

SOMMARIO

AMOS BERTOLACCI, TOMMASO ALPINA, <i>Introduction</i>	pag. VII
FRANÇOISE HUDRY, <i>La traduction latine de la Logica Avicennae et son auteur</i>	» 1
SILVIA DI VINCENZO, <i>Is There a versio vulgata of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā' ? On the Hypothesis of a Double Recension of Kitāb al-Madḥal</i>	» 29
NICCOLÒ CAMINADA, <i>A Latin Translation? The Reception of Avicenna in Albert the Great's De praedicamentis</i>	» 71
RICCARDO STROBINO, <i>Avicenna's Kitāb al-Burhān, II.7 and its Latin Translation by Gundissalinus: Content and Text</i>	» 105
GAIA CELLI, <i>The Rhetoric Section of the Kitāb al-Šifā' : Hermannus Alemannus' Latin Translation and the Arabic Witnesses</i>	» 149
FRÉDÉRIQUE WOERTHER, <i>Citer/traduire. La traduction arabo-latine de la Rhétorique d'Aristote par Hermann l'Allemand et les citations d'al-Fārābī et Averroès</i>	» 177
JULES JANSSENS, <i>The Liber primus naturalium, i.e. the Physics of the Avicenna latinus</i>	» 219
ALESSIA ASTESIANO, <i>L'inizio di un movimento nella fisica del continuo: Avicenna lettore di Aristotele (Libro della guarigione, Fisica, III, 6)</i> . . .	» 239

CRISTINA CERAMI, <i>The De Caelo et Mundo of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'</i> : <i>An Overview of its Structure, its Goal and its Polemical Background . . .</i>	pag. 273
SILVIA DI DONATO, <i>Les trois traductions latines de la Météorologie d'Avicenne: notes pour l'histoire du texte.</i>	» 331
ELISA RUBINO, <i>The Commentary of Alfred of Shareshill on the Pseudo- Aristotelian De mineralibus</i>	» 351
TOMMASO ALPINA, <i>Al-Ġūzġānī's Insertion of On Cardiac Remedies in Avicenna's Book of the Soul: the Latin Translation as a Clue to his Editorial Activity on the Book of the Cure?</i>	» 365
AAFKE M. I. VAN OPPENRAAY, <i>Avicenna's Liber de animalibus ('Abbreviatio Avicennae'). Preliminaries and State of Affairs.</i>	» 401
RÜDIGER ARNZEN, <i>Double Translations in the Latin Version of the Metaphysics of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'</i>	» 417
ALFONSO QUARTUCCI, <i>Avicenna's Notion of al-mawḍū' al-awwal ('first subject') in Ilāhiyyāt, I, 1-2 and its Latin Reception</i>	» 441
AMOS BERTOLACCI, <i>The Latin Translation and the Original Version of the Ilāhiyyāt (Science of Divine Things) of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā' . . .</i>	» 481
NICOLA POLLONI, <i>Gundissalinus and Avicenna: Some Remarks on an Intricate Philosophical Connection.</i>	» 515
IVANA PANZECA, <i>On the Persian Translations of Avicenna's Ilāhiyyāt.</i>	» 553
INDICE DEI MANOSCRITTI	» 571
INDICE DEI NOMI	» 575

Introduction

The present volume hosts the proceedings of the conference ‘A Crossroad between East and West: The Latin Medieval Translations of the *Kitāb al-Šifā*’ (*Book of the Cure*) of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna)’, which took place in Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore, on 1-3 July 2015 in the framework of the project ‘Philosophy on the Border of Civilizations and Intellectual Endeavours: Towards a Critical Edition of the Metaphysics (*Ilāhiyyāt* of *Kitāb al-Šifā*)’ of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā)’, financed by the European Research Council (ERC Advanced Grant, 2014-2019, www.avicennaproject.eu). Some additional articles (N. Caminada, A. Astesiano, N. Polloni, I. Panzeca) complement the papers first presented at the conference. The decision to devote a conference expressly to the Latin translations of the various parts of Avicenna’s philosophical masterpiece produced during the Middle Ages, and, now, to publish the papers of the meeting in a self-standing volume that deals comprehensively with the topic – in both cases for the first time, to the best of our knowledge – finds its justification in the necessity of approaching this key event of the Arabic-into-Latin transmission of philosophical culture in a comprehensive rather than piecemeal way.

