08b30 ἔϑμόν	192/18 [ب-]نبرات	
08b31 ἔϑμόν	193/1 النبرة	
08b32, 09a9 τῶν ... ἔϑμῶν	193/3, 18 النبرات	
09a1 ἔϑμός	193/9 نبرة	
09a21 τὸν ἔϑμόν	194/10f النبرة أو النغمة	
09a21, 23 εὐϑμόν	194/11f, 12f حسن النبرات	
09a24 ἔϑμοί	194/13 النبرات	
09b7 τῶν χύδην	195/13 منتزاً مفرقاً	نثر
05b1 τῶ εὐδοκιμοῦντι	179/4 الذي ينجح	نجح
07a12 εὐδοκιμῶσιν	185/7 ينجح	
10a7 ἀτυχεῖν	197/4 لا ينجحون	
10b22, 27 εὐδοκιμεῖ	199/13, 21 ينجح	
11a1 εὐδοκιμοῦσι	200/5 تنجح	
11b19 νίκης	202/16 الغلبة أو النجاح	
10b7 τὰ εὐδοκιμοῦντα	198/21 المنجحات	
12a7 εὐδοκιμούσαις	203/18 المنجحات	
09b34f γυμνικούς	196/16 النجدة أو الخدق	نجد
10a14 ἐσώθησαν	197/10 نجوا	نجو
05b1 χαλκόν	179/5 بالنحاس الأحمر	نحاس
10a33 χαλκοῦς	198/10 النحاس	
10a33 χαλκοῦ	198/10 النحاس	
11b7f τήν χαλκῆν	202/4 النحاس	
05a33 ὁ χαλκοῦς	178/17 النحاسي	
04a30 τὸν ... τρέπον	174/11 النحو	نحو
04a36 τῶ τρέπω	174/18 النحو	
11a10 τὸ Μιλτιάδου ψή- φισμα	200/15 ناحية ميلتياديس	
08b24 τῶν κηρύκων	192/11 المنادي	ندو
04a5f ἀγωνίζεσθαι	173/2 يتنازعا	نزح
03b32 τὰ ... ἄθλα	172/14 ذوو المنازعة	
03b32 τῶν ἀγῶνων	172/15 المنازعات والمزاوالات	
03b34 τοὺς ... ἀγῶνας	172/17 المنازعات	
04a17 ἄθλα	173/16f منازعين أو مجاهدين	

11b29 ἄφετον	ينزل أو يسوّغ 203/3	نزل
08b19 ἔνθεον	بمنزلة النبا 192/4	
10a3 οἴκοι	في منازلهم 196/21	
11b29 [ἐλεύθερον]	منسوبا إلى الحرّية أو الكرم 203/4	نسب
03b7 τάξαι	ننظّم أو ننسّق 171/4	نسق
05a22 περὶ θεόν	ما يتنسّق به لله 178/6	نسك
12a13 δαιτητήν	النصب 203/25	نصب
05b13, 10b33f, 11a28, b4, 6, 8f, 24, 25 πρὸ ὀμμάτων	نصب العين 179/17, 200/2, 201/14, 21f, 202/2, 5, 19, 20	
09a6 ὁ ἡμιόλιος	نصف الكلّ 193/15f	نصف
11a6 δοῦναι	يتنصّل 200/11	نصل
11a6 εὐθύνας δοῦναι	يتنصّل من دينه 200/11	
04a27 διαλέγεσθαι	ينطقون 174/7	نطق
04b34 διαλέγονται	ينطقون 176/15	
06a30 λέγοντες	[هم] نطقوا 182/12	
07a37 λέγωνσιν	نطقوا 186/20	
08a31 λέγη	ينطق 190/12	
04b11 τὴν διάλεκτον	المنطق 175/11	
07a20 τοῖς συνδέσμοις	الرباطات المنطقية 185/17	
05a13 σκοπεῖν	ننظر 177/14	نظر
09a33 προορῶντες	تقدّموا فنظروا 195/4	
10b34 ὄρᾱν	ننظر 200/2	
03b18 ἐζητήθη	قدّمنا النظر 171/17	
05b19 τῇ ὄψει	المنظر 179/23	
03b7 τάξαι	ننظّم أو ننسّق 171/4	نظم
03b30 ἐυθυμοῖς	النغم أو النبرات 172/12	نغم
08b29 ἐυθυμός	النغمة أو النبرة 192/17	
09a21 τὸν ἐυθυμόν	النبرة أو النغمة 194/10f	
06a24, 26, 30 τῆς ψυχῆς	النفس 9, 5, 182/3	نفس
08a21, 10b19 ἡ ψυχή	النفس 189/24, 199/11	
11b10 τὸ ἀψυχον	الذي لا نفس له 202/5	
11b10 ἔμψυχον	ذي النفس 202/5f	
11b13 τῇ ψυχῇ	النفس 202/9	
12a2 ἔμψυχα	ذوي الأنفس 203/13	

11b32 τὰ ἄψυχα	203/7 بلا نفسانيّات	
12a7 τῶν ἀψύχων	203/19 غير النفسانيّات	
09b14f εὐανάπνευστος	195/17 يسهل التنفّس	
10a1 ὠνησαν	196/19 [نفعوهم]	نفع
11b5 βοηθήσοντας	202/1 ينتفع	
05a7 ἐξ ... βοηθημάτων	177/9 المنافع	
12a12 διέχουσι	203/24 نافعة	
06a34f ἐπεμβάλλη	182/14f تزيد فيه أو نقص منه	نقص
05b9 λύει	179/12 ينقص	
04b15 ἀπρεπέστερον	175/14 أقل أو أنقص	
09a1f λείπεται	193/9 [ناقص]	
08a16 ὕβρις	189/20f العار والمنقصة	
08b32 σεμνός	193/3 [منتقصة]	
07b13 διαστίζαι	187/17 موضع التنقيط	نقل
07b14 τὰ ... διαστίζαι	187/18 التنقيط	
06a29f ἀντίμιμον	182/9 الاقتداء المنكوس	نكس
06b28 δάκνειν	184/5 نهشت	نهش
08b26 ἀπέραντον	192/13 لا يتناهي	نهو
08b28 τὸ ἀπειρον	192/15 الذي لا يتناهي	
08b28 περαίνεται	192/16 يتناهي	
09a14 τελευτώσι	194/5 يتناهي	
09a16 τελευτᾶ	194/6 يتناهي	
09a31 τὸ ἀπειρον	195/2 لا يتناهي	
09b2 τῷ ἀπεράντῳ	195/9 الذي لا يتناهي	
08a4 ἀπειρον	189/7 غير ذي حدّ أو نهاية	
08b28 ἀριθμῶ	192/16 عدد ونهاية	
09a11 τὴν τελευτήν	194/2 النهاية	
09a31 τὸ ... τέλος	195/2 النهاية	
09a33 τὸ πέρας	195/4 النهاية	
10a26 ἢ ... τελευτή	198/4 النهايات	
10b1 ὁμοιοτέλευτον	198/15 موافقا في النهاية	
08b27 πεπεράνθαι	192/14 متناها	
09a17 τελευτήν	194/7 المنتهى	
09a20 τὴν τελευτήν	194/9 المنتهى	
09b8 τετελειῶσθαι	195/14 منتهى	
10a25 τελευτής	198/3 المنتهى	

π1b13 <i>δηλοῖ</i>	202/10	ينيران	نور
π1b12 <i>φῶς</i>	202/9	نورا	
π1a22f <i>πεντεσुरίγγω νόσῳ</i>	201/8	سورنغو نوس	نوس
ο3b14 <i>τὰ ... εἶδη</i>	171/11	أنواعا	نوع
ο5a3 <i>εἶδη</i>	177/4	أنواع	
ο8b1 <i>τῶν εἰδῶν</i>	191/2	الأنواع	
ο9a11 <i>εἶδη</i>	194/3	نوعان	
ι0a35 <i>ἔπαθες</i>	198/13	نالک	نول

ه

π1b19 <i>τῷ ψόγῳ</i>	202/17	هجاء	هجأ
ο3b29 <i>τοῖς τόνοις</i>	172/11	الهاديات	هدي
ο6a34 <i>τὴν ἀδολεσχίαν</i>	182/14	بالهذو	هذي
π1a26 <i>ἔξεχεαν</i>	201/12	ستهراق	هرق
π1b34 <i>ἔπτατε</i>	203/10	هز	هز
ο3b31 <i>σκοποῦσιν</i>	172/13 ⁸² [...]	يهزلون أو	هزل
ο8b20 <i>εἰρωνείας</i>	192/5	مزاح أو هزل	
ι0a13 <i>ἀπώλοντο</i>	197/10	هلكوا	هلك
π1a2 <i>ἀπολομένην</i>	200/7	الذين هلكوا	
π1a32 <i>τελευτησάντων</i>	201/18	الذين هلكوا	
ο4a15 <i>τοῖς ἐλέοις</i>	173/14	ذوات الهم	هم
ο8a19 <i>ταπεινῶς</i>	189/22	للهم والجزأ	
ο8a29 <i>ἔξει</i>	190/10	الهمة	
ο8a30 <i>καθ' ἅπασαν ἔξιν</i>	190/11	في كل همة من الهمم	
ο8a31 <i>τῇ ἔξει</i>	190/13	الهمة	
ι0b33 <i>ἐπιπόλαιον</i>	200/1	بالإهمال	همل
ι0b32 <i>ἀλλότριαν</i>	199/25	غريبا أو مهملا	
ο4a12 <i>γεωμετρεῖν</i>	173/10 [...]	يهندس أو	هندس
ο6b30 <i>γεωμετρεῖν</i>	184/7	المهندس	
π1b9 <i>κινδυνεύοντος</i>	202/4f	أحدث ... هولاً وذعراً	هول
ο8a14 <i>κόσμος</i>	189/17	بالتهيأة	هيء
ο3b19 <i>πέφυκε</i>	171/18	متهيأة في الطباع	
ο7a21 <i>πεφύκασι</i>	185/18	متهيأة	

⁸² Mistranslation, perhaps due to the reading *σκοπτοῦσιν*.

04b8	σεμνοτέραν	175/8	زيادة الهيبة والحذر	هيب
و				
08b2f	προεπιπλήττειν	191/4	يثب أو [يتوهم]	وثب
06b27f	τῶν δεσμῶν	184/4	وثاق	وثق
06b29	ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν	184/6	من وثاقها	
04a3	ἔχοντος	172/23	يجب لها	وجب
04b4	ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα	مجاوزه للقدر الذي يستوجب		
		175/1f		
07b28	συντομίαν	188/13	الإيجاز	وجز
07b36, 39	συντόμως	188/23, 189/2	الإيجاز	
03b22	τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	172/1f	الحيلة في الأخذ بالوجه	وجه
03b23	ὑπεκρίνοντο	172/4	يستعملون الأخذ بالوجه	
03b34	οἱ ὑποκριταί	172/16	ذوو الأخذ بالوجه	
04a13	τῇ ὑποκριτικῇ	173/12	الأخذ بالوجه	
04a15	τὸ ὑποκριτικόν	173/14	الأخذ بالوجه	
04a18	τὴν ὑπόκρισιν	173/18	الأخذ بالوجه	
05b34	γίνεται	180/18	تكون من ... أوجه	
05b35f	τὸν πολυπρόσωπον	180/20	كثيرة الوجوه	
07b35	διαπτυχαί	188/21	ذوات وجهين	
08b6	τῷ προσώπῳ	191/9	الوجه	
08b17	ἐνθουσιάζοντες	192/2	على جهة النبأ	
11b11	πάντα τρόπον	202/7	بكل جهة	
09b17	τὴν μονόκωλον	195/19	ذات الشعبة الواحدة	وحد
11a5	ἑτερόφθαλμον	200/10	ذات عين واحدة	
06a31	ποίημα	182/10	مستوخما مستشعنا	وخم
05b33	παρατηρεῖν	180/16	نتوخي	وخي
06a16	στοχάζεσθαι	181/16	يتوخي	
10b35	στοχάζεσθαι	200/3	نتوخي	
12a12	εὐστόχου	الذي يحسن أن يتوخي الغرض		
		203/24f		
12a2	μαιμώνωσα	203/12	لم يرث لابن أمه ⁸³	ورث
04a13	ἔλθη	173/11	وردت	[a] ورد
10a18	ἐλθόντες	197/15	وردوا علينا	

⁸³ Expression misunderstood by the translator.

05b19f ῥοδοδάκτυλος	180/2 وردية الأصابع	[b] ورد
π1α31 τῶ ἐπιταφίῳ	201/16f ذكر الموارات	وري
09b7f μετρεῖται	195/13 يوزن	وزن
04a32, 08b34 τῶν μέτρων	174/12, 193/6 الأوزان	
04a31 τῶν τετραμέτρων	174/12 الوزن المربع	
04a34 τὰ ἑξάμετρα	174/16 الأوزان المسدسة	
04b12 τῶν μέτρων	175/12 [الأوزان]	
06b1f τοῖς διθυραμβοποιῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى 182/19f [ديثورامبو]	
06b2 τοῖς ἐποποιῖς	الذين يصنعون الوزن الذي يسمّى 182/21f افي	
06b3 [τοῖς ἰαμβείοις]	الوزن الذي يسمّى ايامبو 183/2	
07a14 τοῦ ἀνάλογον	185/11 المعادلة والوزن	
08b21 ἔμμετρον	192/7 ذي وزن ... عدد	
08b22 ἀρρυθμον	192/7 غير ذي وزن ولا عدد	
08b27 μέτρον	192/14 وزن	
08b30, 09a8 μέτρον	192/18, 193/19 وزن	
08b35 ἰαμβεία	193/5f الوزن اليامبيقي	
09a1 τὰ τετράμετρα	193/8 [الوزن ...]	
09a1 τὰ τετράμετρα	193/9 الأوزان المربعة	
09a7f μετρικοί	193/17 من طريق الأوزان	
09a25 τοῖς διθυράμβοις	الذي يكون في وزن الدثرامبو 194/16	
05a8 τῶν μέτρων	177/8 الموزون	
09b6 τὰ μέτρα	195/12 الكلام الموزون	
07b8 σκευή	187/9 وسطاً بين ذلك	وسط
07b28 τοῦ μέσου	188/13 الوسط	
π1b2f διὰ μέσων	201/20 وسط	
π1b4 διὰ μέσου	201/21 الوسط	
03b29, 30 μέση	172/11, 12 الوسطى	
09a33 κάμνουσι	195/4 يصبهم	وصب
07b30 τῶ λόγῳ	188/15 في الصفة	وصف
07b31 τὸν λόγον	188/16 الصفة	
π1b12 τὸ ... μελετᾶν	202/8 الوصف	
07b18 διαστίξαι	187/23 يتصل	وصل
09b13f κῶλοις	195/16 الوصل	

09b17, 10a23 τὰ κῶλα	195/19, 197/21 الوصول	
09b30 τοὺς μακροκῶλους	196/11 الوصول الطوال	
09b31 βραχύκωλοι	196/12 التي صغرت وصولها	
09b32 κῶλοις	196/14 الوصول	
09b36 τῶ κῶλῳ	196/17 الوصل	
10a25 τὸ κῶλον	198/1f الوصول	
08b33 ἄρμονίας	193/4 التوصيل	
06a11 πυκνοῖς	181/10 المتصلات	
06a16 μείζον	181/16 المتصلة والكثيرة	
06a20 πυκνοῖς	181/20 المتصلة	
07b31 δηλοῦν	188/16 يوضح	وضح
05b15 θετέον	179/19 ينبغي ... أن يضع	وضع
05b22 ποιεῖσθαι	180/4 يضع	
05b3 πρόσθεσις	179/6 تقديم وضع	
10b36 ἀντιθέσεως	200/4 الوضع بالخلاف	
11b1 ἀντίθεσιν	201/19 الوضع بالخلاف	
03b15 τὰ ... τόποι	171/12 موضع	
07b13 διαστίξαι	187/17 موضع التنقيط	
07b14 ἔργον	187/19 موضع عمل	
05a10 τὰ ἐπίθετα	177/11 الموضوعات	
05b21, 06a11, 07b31f τοῖς ἐπιθέοις	180/4, 181/9, الموضوعات 188/18	
05b22 τὰς ἐπιθέσεις	180/5 الموضوعات	
06a11 τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	181/9 الموضوعات	
06a19 τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	181/19 الأسماء الموضوعية	
06a31 ἐπίθετον	182/10 موضوع	
07b31f τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις	188/18 الموضوعات	
08a11 ὑποκειμένοις	189/14 الموضوعية	
08b11 τὰ ἐπίθετα	191/14 الموضوعية	
10a22f ἀντίθεσις	197/20 الموضوعية بالخلاف	
10b1 ἀντίθεσιν	198/15 موضوعا بالخلاف	
10b3 ἀντιθέσεις	198/17 موضوعات بالخلاف	
08b11 μάλιστα ἀρμόττει	191/15 أوفق	وفق
03b31 ἄρμονία	172/14 التوفيق	
04b19 πεφυκότως	175/19 بالموافقة	
08a36 τὸ ... εὐκαίρως	191/1 في الوقت الموافق	

08a36 <i>μη εὐκαίρως</i>	191/1 [في الوقت] غير الموافق	
10b1 <i>ὁμοιοτέλευτον</i>	198/15 موافقا في النهاية	
04b38 <i>ὁμωνυμία</i>	176/19 المتَّفقات الأسماء	
11a30 <i>τοὺς συντρέχοντας</i>	201/16 يتوافقون	وفي
11a29 <i>τὰς συνδρομάς</i>	201/15 التوافي	
11a29f [<i>ἐκκλησίας</i>]	201/15 التوافي جموعا	
07b5 <i>προσορίζονται</i>	187/5 يحدّون أو يوقّتون	وقت
08a36 <i>τὸ ... εὐκαίρως</i>	191/1 في الوقت الموافق	
08a36 <i>μη εὐκαίρως</i>	191/1 [في الوقت] غير الموافق	
12a3 <i>τὸ ἀναισχυντεῖν</i>	203/14 الاستحياء والوقاحة	وقح
07b21 <i>προαιρεῖται</i>	186/14 يوقعوا	وقح
10b35 <i>μέλλοντα</i>	200/3 يتوقّعن	
09b35 <i>τοὺς ... ἀγῶνας</i>	196/16 وقائع	
11b15 <i>μέλλοντα</i>	202/11 واقعتان	
05b32 <i>εὐλαβεῖσθαι</i>	180/16 نتوقّي	وقي
08b35 <i>σεμνότητα</i>	193/6 نتوقّي	
06b3 <i>σεμνόν</i>	183/1 التوقّي	
08a13 <i>σεμνῶς</i>	189/16 بالتوقّي	
08a18 <i>εὐλαβουμένου</i>	189/21 التوقّي	
10a30f <i>τετοκέναι</i>	198/8 يولد لي	ولد
07a2 <i>τοῖς παιδίοις</i>	184/17 الولدان	
04b13 <i>ἀρμόττει</i>	175/12 يستولي ويليق	ولي
10a9 <i>ἔλαβον</i>	197/6 استولوا	
11a10f <i>σπεισαμένων</i>	200/16 استولى ... واحتوا	
04b6 <i>τὰ κύρια</i>	175/4 المستولية	
04b31 <i>τὸ ... κύριον</i>	176/14 المستولية	
04b35 <i>τοῖς κυρίοις</i>	176/16 المستوليات	
05a2 <i>κύρια</i>	177/3 مستوليتان	
05b11f <i>κυριώτερον</i>	179/15 المستولي	
08b2f <i>προεπιπλήττειν</i>	191/4 [يثب أو يتوهّم]	وهم
04a11 <i>φαντασία</i>	173/9f متخيّل أو متوهم	
ي		
08b32 <i>ὁ ... ἡρώος</i>	193/3 البيارايقيّة	يارايقيّة
08b33 <i>ὁ ... ἱάμβος</i>	193/4 اليامبيقيّة	يامبقي

ο8β35 <i>ιαμβεία</i>	193/5f الوزن اليامبيقي	
ο9β9 τὰ ... <i>ιαμβεία</i>	195/15 اليامبو	يامبو
ιοβιο <i>ῥαδίως</i>	199/1 يسر	يسر
ο7α19 τὸ <i>ἐλληνίζειν</i>	185/16 تعلم اليونانية	يوناني

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abū al-Barakāt al-Baġdādī: *al-Kitāb al-mu‘tabar fī al-ḥikmah li-sayyid al-ḥukamā’ ‘awḥād al-zamān Abī al-Barakāt Hibat Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn Malkā al-Baġdādī*. Hyderabad, 1357–1358 AH.
- Abū Ridā, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Hādī (ed.): *Rasā’il al-Kindī al-falsafiyah*. Cairo, 1950–1954.
- Adamson, Peter: ‘Aristotelianism and the Soul in the Arabic Plotinus’. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62 (2001): 211–232.
- Afnan, Soheil M.: *Philosophical Terminology in Arabic and Persian*. Leiden, 1964.
- Anawati, Georges C.: ‘[rev.] M. Sālim, *Ibn Sīnā, Kitāb al-maġmū’*’. *Mélanges d’Institut Dominicain d’études orientales du Caire* 1 (1954): 131–132.
- ‘La Ḥikma ‘arūdiyya d’Ibn Sīnā’. In Zeki Velidi Togan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Congress of Orientalists. Held in Istanbul September 15th to 22nd, 1951*, vol. 2, 171–176. Leiden, 1957.
- ‘[rev.] ‘A. Badawī, *Aristotalis, al-Ḥaṭāba’*. *Mélanges d’Institut Dominicain d’études orientales du Caire* 6 (1959–1961a): 260–261.
- ‘[rev.] ‘A. Badawī, *Averrois Paraphrases in Libros Rhetoricorum Aristotelis’*. *Mélanges d’Institut Dominicain d’études orientales du Caire* 6 (1959–1961b): 261–263.
- Ansari, Zafar Ishaq: ‘Islamic Juristic Terminology before Shāfi‘ī: A Semantic Analysis with Special Reference to Kūfa’. *Arabica* 19 (1972): 255–300.
- Aouad, Maroun: ‘Les fondements de la Rhétorique d’Aristote reconsidérés par Fārābī, ou le concept de point de vue immédiat et commun’. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 2 (1992): 133–180.
- ‘[rev.] R. Würsch, *Avicennas Bearbeitungen der aristotelischen Rhetorik’*. *Bulletin critique des Annales islamologiques* 10 (1993): 106–121.
- ‘Les fondements de la Rhétorique d’Aristote reconsidérés par Averroès dans l’abrégé de la rhétorique, ou le développement du concept de “point de vue immédiat”’. In William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities*, vol. 6, 261–313. New Brunswick, London, 1994.
- ‘Définition par Averroès du concept de “point de vue immédiat” dans le *Commentaire moyen de la Rhétorique’*. *Bulletin d’études orientales* 48 (1996): 115–130.
- ‘Définition du concept de loué selon le point de vue immédiat sans la *Rhétorique du Sīfā’*’. In Ahmad Hasnawī, Abdelalī Elamrani-Jamal and Maroun Aouad (eds.), *Perspectives arabes et médiévales sur la tradition scientifique et philosophique grecque, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, vol. 79, 409–451. Leuven, Paris, 1997a.
- ‘La doctrine rhétorique d’Ibn Riḍwān et la Didascalia in Rhetoricam Aristotelis ex glosa Alfarabii [part 1]’. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 7 (1997b): 163–245.
- ‘La doctrine rhétorique d’Ibn Riḍwān et la Didascalia in Rhetoricam Aristotelis ex glosa Alfarabii [part 2]’. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 8 (1998a): 131–160.
- ‘Le texte arabe du chapitre sur la rhétorique d’Ibn Riḍwān et ses correspondants dans la *Didascalia in Rhetoricam Aristotelis ex glosa Alfarabii*: fragments du *Grand Commentaire a la Rhétorique d’al-Fārābī*’. In Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Rhétorique d’Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l’antiquité au XVIIe*