The Latin medieval translations of the *magnum opus* of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā, d. 428H/1037) in philosophy, the *Kitāb al-Šifā*’ or *Book of the Cure/Healing*, are interesting in many respects. First, these translations are ancient and valuable witnesses of the *Šifā*’: in some cases their chronological distance from the period of composition of Avicenna’s work (1020-1027 ca.) does not exceed one century and a half. This temporal closeness makes the Latin translations at stake very precious tools for the reconstruction of the original Arabic text of the *Šifā*’. Second, they cover much of the *Šifā*’: altogether, they encompass a large portion of this massive encyclopedia of logic, natural philosophy, mathematics and metaphysics, and convey into Latin a comprehensive picture of this highly articulated and structured work, although they privilege some of its four main parts over others. Third, numerous and important scholars of the time, many of whom were prime exponents of the European philosophical scenario, acted as translators. These noteworthy aspects of the complex of translations under investigation can be adequately grasped only by means of a synoptic view, capable of highlighting analogies and differences in content and style among the various translations, and of tracing stable elements and developments in their temporal sequence. Cumulatively, the papers delivered at the conference and gathered in the present volume – with their *status quaestionis* and research agenda about each of the extant translations, from logic to metaphysics – meet this task. These introductory pages are meant to briefly sketch the framework in which the following contributions

can be placed. The relevant data to be considered, expounded in details in the articles of the volume, are summarized in the following table.

Conspectus of the Latin Translations of the *Šifā'*

Preface and (I) Logic (9 sections)										
<i>Šifā'</i>	Preface	<i>Madḥal</i>	<i>Maqūlāt</i>	<i>'Ibāra</i>	<i>Qiyās</i>	<i>Burhān</i>	<i>Ġadal</i>	<i>Safsaṭa</i>	<i>Ḥiṭāba</i>	<i>Ši'r</i>
Model	---	Porphyry, <i>Isagoge</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>De Int.</i>	<i>An. Pr.</i>	<i>An. Post.</i>	<i>Topica</i>	<i>El. Soph.</i>	<i>Rhetor.</i>	<i>Poet.</i>
Phase 1		Logica	---	---	---	II.7	---	---	---	---
Phase 2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	fragm.	---

(II) Natural Philosophy (8 sections)									
<i>Šifā'</i>	<i>Samā' ṭabī'ī</i>		<i>Samā' wa-Ālam</i>	<i>Kawn wa-Fasād</i>	<i>Af'āl wa-Infi'ālāt</i>	<i>Ma'ādīn wa-Āṭār 'ulwiyya</i>	<i>Nafs</i>	<i>Nabāt</i>	<i>Ḥayawān</i>
Model	<i>Physica</i>		<i>De Caelo</i>	<i>De Gen. et Corr.</i>	<i>Meteor.</i>	<i>Meteor.</i>	<i>De Anima</i>	<i>Ps.-Arist., De Plantis</i>	<i>Hist. Part. Gen. Animal.</i>
Phase 1	<i>Liber I Natur. I.1-III.1</i>	---	---	---	---	I.1, I.5, II.6 (<i>De Miner.</i>)	<i>De Anima</i>	---	<i>De Animal.</i>
Phase 2		III.1-10	<i>De Caelo</i>	<i>De Gen. et Corr.</i>	<i>De Act. Pass. Qualitatum Primarum</i>	<i>Libri Meteororum</i>	---	attested	---

(III) Mathematics (4 sections)				
<i>Šifā'</i>	<i>Uṣūl al-handasa</i>	<i>'Ilm al-hay'a</i>	<i>Ḥisāb</i>	<i>Ġawāmi' 'ilm al-mūsīqā</i>
Model	Euclid, <i>Elements</i>	Ptolemy, <i>Almagest</i>	Nicomachus of Gerasa, <i>Introd. Arit.</i>	Ptolemy, <i>Harmonica</i>
Phase 1	---	---	---	---
Phase 2	---	---	---	---

(IV) Metaphysics (1 section)	
<i>Šifā'</i>	<i>Ilāhiyyāt</i>
Model	<i>Metaphysics</i>
Phase 1	<i>Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina</i>
Phase 2	---