- siècle, 169–225. Tradition de la pensée classique, Paris, 1998b.
- 'Les prémisses rhétoriques selon les *Īsārāt* d'Avicenne'. In Philippe Büttgen, Stéphane Diebler and Marwan Rashed (eds.), *Théories de la phrase et de la proposition de Platon à Averroès, Etudes de littérature ancienne*, vol. 10, 281–304. Paris, 1999a.
- 'Manāhiġ Ibn Rušd fi al-qawl fi al-'aqāwil al-ḥuṭabīyah wa-talḥiṣ al-ḥiṭābah'. In Miqdād 'Arafah Mansīyah (ed.), *Ibn Rušd, faylasūf al-šarq wa-al-ġarb fi al-dikrā al-mi'awīyah al-tāminah li-wafāti-hi*, vol. 2, 41–55. Tunis, 1999b.
- Aouad, Maroun (ed.): *Averroès (Ibn Rušd). Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote. Textes et traditions*, Paris, 2002.
- *Le Livre de la Rhétorique du philosophe et médecin Ibn Ṭumlūs (Albāgiag bin Thal-mus)*, *Textes et traditions*, vol. 13. Paris, 2006.
- Aouad, Maroun and Marwan Rashed: 'L'exégèse de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote: Recherches sur quelques commentateurs grecs, arabes et byzantins. Première partie'. *Medioevo. Rivista di storia della filosofia medievale* 23 (1997): 43–189.
- 'Commentateurs "satisfaisants" et "non satisfaisants" de la *Rhétorique* selon Averroès'. In Gerhard Endress and Jan A. Aertsen (eds.), *Averroes and the Aristotelian Tradition. Sources, Constitution and Reception of the Philosophy of Ibn Rushd (1126–1198). Proceedings of the Fourth Symposium Averroicum (Cologne, 1996), Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, vol. 31, 83–124. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1999.
- Arnzen, Rüdiger (ed.): *Aristoteles De Anima: eine verlorene spätantike Paraphrase in arabischer und persischer Überlieferung, Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, vol. 9. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1998.
- Assín, Miguel (ed.): *Introducción al arte de la lógica por Abentomlús de Alcira*. Madrid, 1916.
- 'Aṭīyah, Aḥmad 'Abd al-Ḥalīm (ed.): *al-Fikr al-siyāsī wa-l-'ablāqī 'ind al-Āmiri. Dirāsah wa-taḥqīq kitāb al-sa'ādah wa-l-'is'ād fi al-sīrah al-'insānyah*. Cairo, 1991.
- Badawī, 'Abdurrahmān (ed.): *Manṭiq Aristū, Dirāsāt 'islāmīyah*, vol. 7. Cairo, 1948–1952.
- *Aristūṭālīs: al-ḥiṭābah. al-tarġamah al-'arabīyah al-qadīmah, Dirāsāt 'islāmīyah*, vol. 23. Cairo, 1959.
- *Averroès Paraphrases in Librorum Rhetoricorum Aristotelis [Ibn Rušd. talḥiṣ al-ḥiṭābah]*, *Dirāsāt 'islāmīyah*, vol. 24. Cairo, 1960.
- Badawī, 'Abdurrahmān: *La transmission de la Philosophie grecque au monde arabe, Etudes de philosophie médiévale*, vol. 56. Paris, 1968.
- '[rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroès' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics", "Rhetoric", and "Poetics"*. *Revista del Instituto egipcio de estudios islámicos en Madrid* 20 (1979–1980): 183–186.
- Baffioni, Carmela: 'Defining ḥikmah: some preliminary notes'. In Gerhard Endress and Marita Schmeink (eds.), *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum II, Archivum Graeco-Arabicum*, vol. 1, 3–9. Amsterdam, 1989.
- Barnes, Jonathan (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Baumstark, Anton: *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*. Bonn, 1922.
- Bergsträsser, Gotthelf: 'Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq über die syrischen und arabische Galen-Übersetzungen'. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 17 (1925): 1–49.
- 'Neue Materialien zu Hunain ibn Iṣḥāq's Galen-Bibliographie'. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 19 (1932): 1–108.
- Berman, Lawrence V.: '[rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroès' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics", "Rhetoric", and "Poetics"*. *Middle Eastern Studies Association. Bulletin* 15 (1981): 55–57.
- Berti, Vittorio: 'Libre e biblioteche cristiane nell'Iraq dell'VIII secolo. Una testimonianza dell'epistolario del patriarca siro-orientale Timoteo I (727–823)'. In Cristina

- D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 107, 307–317. Leiden, Boston, 2007.
- Black, Deborah L.: *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy, Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, vol. 7. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1990.
- Blau, Joshua: *A Grammar of Christian Arabic, based mainly on South-Palestinian texts from the first millenium, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, vols. 267, 276, 279. Louvain, 1967.
- 'Das frühe Neuarabisch in mittelarabischen Texten'. In Wolfdietrich Fischer (ed.), *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, 96–109. Wiesbaden, 1982.
- *The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judaeo-Arabic. A Study of the Origins of Neo-Arabic and Middle Arabic*. Jerusalem, 3. edn., 1999.
- Blaustein, Michael: 'The Scope and Methods of Rhetoric in Averroes' *Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Rhetoric*'. In Charles E. Butterworth (ed.), *The Political Aspect of Islamic Philosophy. Essays in Honor of Muhsin Mahdi, Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs*, vol. 27, 262–303. Cambridge/Mass., 1992.
- Bogges, William F.: 'Alfarabi and the Rhetoric: The Cave Revisited'. *Phronesis* 15 (1970): 86–90.
- 'Hermannus Alemannus's Rhetorical Translations'. *Viator* 2 (1971): 227–250.
- Bonebakker, Seger A. (ed.): *The Kitāb naqd al-šī'r of Qudāma b. Ġa'far al-Kātib al-Baġdādī*. Leiden, 1956.
- Bonebakker, Seger A.: 'Aspects of the History of Literary Rhetoric and Poetics in Arabic Literature'. *Viator* 1 (1970): 75–95.
- Bottin, Luigi: 'La tradizione araba della *Retorica* di Aristotele e il problema dell'*exemplar decurtatum*'. In *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano*, 53–62. Bologna, 1975.
- *Contributi della tradizione greco-latina e arabo-latina al testo della Retorica di Aristotele, Studia Aristotelica*, vol. 8. Padova, 1977.
- Brock, Sebastian P.: 'Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek'. *Journal of the Syriac Academy (Baghdad)* 3 (1977): 406–422.
- 'From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning'. In Nina G. Garsoian, Thomas F. Mathews and Robert W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, 17–34. Washington/DC, 1982.
- 'Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique'. In René Lavenant (ed.), *III. Symposium Syriacum 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures, Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 221, 1–14. Rome, 1983.
- 'The Syriac Background to Ḥunayn's Translation Techniques'. *Aram* 3 (1991): 139–162.
- 'The Syriac Commentary Tradition'. In Charles Burnett (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Traditions*, 3–18. Warburg Institute surveys and texts, London, 1993.
- 'Greek and Syriac in Late Antique Syria'. In Sebastian Brock (ed.), *From Ephrem to Romanos*, 149–160, 234–235 [orig. pag.]. Variorum Collected Studies, Aldershot, 1999.
- 'A Syriac Intermediary for the Arabic Theology of Aristotle? In Search of a Chimera'. In Cristina D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 107, 293–306. Leiden, Boston, 2007.
- van den Broek, Roelof: 'The Christian "School" of Alexandria in the Second and Third Centuries'. In Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History*, vol. 61, 39–47. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995.
- Browne, Gerald M.: 'Ad Proclum Arabum'. *Orientalia* 53 (1984): 459–460.

- Brunschwig, Jacques: 'Aristotle's Rhetoric as a "Counterpart" to Dialectic'. In Amélie Oksenberg Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric, Philosophical Traditions*, vol. 6, 34–55. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1996.
- Burnyeat, Miles F.: 'Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric'. In Amélie Oksenberg Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric, Philosophical Traditions*, vol. 6, 88–115. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1996.
- Butterworth, Charles E. (ed.): *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics", "Rhetoric", and "Poetics"*. Studies in Islamic Philosophy and Science, Albany/New York, 1977.
- Butterworth, Charles E.: 'The Political Teaching of Averroes'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 2 (1992): 187–202.
- Butterworth, Charles E. (ed.): *Averroes' Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Poetics*. Princeton/New Jersey, 1996.
- Butterworth, Charles E.: 'Averroes' Platonization of Aristotle's Art of Rhetoric'. In Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Rhétorique d'Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVIIe siècle*, 227–240. Tradition de la pensée classique, Paris, 1998.
- Conrad, Lawrence I.: '*Varietas Syriaca*. Secular and Scientific Culture in the Christian Communities of Syria after the Arab Conquest'. In Gerrit J. Reinink and Alexander C. Klugkist (eds.), *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor Han J. W. Drijvers, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, vol. 89, 85–105. Leuven, 1999.
- Crone, Patricia and Martin Hinds: *God's Caliph. Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications*, vol. 37. Cambridge, 1986.
- Dahan, Gilbert: 'L'entrée de la Rhétorique d'Aristote dans le monde latin entre 1240 et 1270'. In Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Rhétorique d'Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVIIe siècle*, 65–86. Tradition de la pensée classique, Paris, 1998.
- Daiber, Hans: *Aetius Arabus. Die Vorsokratiker in arabischer Überlieferung, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der orientalischen Kommission*, vol. 33. Wiesbaden, 1980.
- : *Bibliography of Islamic Philosophy, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One: The Near and Middle East*, vol. 1/43. Leiden, 1999.
- : 'Die Aristotelesrezeption in der syrischen Literatur'. In Dieter Kuhn and Helga Stahl (eds.), *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt*, 327–345. Heidelberg, 2001.
- D'Ancona Costa, Cristina: 'Sources et structure du *Liber de Causis*'. In Cristina D'Ancona Costa (ed.), *Recherches sur le Liber de Causis, Etudes de philosophie médiévale*, vol. 72, 23–52. Paris, 1995.
- Dayf, Šawqī: *al-Balāgh: taṭāwūw wa-ta'riḥ*. Cairo, 1965.
- Denniston, John D.: *The Greek Particles*. Oxford, 1954.
- Dietrich, Albert (ed.): *Über den Weg zur Glückseligkeit durch den ärztlichen Beruf, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Kl.*, vol. 129 (Folge 3). Göttingen, 1982.
- Dodge, Bayard (ed.): *The Fibrist of al-Nadīm, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies*. New York, London, 1970.
- Drijvers, Han J. W.: 'The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture'. In Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History*, vol. 61, 49–59. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995.

- Drossaart Lulofs, Hendrik Joan and Jan Brugman (eds.): *Aristotle, Generation of Animals: The Arabic Translation commonly ascribed to Yaḥyā ibn al-Biṭrīq, Publication of the 'De Goeje Fund'*, vol. 23. Leiden, 1971.
- Dunlop, Douglas Morton (tr.), Anna A. Akasoy and Alexander Fidora (eds.): *The Arabic Version of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, vol. 17. Leiden, Boston, 2005.
- Dutton, Yasin (ed.): *The Origins of Islamic Law: The Qur'an, the Muwaṭṭa' and Madinan 'Amal. Culture and Civilization in the Middle East*, London, 2002.
- Dānēš-Pāzūh, Muḥammad Taqī (ed.): *Manṭiqiyyāt li-l-Fārābī*. Qum, 1988–1990.
- Dānēš-Pāzūh, Muḥammad Taqī: *Manṭiq li-Ibn al-Muqaffa'. Ḥudūd al-manṭiq li-Ibn Bibriz, Entešārāt-e Anḡumān-e šābānsābī-ye falsafe-ye Irān*, vol. 44. Tehran, 1978.
- El-Hibri, Tayeb: 'The Regicide of the Caliph al-Amin and the Challenge of Representation in Medieval Islamic Historiography'. *Arabica* 42 (1995): 334–364.
- Elamrani-Jamal, Abdelali: 'Eléments nouveaux pour l'étude de l'Introduction à l'art de la logique d'Ibn Ṭumlūs'. In Ahmad Hasnawi, Abdelali Elamrani-Jamal and Maroun Aouad (eds.), *Perspectives arabes et médiévales sur la tradition scientifique et philosophique grecque, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta*, vol. 79, 465–483. Leuven, Paris, 1997.
- Endress, Gerhard: *Die arabischen Übersetzungen von Aristoteles' Schrift De Caelo*. Frankfurt/Main, 1966.
- *Proclus Arabus: Zwanzig Abschnitte aus der Institutio Theologica in arabischer Übersetzung, Beirut Texte und Studien*, vol. 10. Beirut, 1973.
- 'Die wissenschaftliche Literatur'. In Helmut Gätje (ed.), *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, vol. 2, 400–506 and 3, 3–152. Wiesbaden, 1987.
- 'Die griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen und die Sprache der arabischen Wissenschaften'. In Gerhard Endress and Marita Schmeink (eds.), *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum II, Archivum Graeco-Arabicum*, vol. 1, 103–145. Amsterdam, 1989.
- 'The Defense of Reason: The Plea for Philosophy in the Religious Community'. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 6 (1990): 1–49.
- 'Al-Kindī über die Wiedererinnerung der Seele: Arabischer Platonismus und die Legitimation der Wissenschaften im Islam'. *Oriens* 34 (1994): 174–221.
- 'The Circle of al-Kindī: Early Arabic Translations and the Rise of Islamic Philosophy'. In Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism: Studies in the Transmission of Greek Philosophy and Sciences*, 43–76. Leiden, 1997.
- 'Building the Library of Arabic Philosophy. Platonism and Aristotelianism in the Sources of al-Kindī'. In Cristina D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 107, 319–350. Leiden, Boston, 2007.
- Endress, Gerhard and Dimitri Gutas (eds.): *A Greek and Arabic lexicon: materials for a dictionary of the medieval translations from Greek into Arabic, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One: The Near and Middle East*, vol. 11. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1992–.
- van Ess, Josef: 'Ibn Kullāb und die Mihna'. *Oriens* 18–19 (1965–1966): 92–142.
- Farmer, Henry George: *A History of Arabian Music to the XIIIth Century*. London, 1929.
- Flügel, Gustav (ed.): *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Leipzig, 1871–1872.
- Frank, Richard M.: 'Some Fragments of Ishāq's Translation of the De Anima'. *Cabiers de Byrsa* 8 (1958–1959): 231–251.
- 'Meanings Are Spoken of in Many Ways: The Earlier Arab Grammarians'. *Le Muséon* 94 (1981): 259–319.
- "'lam yazal" as a Formal Term in Muslim Theological Discourse'. *Mélanges d'Institut*

- Dominicain d'études orientales du Caire* 22 (1994): 243–270.
- Freese, John Henry (ed.): *Aristotle. The "Art" of Rhetoric, The Loeb Classical Library*, vol. 22. Cambridge/Mass., London, 1994.
- Friedrich, Gerhard (ed.): *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 8. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz, 1969.
- Gacek, Adam: *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition. A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One: The Near and Middle East*, vol. 58. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2001.
- Galston, Miriam: 'Al-Farabi et la logique aristotélicienne dans la philosophie islamique'. In Mohammed Allal Sinaceur (ed.), *Aristote aujourd'hui*, 192–217. Paris, 1988.
- Georr, Khalil: *Les Catégories d'Aristote dans leurs versions syro-arabes*. Beirut, 1948.
- Gerzymisch-Arbogast, Heidrun: *Übersetzungswissenschaftliches Propädeutikum, Uni-Taschenbücher für Wissenschaft*, vol. 1782. Tübingen, Basel, 1994.
- Gibb, Hamilton A. R. (ed.): *The Encyclopedia of Islam*. Leiden, 2. edn., 1954–2005.
- Goulet, Richard (ed.): *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Paris, 1989–.
- *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques. Supplément*. Paris, 2003.
- Graf, Georg: *Der Sprachgebrauch der ältesten christlich-arabischen Literatur*. Leipzig, 1905.
- Green, Lawrence D.: 'The Reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in the Renaissance'. In William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities*, vol. 6, 320–348. New Brunswick, London, 1994.
- Grignaschi, Mario: 'Al-Fārābī et "l'épître sur les connaissances à acquérir avant d'entreprendre l'étude de la philosophie"'. *Türkiyat Mecmüasi* 15 (1968): 175–210.
- 'Les traductions latines des ouvrages de la logique arabe et l'Abrégé d'Alfarabi'. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 47 (1972): 45–60.
- Gueguen, John A.: [rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics"*. *The American Political Science Review* 72 (1978): 1372–1373.
- Guidi, Michelangelo and Richard Walzer: 'Studi su al-Kindī: I—Uno scritto introduttivo allo studio di Aristotele'. *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 6 (ser. 6) (1940): 375–405.
- Gutas, Dimitri: *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition. Introduction to reading Avicenna's philosophical works, Islamic Philosophy and Theology. Texts and Studies*, vol. 4. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1988.
- 'On Translating Averroës' Commentaries'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110 (1990): 92–101.
- 'Aspects of Literary Form and Genre in Arabic Logical Works'. In Charles Burnett (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Traditions*, 29–76. Warburg Institute surveys and texts, London, 1993.
- 'Pre-Plotinian Philosophy in Arabic (Other than Platonism and Aristotelianism): A Review of the Sources'. In Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Teil II: Principat*, vol. 36/7, 4939–4973. Berlin, New York, 1994.
- *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture*. London, New York, 1998.
- 'The "Alexandria to Baghdad" Complex of Narratives. A Contribution to the Study of Philosophical and Medical Historiography among the Arabs'. *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 10 (1999): 155–193.
- 'The Presence of Antiquity in the Sasanian and Early 'Abbāsīd Empires'. In Dieter Kuhn and Helga Stahl (eds.), *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt*, 347–352. Heidelberg, 2001.
- Gyekye, Kwame: *Arabic Logic. Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Commentary on Porphyry's Eisagoge*. Studies

- in *Islamic Philosophy and Science*, Albany/New York, 1979.
- Gätje, Helmut: *Studien zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen Psychologie im Islam*. Heidelberg, 1971.
- [rev.] J. Langhade, *al-Fārābī: Deux ouvrages inédits sur la rhétorique*. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 122 (1972): 349–351.
- Hadot, Pierre (ed.): *Philosophy as a Way of Life*. Oxford, Cambridge/Mass., 1995.
- Halldén, Philip: 'What is Arab Islamic Rhetoric? Rethinking the History of Muslim Oratory Art and Homiletics'. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37 (2005): 19–38.
- Harvey, Steven: [rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics"*. *Review of Metaphysics* 33 (1980): 616–618.
- Hatim, Basil: *Communication Across Cultures. Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter Linguistic Studies, Exeter, 1997.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason: *Discourse and the Translator*. Language in Social Life Series, London, New York, 1990.
- den Heijer, Johannes: 'Syriacisms in the Arabic Version of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* [sic]'. *Aram* 3 (1991): 97–114.
- Hein, Christel: *Definition und Einteilung der Philosophie. Von der spätantiken Einleitungsliteratur zur arabischen Enzyklopädie, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 20: Philosophie*, vol. 177. Frankfurt/Main, Bern, New York, 1985.
- Heinrichs, Wolfhart: *Arabische Dichtung und griechische Poetik. Hāzīm al-Qarṭāğānīs Grundlegung der Poetik mit Hilfe aristotelischer Begriffe, Beirut Texte und Studien*, vol. 8. Beirut, 1969.
- 'Die antike Verknüpfung von phantasia und Dichtung bei den Arabern'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 128 (1978): 252–298.
- [rev.] M. C. Lyons, *Aristotle's Ars Rhetorica*. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 1 (1984): 312–316.
- al-Ḥūfī, Aḥmad and Badawī Ṭabānah (eds.): *al-Maṭal al-sā'ir fī 'adab al-kātib wa-l-šā'ir li-'Izz al-Dīn ibn al-'Aṭir*. Cairo, 1959–1962.
- Hugonnard-Roche, Henri: 'Sur les versions syriaques des Catégories d'Aristote'. *Journal Asiatique* 275 (1987): 205–222.
- 'Aux origines de l'exégèse orientale de la logique d'Aristote: Sergius de Reš'aina (m. 536), médecin et philosophe'. *Journal Asiatique* 277 (1989a): 1–17.
- 'Sur la tradition syro-arabe de la logique péripatéticienne'. In Geneviève Contamine (ed.), *Traduction et traducteurs au moyen âge: Actes du colloque international du CNRS organisé à Paris, Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes les 26-28 mai 1986*, 3–14. Paris, 1989b.
- 'Les traductions du Grec au Syriaque et du Syriaque à l'Arabe'. In Jacqueline Hamesse and Marta Fattori (eds.), *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale: traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIVe siècle*, Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales, vol. 11, 131–147. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1990.
- 'Contributions Syriaques aux études arabes de logique à l'époque Abbasside'. *Aram* 3 (1991a): 193–210.
- 'L'intermédiaire syriaque dans la transmission de la philosophie grecque à l'arabe: le cas de l'Organon d'Aristote'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 1 (1991b): 187–209.
- 'Une ancienne "édition" arabe de l'Organon d'Aristote: problèmes de traduction et de transmission'. In Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.), *Les problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes anciens et médiévaux*, Université Catholique de Louvain. Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales. Textes, Etudes, Congrès, vol. 13, 139–157. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1992.
- 'Remarques sur la tradition arabe de l'Organon d'après le manuscrit Paris, Biblio-