1) Chronology. The *Šifā'* was translated into Latin during the XII and XIII centuries, in distinct places and moments. In a chronological perspective, the translation activity can be grouped around two main phases. The first phase (Phase 1 in the table) was generated by translators active in the city of Toledo, or related to it for biographical reasons, from 1150 until circa 1250. The second, less extensive and more shadowy phase (Phase 2) occurred in Burgos in the second half of the XIII century. The second phase of translation looks to be dependent on the first, and to be considered by the translators as its continuation: significantly, the Latin translation of the first section of natural philosophy starts in the second phase exactly where it had stopped in the first, i.e. in correspondence with chapter III.1. The Spanish environment is not the only common feature of these two phases. The second, with its exclusive focus on the natural philosophy of the *Šifā'*, appears to share the same scientific interests and operational options of the first phase, which had not exceeded the boundaries of the natural philosophy and the metaphysics of the work, apart from an incursion into its logic, with a conspicuous neglect of mathematics. The main difference between the two phases holds *a posteriori*, and it is given by the diffusion of the translations: whereas the versions produced during the first phase enjoyed a wide circulation, the ones composed during the second phase had a much more limited dissemination.

The Latin translations of the *Šifā'*, especially those produced during the first phase of the translation activity, hold a very high chronological position among the testimonia of the original Arabic text of the work. The Latin translation of the metaphysical section of the work, the *Ilāhiyyāt*, documents this point in full clarity. This translation was accomplished in the second half of the XII century, probably in the third quarter of the century, under the title of *Liber de Philosophia prima sive Scientia divina*, on the basis of an Arabic model that we cannot date precisely and which could be potentially much older than the translation itself. But, regardless of the exact date of the Arabic manuscript(s) on which the Latin translation was made, this latter belongs to the small group of the most ancient testimonies of the *Ilāhiyyāt* presently known, namely a sample of extant Arabic manuscripts and some attested codices dating back to the V/XI and VI/XII centuries. More precisely, at the present state of research, the *Philosophia prima* figures in the 'top ten' of the most ancient extant witnesses of the work. Its ancientness, noteworthy in itself, is even more remarkable, if we consider that among the manuscripts at the basis of the current printing by means of which we presently know the *Ilāhiyyāt*, i.e. the edition published in Cairo in 1960, the most ancient dates back to the VII/XIII century, and that the *Philosophia prima* conveys readings and ways of disposing chapters and structuring treatises that look more original than those transmitted in the version according to which

we are accustomed to approach Avicenna's text. In other words, the Latin translation is a witness of the *Ilāhiyyāt* which cannot be disregarded both by present scholars interested in grasping precisely Avicenna's original thought in metaphysics, and by future editors undertaking the demanding task of a real critical edition of his metaphysical *magnum opus*.

What applies to the *Philosophia prima* holds, *mutatis mutandis*, for all the other parts of the *Šifā'* translated into Latin during the first phase of translation, and also, to a lesser degree, for the translations accomplished in the second phase.

II) Extent. A substantial portion of Avicenna's *summa* — which consists of twenty-two distinct sections (nine of logic, eight of natural philosophy, four of mathematics, plus the single section of metaphysics) and covers more than five thousands pages in the standard printed edition of the Arabic text — was made available to Latin scholars. Actually, if taken together and considered as translations of one and the same Arabic work, as in fact they are, the distinct Latin translations of the *Šifā'* represent one of the most extensive translations from Arabic into Latin ever made during the Middle Ages. More specifically, during the aforementioned two phases of translation, three of the four main parts of the *Šifā'* were translated into Latin: natural philosophy and metaphysics were translated almost integrally (with the exception of the fourth treatise of the first section of natural philosophy, which was strangely neglected during the second phase of translations, and the last two chapters of the section of metaphysics, which were summarized rather than translated *verbatim*). As to logic, only one entire section, the first, corresponding to Porphyry's *Isagoge*, and some excerpts of the fifth and the eighth sections, corresponding respectively to the *Posterior Analytics* and the *Rhetoric*, are extant (chapter II.7 and scattered fragments, respectively), whereas the remaining six sections were completely overlooked. By contrast, no section of the mathematical part of the *Šifā'* results to have been ever translated.