- thèque nationale, ar. 2346'. In Charles Burnett (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Traditions*, Warburg Institute surveys and texts, vol. 23, 19–28. London, 1993.
- 'Les traductions du syriaque'. In Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.), *Les traducteurs au travail. Leurs manuscrits et leurs méthodes*, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Etudes Médiévales. Textes et Etudes du Moyen Âge, vol. 18, 19–49. Turnhout, 2001.
- 'Le corpus philosophique syriaque aux VIe–VIIe siècles'. In Cristina D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 107, 279–291. Leiden, Boston, 2007.
- Hārūn, 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad (ed.): *Kitāb al-ḥayawān ta'lif Abi 'Utmān 'Amr ibn Baḥr al-Ġāhiz*. Maktabat al-Ġāhiz, Cairo, 2. edn., 1965.
- Ivry, Alfred L. (ed.): *Al-Kindī's Metaphysics. A Translation of Ya'qub ibn Ishāq al-Kindī's Treatise "On First Philosophy" (fī al-Falsafah al-Ūlā)*. Studies in Islamic Philosophy and Science, Albany/New York, 1974.
- Jauss, Hans Robert: *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Brighton, 1982.
- Jolivet, Jean: [rev.] H. Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*. *Arabica* 30 (1983): 215–217.
- 'L'idée de la sagesse et sa fonction dans la philosophie des 4e et 5e siècles'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 1 (1991): 31–65.
- 'L'Épître sur la quantité des livres d'Aristote, par al-Kindī (une lecture)'. In Régis Morelon and Ahmad Hasnawi (eds.), *De Zénon d'Elée à Poincaré. Recueil d'études en hommage à Roshdi Rashed*, *Les Cahiers du MIDEO*, vol. 1, 665–683. Louvain, Paris, 2004.
- Jéhamy, Gerard: *Mawsū'at muṣṭalahāt al-falsafah 'ind al-'arab*. Arabic and Islamic Terminology Encyclopedias, Beirut, 1998.
- *Mawsū'at muṣṭalahāt al-'ulūm 'ind al-'arab*. Arabic and Islamic Terminology Encyclopedias, Beirut, 1999.
- Kahn, Charles H.: 'On the Terminology for *Copula* and *Existence*'. In Samuel Miklos Stern, Albert Hourani and Vivian Brown (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition. Essays presented by his friends to Richard Walzer on his seventieth birthday*, 141–158. Columbia/South Carolina, 1972.
- Kassel, Rudolf: *Der Text der Aristotelischen Rhetorik. Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe, Peripatoi. Philologisch-historische Studien zum Aristotelismus*, vol. 3. Berlin, New York, 1971.
- *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*. Berlin, New York, 1976.
- Kennedy, George A.: *Aristotle, On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford, New York, 1991.
- King, David A.: 'Science in the Service of Religion: The Case of Islam'. *Impact of Science on Society* 40 (1990): 245–262.
- Kraemer, Joel L.: *Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam. The Cultural Revival during the Buyid Age*, *Studies in Islamic Culture and History*, vol. 7. Leiden, New York, Köln, 2. edn., 1992.
- Kraus, Paul: 'Zu Ibn al-Muqaffa'. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 14 (1934): 1–20.
- Kruk, Remke: *The Arabic Version of Aristotle's Parts of Animals. Book XI–XIV of the Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, vol. 97 (n. s.). Amsterdam, Oxford, 1979.
- Kummerer, Christoph: *Der Fürst als Gesetzgeber in den lateinischen Übersetzungen von Averroes, Abhandlungen zur rechtswissenschaftlichen Grundlagenforschung*, vol. 71. Ebelsbach, 1989.
- Kunitzsch, Paul: 'Über das Frühstadium der arabischen Aneignung antiken Gutes'. *Saeculum* 26 (1975): 268–282.

- 'Zur Problematik und Interpretation der arabischen Übersetzungen antiker Texte'. *Oriens* 25–26 (1976): 116–132.
- '[rev.] H. Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*'. *Gnomon* 54 (1982): 335–340.
- Lacroix, Marie-Claude: 'Education et instruction selon Abū l-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī: Présentation et traduction d'un extrait du Kitāb al-sa'āda wa l-is'ād'. *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 87 (1989): 165–214.
- Lameer, Joep: 'Aristotelian Rhetoric and Poetics as Logical Arts in Medieval Islamic Philosophy ([rev.] D. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*)'. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 50 (1993): cols. 563–582.
- *Al-Fārābī and Aristotelian Syllogistics. Greek Theory and Islamic Practice, Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, vol. 20. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1994.
- Langhade, Jacques and Mario Grignaschi (eds.): *al-Fārābī. Deux ouvrages inédits sur la Rhétorique, Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut des lettres orientales de Beyrouth, première série: Pensée Arabe et Musulmane*, vol. 48. Beirut, 1971.
- Larcher, Pierre: 'Éléments de rhétorique aristotélicienne dans la tradition arabe hors la falsafa'. In Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Rhétorique d'Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVIIe siècle*, 241–256. Tradition de la pensée classique, Paris, 1998.
- Lasinio, Fausto (ed.): *Il commento medio di Averroè alla Retorica di Aristotele, pubblicato per la prima volta nel testo arabo, Pubblicazioni del Reale Istituto di Studi Superiori pratici e di perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di filosofia et filologia. Accademia orientale*, vol. 1. Florence, 1875–1878.
- Leaman, Oliver: 'Does the Interpretation of Islamic Philosophy Rest on a Mistake? ([rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics", "Rhetoric", and "Poetics"*)'. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 12 (1980): 525–538.
- '[rev.] D. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*'. *Asian Philosophy* 2 (1992): 102–104.
- Lippert, Julius (ed.): *Ibn al-Qifṭī's Ta'riḥ al-ḥukamā'*. Leipzig, 1903.
- Lyons, Malcolm C. (ed.): *An Arabic Translation of Themistius' Commentary on Aristoteles De anima, Oriental Studies*, vol. 2. Oxford, 1973.
- Lyons, Malcolm C.: *Aristotle's Ars Rhetorica: The Arabic Version*. Cambridge, 1982.
- 'Poetic Quotations in the Arabic Version of Aristotle's Rhetoric'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 12 (2002): 197–216.
- Macúch, Rudolf: 'Greek Technical Terms in Arabic Sources'. *Graeco-Arabica* 1 (1982): 11–34.
- Mahdi, Muhsin (ed.): *Alfarabi's Book of Letters (Kitāb al-Ḥurūf). Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics, Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut des lettres orientales de Beyrouth, première série: Pensée Arabe et Musulmane*, vol. 46. Beirut, 1969.
- Mansfeld, Jaap and David T. Runia: *Aëtiana. The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer. Volume One: The Sources, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 73. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1997.
- Margoliouth, David Samuel: 'On The Arabic Version of Aristotle's Rhetoric'. In George Alexander Kohut (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut*, 376–387. Berlin, 1897.
- Marlow, Louise: *Hierarchy and egalitarianism in Islamic thought. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization*, Cambridge, 1997.
- Mattock, John N.: '[rev.] R. Kruk, *The Arabic Version of Aristotle's Parts of Animals*'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43 (1980): 364–365.
- 'The early translations from Greek into Arabic: an experiment in comparative assessment'. In Gerhard Endress and Marita Schmeink (eds.), *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum*

- II, *Archivum Graeco-Arabicum*, vol. 1, 73–102. Amsterdam, 1989.
- Maṭlūb, Aḥmad and Ḥadiġah Ḥadiṭī (eds.): *Kitāb al-burhān fī wuġūb al-bayān*. Baghdad, 1967.
- Meyerhof, Max: 'New Light on Ḥunain Ibn Ishāq and his Period'. *Isis* 8 (1926): 685–724.
- Minovi, Mojtaba (ed.): *al-ʿĀmirī*: Kitāb al-saʿādah wa-l-ʿisʿād. Wiesbaden, 1336 AH.
- Montgomery, James E.: 'Al-Jāhiz's *Kitāb al-Bayān wa al-Tabayin*'. In Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam. Muslim horizons, Routledge Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol. 11, 91–152. London, New York, 2006.
- 'Al-Ġāhiz and Hellenizing Philosophy'. In Cristina D'Ancona (ed.), *The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Philosophia Antiqua. A Series of Studies on Ancient Philosophy*, vol. 107, 443–456. Leiden, Boston, 2007.
- Morony, Michael G.: *Iraq after the Muslim conquest*. Princeton Studies on the Near East, Princeton, 1984.
- Motzkin, Aryeh Leo: '[rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics" and Commentarium medium in Aristotelis Topica*'. *Speculum* 56 (1981): 842–844.
- Müller, August (ed.): *Ibn Abi Useibia* ['Uyūn al-ʿanbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-ʿaṭibbāʾ]. Königsberg, 1884.
- Najjar, Fauzi M.: '[rev.] al-Fārābī, *Deux ouvrages inédits sur la Rhétorique*'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32 (1973): 504–506.
- Nawas, John A.: 'A Reexamination of Three Current Explanations For al-Maʿmūn's Introduction of the *Miḥna*'. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (1994): 615–629.
- Neuwirth, Angelika (ed.): *ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī's Bearbeitung von Buch Lambda der aristotelischen Metaphysik, Veröffentlichungen der orientalischen Kommission*, vol. 27. Wiesbaden, 1976.
- Ormsby, E. L.: '[rev.] D. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*'. *The Middle East Journal* 46 (1992): 704–705.
- Panoussi, Estiphān: 'Some annotations relating to the Arabic Version of Aristotle's Rhetoric'. In Maria Macúch, Christa Müller-Kessler and Bert G. Fragner (eds.), *Studia Semitica necnon Iranica Rudolpho Macucho septuagenario ab amicis et discipulis dedicata*, 195–200. Wiesbaden, 1989.
- 'The Unique Arabic Manuscript of Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica* and its Two Editions Published to Date by ʿAbdurrahmān Badawī and by M[alcolm] C. Lyons'. In Sayyid Jalāl ad-Dīn Āshtiyānī, Hideichi Matsubara, Takashi Iwami and Akiro Matsumoto (eds.), *Consciousness and Reality. Studies in Memory of Toshibiko Izutsu, Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, vol. 38, 233–250. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000.
- Peters, Francis E.: *Aristoteles Arabus: The Oriental Translations and Commentaries on the Aristotelian Corpus*. Leiden, 1968.
- Pines, Shlomo: 'A Parallel in the East to the "Logica Vetus"'. In Sarah Stroumsa (ed.), *The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines*, vol. 3, 262–266. Jerusalem, 1996.
- Pohl, Stefan: 'Die aristotelische Ethik im *Kitāb as-saʿāda wa-l-ʿisʿād* des Abū I-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī'. In Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*, 201–238. Leiden, 1997.
- Ragep, F. Jamil: 'Freeing Astronomy from Philosophy. An Aspect of Islamic Influence on Science'. *Osiris* 16 (2001): 49–64, 66–71.
- Rapp, Christof (ed.): *Aristoteles: Rhetorik, Aristoteles. Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. Berlin, 2002.
- Rashed, Roshdi: 'Problems of the Transmission of Greek Scientific Thought into Arabic: Examples from Mathematics and Optics'. *History of Science* 27 (1989): 199–209.