The decision by the Latin translators of ignoring the mathematics of the *Šifā'*, and of paying greater attention to the natural philosophy and the metaphysics of the work than to its logic, does not reflect the importance that Avicenna himself ascribes to these disciplines in this *summa*: mathematics is one of its substantial constituents — contrary to what happens in the case of other less extensive *summae* by Avicenna, where mathematics is absent or is copied from previous works — and logic is, by and large, the most extensive part of this work. If we assume that a complete text of the *Šifā'* was available in Andalusia at the time of the translations, the translators' selection of the parts of the work to be rendered into Latin arguably mirrors their own interests and the scientific needs of the intended audience of the translations: thanks to previous translations, Latin readers had already at their disposal abundant material regarding the Arabic *quadrivium*; moreover, they were more attracted by a new

and comprehensive world-view such as the one proposed by Avicenna, than by a logical theory that, despite its originality, was less new in the Latin world. In particular, the choice of privileging within the logic of the *Šifā'* the section dealing with Porphyry's *Isagoge* might be a consequence of the still lively debate on universals in Latin philosophy since the time of Roscelin, Abaelard and the likes in the first half of the XII century. In other words, whereas the Avicenna Arabus is, in the *Šifā'*, a logician and a mathematician no less than a natural philosopher and a metaphysician, the Avicenna Latinus conveys an image of the author much more leaning towards natural philosophy and metaphysics, thus influencing the view of Avicenna that Western scholarship has had since then.

Of the three parts of the *Šifā'* translated into Latin, the data regarding the manuscript dissemination document a wider diffusion of natural philosophy and metaphysics with respect to logic: the *Logica* of Avicenna counts 13 Latin manuscripts, much fewer than those of the *De Mineralibus* (148 mss.) — transmitted by a large number of testimonia due to the connection of the translation of this part of the *Šifā'* with the Latin translation of Aristotle's *Meteorology*, to which it was attached — the *De Anima* (50 mss.), the *De Animalibus* (33 mss.), the *Philosophia Prima* (25 mss.), and the *Liber primus naturalium* I-III.1 (22 mss.). A much more meager manuscript diffusion regards the Latin translation of the Preface (2 mss.) — namely the Introduction to the *Šifā'* written by al-Ğūzġānī, Avicenna's secretary and biographer, and the Prologue by Avicenna himself — and the translation of the sections of natural philosophy accomplished during the second phase (1 ms.). The Latin translation of the Preface, despite the interest of this preliminary section of the *Šifā'*, counts few testimonia probably because of its extrinsic connection with the translation of the part on logic; the same applies to the translations of the sections of natural philosophy made available in Latin during the second phase because of their production in a philosophical setting in which Avicenna's philosophy, after the translation of Averroes' commentaries, had ceased to function as a tool for interpreting Aristotle's thought for Latin readers, losing any pivotal position in university curricula. Since the largest share of extant manuscripts of the most widespread translations has been copied between the second half of the XIII century and the beginning of the XIV, it seems that the 'long wave' of interest in Avicenna's philosophical masterpiece started dwindling around the middle of the XIV century, until its resurgence with the Renaissance printings.

III) Translators. The Latin translators of the *Šifā'* in the first phase of the translation activity are among the prime exponents of Jewish and Latin philosophy of the XII century. There is no need to emphasize the importance and significance of figures like Abraham Ibn Daud (Avendauth in Latin), Dominicus Gundissalinus, Alfred of Sareshel, and Michael Scot, who were not

only translators, but also commentators and receptors of Avicenna's thought, as well as original thinkers with a clear-cut intellectual profile and a well-defined cultural agenda. In the second phase of translation, Hermannus Alemannus – the translator of the excerpts of the section on rhetoric – certainly holds a status comparable to that of his predecessors, whereas Johannes Gualterius and Salomon – to whom the translation of several sections of the natural philosophy is ascribed – are for the moment more shadowy figures.