- 'Al-Kindī's Commentary on Archimedes' "The Measurement of the Circle". *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 3 (1993): 7–53.
- Reckendorf, Hermann: *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg, 1977.
- Reinink, Gerrit J.: 'Severus Sebokts Brief and den Periodeutes Jonan. Einige Fragen zur aristotelischen Logik'. In René Lavenant (ed.), *III. Symposium Syriacum 1980. Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures, Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 221, 97–107. Rome, 1983.
- Rescher, Nicholas: 'Al-Kindī's Sketch of Aristotle's Organon'. *The New Scholasticism* 37 (1963): 44–58.
- *The Development of Arabic Logic*. Pittsburgh, 1964.
- Richter-Bernburg, Lutz: 'Islamischer Hellenismus zwischen Nil und Indus. Perioden des Hellenisierungsprozesses in der arabisch-islamischen Kultur'. In Gerhard Endress and Marita Schmeink (eds.), *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum II, Archivum Graeco-Arabicum*, vol. 1, 44–64. Amsterdam, 1989.
- Riḍā, Nizār (ed.): *'Uyūn al-'anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-'aṭibbā'*. Beirut, 1965.
- Rosemann, Philipp W.: [rev.] D. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*. *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 33 (1991): 219–222.
- Rosenthal, Franz: 'On the Knowledge of Plato's Philosophy in the Islamic World'. *Islamic Culture* 14 (1940): 387–422.
- *Aḥmad b. aṭ-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī, American Oriental Series*, vol. 26. New Haven/Connecticut, 1943.
- *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam*. Die Bibliothek des Morgenlandes, Zürich, Stuttgart, 1965.
- *Knowledge Triumphant*. Leiden, 1970.
- *The Classical Heritage in Islam*. Arabic Thought and Culture, London, New York, 1992.
- Rosier-Catach, Irène: 'Roger Bacon, al-Farabi et Augustin. Rhétorique, logique et philosophie morale'. In Gilbert Dahan and Irène Rosier-Catach (eds.), *La Rhétorique d'Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVIIe siècle*, 87–110. Tradition de la pensée classique, Paris, 1998.
- Rowson, Everett K.: *A Muslim Philosopher on the Soul and its Fate: Al-Āmirī's Kitāb al-Amad 'alā l-'abad, American Oriental Series*, vol. 70. New Haven/Connecticut, 1988.
- Rémondon, Denise: 'Al-Aḥlāq wa-l-Infī'ālāt an-Nafsāniyah'. In *Mémorial Avicenne*, vol. 4, 19–29. Cairo, 1954.
- Sabra, Abdelhamid I.: 'One Ibn al-Haytham or Two? An Exercise in Reading the Bio-Bibliographical Sources'. *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 12 (1998): 1–50.
- Sallam, A. M. A.: 'Averroes' Commentary on the third Book of Aristotle's Rhetoric', 1952. unpublished, Oriel College, Oxford.
- al-Šannūfī, 'Alī: 'al-Ġadal wa-l-ḥitābah bayn Aristū wa-Ibn Rušd'. In Miqdād 'Arafah Mansiyah (ed.), *Ibn Rušd, faylasūf al-šarq wa-l-ġarb fī al-dikrā al-mi'awiyah al-tāminah li-wafāti-hi*, vol. 2, 55–67. Tunis, 1999.
- Schacht, Josef and Max Meyerhof (eds.): *The Medico-Philosophical Controversy Between Ibn Butlan of Baghdad and Ibn Ridwan of Cairo, Publications of the Egyptian University, Faculty of Arts*, vol. 13. Cairo, 1937.
- Schoeler, Gregor: 'Averroes' Rückwendung zu Aristoteles. Die "Kurzen" und die "Mittleren Kommentare zum Organon" ([rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics"*). *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 37 (1980): 294–301.
- 'Der poetische Syllogismus. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der "logischen" Poetik der Araber'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 133 (1983): 43–92.

- Schrier, Omert J.: 'The Syriac and Arabic Versions of Aristotle's Poetics'. In Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*, 259–278. Leiden, 1997.
- Shehadi, Fadlou A.: 'Arabic and the Concept of Being'. In George F. Hourani (ed.), *Essays on Islamic Philosophy and Science*, 147–157. Studies in Islamic Philosophy and Science, Albany/New York, 1975.
- *Philosophies of Music in Medieval Islam*. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995.
- Shiloah, Amnon: *Music in the world of Islam: a socio-cultural study*. Aldershot, 1995.
- de Slane, Baron William (ed.): *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes*. Paris, 1883–1895.
- Steinschneider, Moritz: *Al-Farabi (Alpharabius): des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften, Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, 7. ser., vol. 13/4. St. Petersburg, 1869.
- *Die europäischen Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Graz, 1956.
- *Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*. Graz, 1960.
- Stern, Samuel Miklos: 'Ibn al-Samḥ'. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1956): 31–44.
- Strohmaier, Gotthard: 'Die griechischen Götter in einer christlich-arabischen Übersetzung. Zum Traumbuch des Artemidor in der Version des Hunain ibn Ishāq'. In Jan Burian (ed.), *Weitere Neufunde. Nordafrika bis zur Einwanderung der Wandalen. Du Nuwās, Die Araber in der alten Welt*, vol. 5/1, 127–162. Berlin, 1968.
- [rev.] H. Daiber, *Aetius Arabus*. *Der Islam* 60 (1983): 315–317.
- 'Hunain Ibn Ishāq—An Arab Scholar Translating into Syriac'. *Aram* 3 (1991): 163–170.
- Stroumsa, Sarah: *Freethinkers of Medieval Islam: Ibn al-Rāwandī, Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and their Impact on Islamic Thought, Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, vol. 35. Leiden, Köln, New York, 1999.
- Sālim, Muḥammad Salim (ed.): *Ibn Sinā, Kitāb al-maǧmūʿaw al-ḥikmah al-ʿarūḍiyah fi maʿāni kitāb riṭūriqā*. Cairo, 1945.
- *Ibn Sinā, al-Šifāʿ. La Logique. 8. Rhétorique (al-Ḥaṭābah)*. Cairo, 1954.
- *Talḥiṣ al-ḥaṭābah*. Cairo, 1967.
- *Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī: Kitāb fi al-mantiq. al-ḥaṭābah*. Cairo, 1976.
- Taylor, Richard C.: 'The *Kalām fi maḥḍ al-Ḥair (Liber de Causis)* in the Islamic Philosophical Milieu'. In Jill Kraye, W. F. Ryan and Charles B. Schmitt (eds.), *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages. The Theology and Other Texts, Warburg Institute surveys and texts*, vol. 11, 37–52. London, 1986.
- Thillet, Pierre: 'Réflexions sur la paraphrase de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote'. In *Multiple Averroès. Actes du Colloque International organisé à l'occasion du 850^e anniversaire de la naissance d'Averroès Paris 20–23 septembre 1976*, 105–116. Paris, 1978.
- 'Réflexions sur les "traductions doubles"'. In Ahmad Hasnawi, Abdelali Elamrani-Jamal and Maroun Aouad (eds.), *Perspectives arabes et médiévales sur la tradition scientifique et philosophique grecque*, 249–263. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, Leiden, Paris, 1997.
- Tkatsch, Jaroslous: *Die arabische Übersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles und die Grundlage der Kritik des griechischen Textes*. Wien, Leipzig, 1928.
- Ullmann, Manfred: '[rev.] J. Langhade, *al-Fārābī: Deux ouvrages inédits sur la Rhétorique*'. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 72 (1977a): cols. 193–195.
- '[rev.] M. C. Lyons, *An Arabic translation of Themistius' Commentary on Aristotle's De anima*'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 127 (1977b): 133–134.
- Ullmann, Manfred (ed.): *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden, 2002–.

- *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts. Supplement I: A bis O*. Wiesbaden, 2006.
- Vajda, Georges: '[rev.] J. Langhade, *Le Kitāb al-Ḥaṭābah d'Al-Fārābi. Texte arabe critique et traduction française*'. *Journal Asiatique* 257 (1969): 191–194.
- '[rev.] J. Langhade, *al-Fārābi: Deux ouvrages inédits sur la rhétorique*'. *Arabica* 20 (1973): 311–313.
- '[rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics"*'. *Arabica* 26 (1979): 195–198.
- Versteegh, Kees: 'Die Mission des Kyrillos im Lichte der arabo-byzantinischen Beziehungen'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 129 (1979): 233–262.
- 'The Origin of the Term "qiyās" in Arabic Grammar'. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 4 (1980): 7–30.
- 'Grammar and Exegesis. The Origins of Kufan Grammar and the Tafsīr Muqātil'. *Der Islam* 67 (1990): 206–242.
- Wakelnig, Elvira (ed.): *Feder, Tafel, Mensch. Al-ʿĀmirī's Kitāb al-Fuṣūl fi l-Maʿālim al-ilāhiya und die arabische Proklos-Rezeption im 10. Jh., Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, vol. 67. Leiden, Boston, 2006.
- Wallbridge, John: 'Explaining Away the Greek Gods in Islam'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59 (1998): 389–403.
- Walzer, Richard: 'Arabic Transmission of Greek Thought to Medieval Europe'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 29 (1945–1946): 160–183.
- 'Islamic Philosophy'. In Richard Walzer (ed.), *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy, Oriental Studies*, vol. 1, 1–28. Oxford, 1962a.
- 'New Light on the Arabic Translations of Aristotle'. In Richard Walzer (ed.), *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy, Oriental Studies*, vol. 1, 60–113. Oxford, 1962b.
- 'New Studies on Al-Kindī'. In Richard Walzer (ed.), *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy, Oriental Studies*, vol. 1, 175–205. Oxford, 1962c.
- 'On the Arabic Versions of Books A, α and Λ of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*'. In Richard Walzer (ed.), *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy, Oriental Studies*, vol. 1, 114–128. Oxford, 1962d.
- 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte der aristotelischen Poetik'. In Richard Walzer (ed.), *Greek into Arabic: Essays on Islamic Philosophy, Oriental Studies*, vol. 1, 129–136. Oxford, 1962e.
- 'Gedanken zur Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie'. *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 50 (1968): 101–114.
- 'L'Eveil de la philosophie islamique'. *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 38 (1970): 7–42, 207–242.
- Wansbrough, John: '[rev.] M. C. Lyons, *Aristotle's Ars Rhetorica*'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47 (1984): 550–551.
- Watt, John W.: 'Antony of Tagrit on Rhetorical Figures'. In H. J. W. Drijvers, René Lavenant, C. Molenberg and Gerrit J. Reinink (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature, Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 229, 317–325. Rome, 1987.
- 'Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 143 (1993a): 45–71.
- 'The Syriac Reception of Platonic and Aristotelian Rhetoric'. *Aram* 5 (1993b): 579–601.
- 'Syriac Rhetorical Theory and the Syriac Tradition of Aristotle's Rhetoric'. In William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities*, vol. 6, 243–260. New

- Brunswick, London, 1994.
- 'Eastward and Westward Transmission of Classical Rhetoric'. In Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 61, 63–75. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995a.
- 'From Themistius to al-Farabi: Platonic Political Philosophy and Aristotle's Rhetoric in the East'. *Rhetorica* 13 (1995b): 17–41.
- 'From Synesius to al-Farabi: Philosophy, Religion, and Rhetoric in the Christian Orient'. In René Lavenant (ed.), *Symposium Syriacum VII, Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 256, 265–277. Rome, 1998.
- Watt, John W. (ed.): *Aristotelian Rhetoric in Syriac. Barhebraeus, Butyrum Sapientiae, Book of Rhetoric, Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, vol. 18. Leiden, 2005.
- Wright, William: *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Cambridge, 1967.
- Würsch, Renate: *Avicennas Bearbeitungen der aristotelischen Rhetorik: ein Beitrag zum Fortleben antiken Bildungsgutes in der islamischen Welt, Islamkundliche Untersuchungen*, vol. 146. Berlin, 1991.
- 'Die Lehre vom Enthymem in der Rhetorik des Aristoteles und ihre Weiterentwicklung bei Avicenna und Averroes'. In Klaus Jacobi (ed.), *Argumentationstheorie. Scholastische Forschungen zu den logischen und semantischen Regeln des korrekten Folgerns, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 38, 589–606. Leiden, New York, Köln, 1993.
- '[rev.] D. Black, *Logic and Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics in Medieval Arabic Philosophy*'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 144 (1994): 380–388.
- Zimmermann, Fritz W.: '[rev.] J. Langhade, *al-Fārābī: Deux ouvrages inédits sur la Rhétorique*'. *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 17 (1974): 263–265.
- '[rev.] Ch. Butterworth, *Averroës' Three Short Commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics"*'. *Der Islam* 56 (1979): 320–322.
- *Al-Farabi's commentary and short treatise on Aristotle's De Interpretatione, Classical and Medieval logic texts*, vol. 3. London, 1981.
- 'The Origins of the so-called *Theology of Aristotle*'. In Jill Kraye, W. F. Ryan and Charles B. Schmitt (eds.), *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages. The Theology and Other Texts, Warburg Institute surveys and texts*, vol. 11, 110–240. London, 1986.
- 'Proclus Arabus Rides Again'. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 4 (1994a): 9–51.
- 'Topics and the Misnamed *Book of Poetic Gleanings* attributed to Aristotle and Alexander of Aphrodisias in a Medieval Arabic Manuscript'. In William W. Fortenbaugh and David C. Mirhady (eds.), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle, Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities*, vol. 6, 314–319. New Brunswick, London, 1994b.