Both phases were characterized by team-work, at different levels and in various degrees. More in particular, in both cases the translation activity was marked by the cooperation of Jewish and Christian scholars under the patronage of ecclesiastic authorities in Andalusia after the *reconquista*. The presence and active contribution of the Jewish component in a cultural phenomenon that *prima facie* seems to concern exclusively the transmission of philosophy from the Muslim world to the Christian cultural environment is worth attention: rather than linear, this process of cultural transmission has to be conceived as triangular: Ibn Daud and Salomon, on the Jewish side, worked in cooperation with, respectively, Gundissalinus and Johannes Gualterius, and under the patronage of churchmen, on the Christian side, for the translation into Latin of the work of a Muslim philosopher like Avicenna. If we tend to consider the Jewish component of this process as less relevant than the Christian one, we have also to keep in mind that this impression might just be a retrospective deformation of the historical reality due to our present greater familiarity with the latter than with the former. Ibn Daud, in particular, was the real promoter and sponsor of the first and fundamental 'Avicenna Latinus project' in the Middle Ages. In other words, the Latin translations of Avicenna's *Šifā'* are the result of the joint efforts of distinct scholars that in some cases were unaware of each other for geographical or historical reasons, but that in fact constitute *in nuce* a 'community of learning' and a small intercultural and cross-confessional 'translation movement' within the larger framework of the transfer of knowledge from Arabic into Latin. Thus, the Latin translations of the *Šifā'* put us in front of a glaring example of fruitful cultural interaction, capable of coexisting with, and in a way also of countering, the fiery competition that took place, at the same time, on the religious, political, and military side. The translations under consideration show that the so-called 'dark Middle Ages' of the Arab conquest and of the Crusades are also, at the same time, the 'bright Middle Ages' of the transfer of culture from Muslim lands, by means of Jewish scholars, into European universities, and of the circulation of knowledge among intellectual communities of different creeds and religious affiliations across the shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

IV) Context. If we enlarge the perspective and set the event under consideration in the larger context of the translation movement from Arabic

into Latin to which it belongs, we notice some interesting facts, which are also guidelines for future research. First, the *Šifā'* is the only philosophical work by Avicenna systematically translated into Latin during the Middle Ages: among the other Avicennian *summae* of philosophy, only some quotations or fragments of the *Kitāb al-Išārāt wa-l-Tanbihāt* (*Book of Pointers and Reminders*) and of the *Kitāb al-Naġāt* (*Book of the Salvation*) are preserved in the *Pugio Fidei* of the Dominican Ramon Martí in the XIII century. This positively documents the keen perception that the Latin translators had of the paramount importance of the *Šifā'* within Avicenna's philosophical output, and of the particularly enhanced Peripatetic character of this *summa*, which was congruent with their search of an all-encompassing interpretation of Aristotle.

However, in a second respect, the *Šifā'* is in no way the only work of Avicenna translated into Latin in the Middle Ages: also the important *Qānūn fī l-Ṭibb* (*Canon of Medicine*) and other minor medical works by Avicenna were made available to Latin readers. The *Canon* was translated by Gerard of Cremona in Toledo in the XII century, in the same place and time of the first phase of the translation activity concerning the *Šifā'*. Thus, the two most important Toledan schools of translations from Arabic into Latin (the team made by Ibn Daud and Gundissalinus, on the one hand, and the school of Gerard of Cremona, on the other) were engaged, almost at the same time, in the translation of Avicenna's two masterpieces in philosophy and in medicine respectively. The two works are constitutively linked, since the zoology of the former is tributary to the anatomy and physiology of the latter. The Toledan translators might have caught this intimate bond. For sure, the Latin receptions of these two works cannot be studied separately, since one has certainly influenced the other, in ways that have still to be explored in detail.

Third, the Latin translations of Avicenna's works are not an isolated case, since they are both preceded and followed by many other translations of Arabic works into Latin, through which a considerable amount of Arabic philosophy and science became available to Latin readers. The specific role and peculiar interactions of the translations of Avicenna within this larger framework remain to be studied more closely. In particular, the Latin reception of Avicenna's philosophy cannot be accurately understood without keeping into consideration the existence and circulation of translations of his 'summarizer' and 'follower' Algazel (al-Ġazālī, d. 1111, of which Latin readers of the XII and XIII centuries knew only the digest of Avicenna's philosophy entitled *Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa, Intentions/Doctrines of the Philosophers*), and of his 'enemy' and 'critic' Averroes (Ibn Rušd, d. 1198).

Finally, Latin is not the only medieval language in which Avicenna's *Šifā'* was translated. Hebrew and Persian translations of the work are also extant, and

extensive quotations of it in Syriac are preserved. A synoptic view of the way in which the translations of the *Šifā'* in these different languages differ from, or are similar to one another, in terms of extent, style, and impact, is also a major desideratum of future research. This kind of comparative approach can shed light not only on the width of the influence of Avicenna's masterpiece in philosophy from Muslim Spain until India, but also on the intellectual trends at work in the distinct linguistic and cultural environments in which this work left its mark.