INDEX

- ʿAbbāsids, 14–5, 17–20, 26–30, 35, 189
 early ʿAbbāsids, 5, 13, 22, 27
 ʿAbbāsid court, 21
 ʿAbbāsid ideology, 27
 ʿAbbāsid revolution, 20, 23, 26–7, 51
 ʿAbbāsid society, 25–6
 ʿAbbāsid state, 15, 19, 28
 Abraham of Balmes, 204
 Abū al-Barakāt Hibat Allāh ibn Malkā al-
 Baġdādī, 196
 Kitāb al-muʿtabar fī al-ḥikmah, 196
 Abū al-Faraġ al-Iṣfahānī, 87
 Kitāb al-aġānī, 87–8
 Abū Biṣr Mattā ibn Yūnus al-Qunnāʾī, 7,
 37–8, 56
 translation of the *Poetics*, 40, 63, 70,
 81–2, 87–8, 93, 106, 109, 114
 translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, 40
 Adamson, Peter, 108
 Aḥmad ibn Ṣalāḥ, 58
 Ahrun, 22
 Albertus Magnus, 202
 Alexander of Aphrodisias, 44, 185
 Kitāb al-fawāʾid al-šīʿriyah, 185
 commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 183
 Alexandria, 16, 56–7
 “Alexandria to Baghdad”-narrative, 57,
 59
 Alexandrian commentators, 52, 187, 195
 Alexandrian philosophical tradition, 52,
 56
 Alexandrian teaching tradition, 58, 182
 School of, 56–7, 59
 Amida, 16
 al-Amīn (ʿAbbāsid caliph), 28
 al-ʿĀmirī, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf, 188–90
 Kitāb al-saʿādah wa-l-ʿisʿād, 188–91
 Ammonius of Alexandria, 17, 52
 Andronicus of Rhodes, 73
 Antioch, 16
 Antony of Tagrit, 54–5
 Rhetoric, 54
 and al-Fārābī, 55
 rhetorical thought, 54
 Aouad, Maroun, 186–8, 198
 Arabian Peninsula, 19–20
 Archimedes, 3
 Ardašīr I. (Sasanian ruler), 28
 Aristotle
 Categories, 40, 48, 52, 55, 192, 202
 De anima, 140, 173, 177
 De caelo, 31, 155, 164, 173, 177
 De interpretatione, 7, 40, 52, 55–6, 106,
 202
 Generation of Animals, 137–8, 144, 159–61,
 163–4
 History of Animals, 137, 154–5
 Metaphysics, 8–9, 31–2, 66, 102, 106
 Meteorology, 173, 177–8
 Nicomachean Ethics, 61, 140–1, 146, 152,
 156–63, 165–6, 170–80, 190
 Organon, 16, 38–9, 41–2, 51–2, 54–60,
 66, 185–7, 190, 192, 195, 197–9, 202
 Parts of Animals, 137–8, 144, 158, 164
 Physics, 27
 Poetics, 40–1, 44–5, 51–4, 56–60, 63, 66,
 70, 80–2, 87–8, 93, 106, 110, 114–5, 119,
 184, 186, 189, 191, 193–4, 197, 202–3
 Posterior Analytics, 40, 52, 57
 Prior Analytics, 40–2, 52, 55–8, 202
 Sophistical Refutations, 40–1, 44–5, 53,
 57–8, 138, 157
 Topics, 27, 40–1, 44, 52, 57, 106, 189, 197,
 202
 zoological works, 7, 137–42, 144–50,
 155–60, 162–5, 167–80
 Arles, 204
 Arnzen, Rüdiger, 102, 173, 177–8
 Astorga, 203
 Athanasius of Balad, 55
 Avesta, 26
 Bacon, Roger, 202–3
 Opus maius, 202

- Badawī, ‘Abdurrahmān, 39, 45–7, 50, 69, 85, 103, 197, 199
- Baghdad, 5–6, 13–5, 21, 25, 29, 31, 38, 40, 43, 51, 55, 57, 138, 184
“Alexandria to Baghdad”-narrative, 57, 59
- Baghdad Aristotelians, 14, 37–8, 40, 42–3, 55, 138
- al-Baġdādī, Muwaffaq al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Latīf, 201
- Banū Mūsā, 184
- Banū Šākir, 31
- Bar Hebraeus, 54
Butyrum sapientiae, 60
and Ibn Sīnā, 60
- Beirut, 16
- Bible
New Testament, 16, 79–80
- al-Bīṭrīq, 31
- Blau, Joshua, 147
- Boethius, 202
- Brugman, Jan, 138–9, 141
- Byzantine Empire, 16, 20, 26, 28, 31, 161
administrators, 20
conquered by Muslims, 18, 20–1
culture, 20
education, 35, 208
literature, 79
theological disputes, 15, 25
- Cairo, 39, 50
- Cicero, 203
- Constantinople, 15
- Ctesiphon, 16
- Daiber, Hans, 139, 141, 151, 157, 161–2
- Damascus, 25
- Denniston, John D., 125, 129, 133
- al-Dimašqī, Abū ‘Uṭmān Sa‘īd ibn Ya‘qūb, 40, 44–5
translation of the *Institutio theologica*, 140
translation of the *Isagoge*, 40
translation of the *Rhetoric*, 44–5, 199
translation of the *Topics*, 40–1, 106
- Drossaert Lulofs, Hendrik J., 138–9, 141
- Dunlop, Douglas, 61, 140–1, 143, 156
- Edessa, 16–7
School of, 17
- Egypt, 18, 25
- Endress, Gerhard, 5, 22–4, 27, 31–2, 35, 140–1, 164–5, 173–4
- al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr, 6–7, 38, 52–3, 55, 57, 103, 111, 185, 188, 193–5, 198–200
De scientiis, see al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr, *Kitāb ‘iḥṣā’ al-‘ulūm*
Declaratio compendiosa per viam divisionis Alfarabii super libris rethoricorum Aristotilis, 187
Didascalia in Rethoricam Aristotilis ex glosa Alpharabii, 185–7, 194–6, 202–3
Faḍīlat al-‘ulūm wa-l-ṣinā‘at, 103
Kitāb al-ḥurūf, 7
Kitāb al-ḥaṭābah, 185–7, 194, 197–9, 201
Kitāb ‘iḥṣā’ al-‘ulūm, 202–3
bādi’ al-ra’i al-muštarak, 187
Šadr li-kitāb al-ḥaṭābah, see al-Fārābī, Abū Naṣr, *Didascalia in Rethoricam Aristotilis ex glosa Alpharabii*
“Alexandria to Baghdad”-narrative, 57–8
and logic, 185–6, 195
and the *Rhetoric* as a logical work, 53, 66
as a commentator, 181
commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 44
Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 186, 188, 196, 200, 203
rhetorical thought, 54–5, 185–8, 195–6, 198–9
- Farmer, Henry G., 87
- Ġābir ibn Ḥayyān, Abū Mūsā, 86, 184
- al-Ġāhiz, ‘Amr ibn Baḥr, 7–8, 24
Kitāb al-bayān wa-l-tabayīn, 189
Kitāb al-ḥayawān, 7
- Galen, 36, 173, 183
De anatomicis administrationibus, 175
De elementis, 178
De simplicium medicamentorum, 176
In Hippocratis de officina medici, 174
- Gätje, Helmut, 150
- Gaza, 16
- al-Ġazālī, Abū Ḥāmid
Maqāsid al-falāsifāh, 203
- George, Bishop of the Arabs, 17, 55–6
- George of Trebizond, 63
- Georr, Khalil, 40–1, 46, 48–50
- Gerhard of Cremona
translation of the *Kitāb ‘iḥṣā’ al-‘ulūm*, 202
- Germany, 202

- Glaukon of Teos, 72, 77, 83, 117
 Gorgias, 110–2
 Graf, Georg, 127, 147, 157
 Greece, 6
 Gundīšāpūr, 16
 Gundissalinus, Dominicus, 202
 Gutas, Dimitri, 24–7, 29–30, 51, 59, 165, 182, 197
 Gyekye, Kwame, 192
- Ḥālid (Umayyad prince), 22
 al-Ḥalīl ibn Aḥmad, 88
 Hamaḍān, 194
 Harrān, 40
 Hārūn al-Rašīd (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 23, 28
 and the *bayt al-ḥikmah*, 24
 and translation, 31
 Hatim, Basil, 63–4
 den Heijer, Johannes, 154–6, 160
 Heinrichs, Wolfhart, 45, 50, 56
 Hermannus Alemannus, 188
 and Ibn Rušd, 203
 and Roger Bacon, 203
 and the *exemplar decurtatum*, 201–2
 translation of the *Rhetoric*, 69, 188–9, 202–4
 Hinds, Martin, 19, 33
 Hippocrates, 109
 Ḥubayš ibn al-Ḥasan, 36
 Hugonnard-Roche, Henri, 17, 42
 Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq, 4, 6–9, 13, 21, 26, 31–2, 36–7, 40, 42, 60–1, 102, 139–40, 166
 Risālah, 4, 13, 24, 30, 36–7, 167
 and his associates, 8, 14, 35–6, 38, 40, 102, 141, 147, 166, 170, 178
 and his translation method, 36–7, 45
 translation of *Kitāb al-fawāʿid al-šīʿriyah*, 185
 translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, 140
 Ḥurāsān, 28
- Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhi, 88
 Kitāb al-ʿiqd al-farīd, 88
 Ibn Abī al-Ḥarīš, 24
 Ibn Abī Darr, Abū al-Ḥasan, 190
 Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿah, Aḥmad ibn al-Qāsim, 14
 ʿUyūn al-ʿanbāʾ fi ṭabaqāt al-ʿaṭibbāʾ, 14, 57, 192, 201
 Ibn al-Aṭīr, ʿAlī ʿIzz al-Dīn, 53
 al-Maṭal al-sāʿir fi ʿadab al-kātib wa-l-šāʿir, 53
 Ibn al-Biṭrīq, 7, 138–40, 155, 164, 173, 177–8
 translation of *In Hippocratis de septimanis commentarium*, 173
 translation of an anonymous *De anima* paraphrase, 173, 177
 translation of Aristotle’s zoological works, 138
 translation of the *Institutio theologica*, 33, 139, 141, 145–6, 148–50, 165, 168–9, 171, 173–80
 translation of the *Meteorology*, 173, 177–8
 Ibn al-Ḥammār, *see* Ibn Suwār, Abū al-Ḥayr al-Ḥasan
 Ibn al-Ḥayṭam, al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan, 191
 Ibn al-Ḥayṭam, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, 191
 Ibn al-Imām, Abū al-Ḥasan, 196
 Ibn al-Muqaffāʾ, 58
 Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad ibn Iṣḥāq, 13
 Fihrist, 13, 24, 30, 40, 44–6, 51, 82–3, 88, 138–40, 155, 191, 199, 213
 Ibn al-Nafīs, 201
 Kitāb šarḥ al-wurayqāt, 201
 Ibn al-Samḥ, Abū ʿAlī, 40–3, 47, 49, 59, 61, 75, 199
 Ibn al-Šayḥ, Abū ʿAlī, 49
 Ibn al-Ṭayyib, Abū al-Faraġ ʿAbd Allāh, 191
 Long Commentary on the *Categories*, 192
 Long Commentary on the *Isagoge*, 192
 Long Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 192
 summary of the *Rhetoric*, 192
 Ibn al-Ṭayyib al-Sarḥsī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, 44–6
 Ibn Badr, 191
 summaries of the *Organon*, 191
 Ibn Bāġġah, Abū Bakr al-Šāʿig, 196
 Ibn Fihri, 7
 Ibn Ḥaylān, Yuḥannā, 57
 Ibn Mūsā, Muḥammad, 46, 184
 Kitāb ʿalā mā ʿiyat al-kalām, 184
 Ibn Nāʾimah al-Ḥīmšī, ʿAbd al-Masīḥ, 7, 31, 40, 157
 translation of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, 138
 translation of the *Sophistical Refutations*, 40–1, 138, 157
 translation of the *Theology of Aristotle*, 31, 157, 210

- Ibn Riḍwān, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī, 188, 195–6
Kitāb fi al-musta‘mal min al-manṭiq fi al-‘ulūm wa-l-ṣanā‘i, 195–6
 and al-Fārābī, 196
- Ibn Ruṣd, Abū al-Walīd, 31, 38, 166, 193, 196–7, 200
bādi’ al-ra’i al-muṣṭarak, 198, 200
 and al-Fārābī, 185, 188, 198–200
 and Ibn al-Ṭayyib, 192
 and Ibn Sinā, 195, 199–200
 and the *exemplar decurtatum*, 199, 201–2
 and the *Rhetoric* as a logical work, 53–4, 66
 as a commentator, 181–2, 197–9
 commentary on the *Republic*, 200
 Middle Commentary on the *Poetics*, 197
 Middle Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 188, 192, 197–201, 203–4
 political thought, 200
 rhetorical thought, 194, 198, 200
 Short Commentaries on the *Organon*, 197
 Short Commentary on the *Poetics*, 197
 Short Commentary on the *Rhetoric*, 197–8, 201, 204
 Short Commentary on the *Topics*, 197
 terminology of, 182
- Ibn Sinā, Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥusayn, 38, 60, 69, 166, 193–4, 200
Fi al-‘aḥlāq wa-l-infi‘ālāt, 193
Fi ma‘āni kitāb riṭūriqā, 193, 196
Kitāb al-nağāt, 192
Kitāb al-ṣifā’, 53, 60, 194–5, 198, 200–1, 203
Kitāb al-‘iṣārāt wa-l-tanbibāt, 192
al-Ḥikmah al-‘arūḍiyah, 83, 193–4
 and al-Fārābī, 185, 188
 and Ibn al-Ṭayyib, 192
 and logic, 192
 and the *Rhetoric* as a logical work, 53–4, 66
 as a commentator, 83, 181, 192, 194, 198
 rhetorical thought, 53, 193–5, 200
- Ibn Surayğ, 87
- Ibn Suwār, Abū al-Ḥayr al-Ḥasan, 37, 39, 41–2
 annotation of the *Organon*, 42, 59
- Ibn Ṭumlūs, Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad, 201
Madḥal ‘ilā ṣinā‘at al-manṭiq, 201
 and Ibn Ruṣd, 201
 and the *exemplar decurtatum*, 201
- Ibn Wahb al-Kātib, Ishāq, 188–9
Kitāb al-burbān fi wuğūh al-bayān, 188–91, 195
- Ibn Wahilī, 7
- Ibn Zur‘ah, ‘Īsā ibn Ishāq, 37, 138
 translation of the *Kitāb al-ḥayawān*, 138
 translation of the *Sophistical Refutations*, 40–1
- Iḥwān al-ṣafā’, 86
Rasā’il Iḥwān al-ṣafā’, 86, 88
- India, 25
- Iraq, 4, 15, 18, 25, 35, 211
- Ishāq ibn Hunayn, 36, 45, 140–1
Kitāb al-‘aḥlāq, 140
 translation methods, 163, 170, 178
 translation of *De interpretatione*, 40, 106
 translation of Porphyry’s commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, 140
 translation of the *Categories*, 40
 translation of the *Metaphysics*, 9, 32, 66
 translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, 61, 140–1, 146, 152, 156–63, 165–6, 170–80, 190
 translation of the *Poetics*, 44–5
 translation of the *Rhetoric*, 44–5, 199
 translation of the *Sophistical Refutations*, 44–5
 translation of Themistius’ *De anima*-commentary, 106, 140–1, 144–5, 147–50, 156–71, 173–6, 178–80
- Iṣṭifān (the older), 22
- Iṣṭifān (the younger), 40
- Jacob bar Šakko
Book of Dialogues, 54
- Jacob ben Maḥir, 204
- Jacobites, 16
- Jacob of Edessa, 55
- John of Seville, 202
 translation of the *Kitāb ‘iḥṣā’ al-‘ulūm*, 202
 translation of the *Maqāṣid al-falāsifah*, 203
- Kennedy, George A., 104
- al-Kindī, Ya‘qūb ibn Ishāq, 2–3, 29, 31–5, 38, 44, 46, 53, 86–8, 102, 111, 138–9, 183–4, 191
Risālah fi kammīyat kutub Aristū, 53, 184
Risālah fi ṣifāt al-balāğah, 184
 and logic, 184

- and mathematics, 3, 33
 and science, 3
 and the Hellenistic movement, 33
 commentary on Archimedes, 3
 Kindī-circle, 14, 16, 32–3, 35, 40, 46,
 102–3, 138–41, 157, 165, 168, 171–3, 178,
 180, 183, 207
 philosophy of, 33
 program of, 34
 Kruk, Remke, 138, 141–2, 150
- Leon, 203
- Lyons, Malcolm C., 39, 43, 45–50, 56, 60,
 69, 71, 75, 78, 83, 85, 89–90, 96–8, 100–1,
 103–4, 107, 112–4, 140–1, 153, 166, 213
- Madrid, 195
- al-Mahdī (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 27
- de Maillet, Benoît, 39
- Mālik ibn Anas, 12
Muwaṭṭaʿ, 12
- al-Maʿmūn (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 14, 19, 24, 28,
 34
 and the *bayt al-ḥikmah*, 24
 and the *miḥnah*, 19, 24, 28, 34
 and the *muʿtazilah*, 19, 21
 and translation, 18, 24, 28, 31, 34
- al-Manṣūr (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 24, 27
- Marw, 28
- Māsarḡawayh, 22
- Mason, Ian, 63–4
- Melkites, 40
- Menander
Sententiae, 177–8
- Mesopotamia, 18, 21, 25
- Middle East, 10, 21, 23, 27
 Fertile Crescent, 15, 25
- Muḥammad (Prophet), 21, 24, 28, 33, 47–8
- al-Munaḡḡim, ʿAlī ibn Yaḥyā, 4
- Muqātil ibn Sulaymān, 4
Tafsīr, 4
- al-Muʿtaḏid (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 45
- al-Muʿtaṣim (ʿAbbāsīd caliph), 14
 and the *miḥnah*, 34
 and translation, 18–9, 34
- Nawas, John, 24
- Nestorians, 16, 54
- Nisibis, 16
- North Africa, 10
- Palestine, 15, 19
- Paris, 39, 41, 63, 187, 199
- Persia, 16, 18, 20, 28
 culture, 23
- Persian Empire, 20–1, 24, 26
 administrators, 21
 conquered by Muslims, 18, 24–5
- Pines, Shlomo, 58, 196
- Plato, 16, 34, 108
Gorgias, 108
Phaidros, 108
Republic, 200
- Platonism, 13, 33
 rhetorical thought, 108, 200
- Plotinus, 108
Enneads, 33
- Plutarchus of Chaeroneia, 6, 139
- Porphyry, 16
Isagoge, 40–1, 55, 60, 192, 195, 202
 commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*,
 140, 156
- Prōbā, 58
- Proclus Diadochus, 147
Institutio theologica, 33, 139, 141, 145–6,
 148–50, 165, 168–9, 171, 173–80
- pseudo-Plutarchus
Placita philosophorum, 6, 78, 139, 144,
 147–50, 155–65, 167–71, 173–80, 207
- pseudo-Aristotle
Liber de causis, 33
Theology of Aristotle, 31, 108, 157, 210
- pseudo-Galen
*In Hippocratis de septimanis commentar-
 ium*, 173
- Qartmin, 17
- al-Qifṭī, ʿAlī ibn Yūsuf, 14
Taʿrīḥ al-ḥukamāʾ, 13, 140, 184, 191
- Qudāmah ibn Ḡaʿfar, 189
Kitāb naqd al-šīʿr, 189
 and the *Kitāb al-burhān fi wuḡūb al-
 bayān*, 189
- Quintilian, 203
- Qurʾān, 4, 7–8, 19–21, 24, 33, 161, 174
- Qustā ibn Lūqā, 31, 139–40, 161
 translation of the *Placita philosophorum*,
 6, 78, 139, 144, 147–50, 155–65, 167–71,
 173–80, 207
- Rashed, Roshdi, 3
- al-Rāzī, Abū Bakr, 23

- Reckendorf, Hermann, 126
 Reinink, Gerrit, 56
 Rescher, Nicholas, 184, 192
 Rome, 57
 Rosenthal, Franz, 11, 19–23, 26–7
- al-Šafādī, Ḥalīl ibn Aybak, 4, 8–9, 210
 Sallām al-Abraš, 31
 Sasanians, 24
 imperial ideology, 27–9
 Sasanian empire, 23
 Seleucia, 16
 Sergius of Rēš'aynā, 26, 55–6, 167
 Severus Šebōḥt, 55–6
 Sicily, 162
 Simplicius, 52
 Socrates, 108
 Spain, 202
 Stern, Samuel M., 46–50
 Syria, 4, 15, 18–22, 25–6, 182
- Ṭābit Abū Qurrah, 40
 Ṭadārī, 40–1
 translation of the *Prior Analytics*, 40, 42
 Themistius
 commentary on *De anima*, 106, 140–1,
 144–5, 147–50, 156–71, 173–6, 178–80
 Theodore Abū Qurrah, 7
 Thomas of Aquin, 203
 Thrasymachos, 99, 104
 Timothy I., 54
 Todros Todrosi, 204
 Toledo, 202
- Ullmann, Manfred, 141, 165
 Umayyads, 20, 22, 25–6, 45, 50, 87
 Ustāt, 8, 31, 106, 111, 138
 translation of the *Metaphysics*, 8–9, 31–2,
 66, 102, 106
- Walzer, Richard, 14, 19, 22, 42
 al-Waṭīq ('Abbāsīd caliph), 34
 Watt, John W., 55, 60–1
 William of Moerbeke
 translation of the *Rhetoric*, 202–3
 Würsch, Renate, 82, 193
- Yahyā ibn 'Adī, 38, 40, 42, 44
 translation of the *Sophistical Refutations*,
 40–1
 Yaunan the Periodeutēs, 56
- Yazīd I. (Umayyad caliph), 22
 Yūnus al-Kātib, 88
- Zimmermann, Fritz W., 61, 82, 154, 156