There is no need to enter into further detail, since most of the sections of the *Šifā'* translated into Latin will be the object of at least one paper in the present volume. The order in which the articles are presented is thematic — from logic, through natural philosophy, to metaphysics — disregarding whether the consecutive sections of the *Šifā'* taken into consideration were translated into Latin during the first or the second phase of the translation activity.

In the first contribution, Françoise Hudry documents the literary richness of the language employed by the Latin translator of the *Madḥal*, the first section of the logic of the *Šifā'* corresponding to Porphyry's *Isagoge*. She also endeavors to assess the identity of the translator of the parts of this translation of uncertain authorship: on the basis of the ascription to Ibn Daud of the translation of chapter I.12 attested by manuscripts, she collects the evidence pointing at this latter as the possible translator of the entire *Madḥal*. Her findings, if compared with the alternative opinion of M. Alonso Alonso (now corroborated by the computational techniques employed by Dag N. Hasse), according to which Gundissalinus is a more likely candidate, raise the interesting question of whether this translation might have resulted from some kind of synergy between the two.

By examining the manuscript tradition of Avicenna's *Madḥal*, and comparing fifty-nine witnesses of the Arabic text with the Latin translation, Silvia Di Vincenzo advances the persuasive hypothesis that there were two different recensions of this section of Avicenna's *Šifā'*, an earlier one, which is preserved in eleven manuscripts, the Latin translation, and the early indirect tradition of the work, and might correspond to Avicenna's first version of the text, and a later one, which she labels *versio vulgata*.

Niccolò Caminada enters into the scholarly debate about the hypothesis that Albertus Magnus might have known, alone among all Latin thinkers, otherwise unattested Latin translations of the second, third, and fifth section of the logic of the *Šifā'*, a possibility, first advanced by M. Grignaschi in the seventies, that now several scholars see with skepticism. Caminada confirms that, at least in the case of the *Maqūlāt* (*Categories*) of the *Šifā'*, Grignaschi's hypothesis is hardly tenable.

In his article Riccardo Strobino discusses the relationship between chapter II.7 of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Burhān* (*Book of Demonstration*) and its XII century Latin translation by Dominicus Gundissalinus (fl. ca 1150), famously incorporated by the latter as an independent section in his own *De divisione philosophiae*. This chapter turns out to be extremely important on both the philosophical and philological ground, since it represents the only part of Avicenna's *Burhān* available in Latin translation.

Gaia Celli and Frédérique Woerther devote their papers to Hermannus Alemannus' (fl. XIII century) Arabic-Latin translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Celli deals primarily with two excerpts from the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* (*Book of Rhetoric*) of Avicenna's *Šifā'*, which Hermannus inserted in his translation in order to substitute or explain difficult passages of the Aristotelian text. Likewise, Woerther focuses on the way in which Hermannus uses quotations from Fārābī's and Averroes' commentaries in order to provide a general framework against which Hermannus' use of quotations in his translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* can be assessed.

In his article, as a prolegomenon to his forthcoming critical edition of the third treatise of the Latin translation of *Al-Samā' al-ṭabī'ī* (*Physics*) of Avicenna's *Šifā'*, Jules Janssens provides a general overview of the translation techniques used therein on the basis of a close scrutiny of a large sample of passages. In particular, he points out the similarities and the differences between the two phases in which this (partial) translation of the first section of the natural philosophy of the *Šifā'* was accomplished.

Alessia Astesiano discusses the way in which in *Samā' ṭabī'ī*, III.6 Avicenna interprets the Aristotelian tenet according to which every motion has an end, but not a beginning (*Physics*, book VI). The major task of the article is to clarify the most significant passages of this chapter from a doctrinal as well as a textual point of view. In order to achieve her aim, the author examines the most ancient witnesses of the manuscript tradition of Avicenna's *Physics*, many of which have not been taken into consideration in the previous editions, as well as the Latin medieval translation.

The contribution by Cristina Cerami is devoted to *Al-Samā' wa-l-ālam* (*On the Heaven and the Universe*, different from the pseudo-Avicennian *De Caelo et Mundo*), the second section of the natural philosophy of the *Šifā'*. In particular, the author provides a comprehensive study of its structure, goals, and place within the framework of Avicenna's natural philosophy. The two major conclusions of the contribution are that, without being a standard treatise of cosmology, Avicenna's treatise must be seen as a study of the five simple bodies that constitute the universe as a whole, and that, within a broader philosophical and historical context, Avicenna's investigation aims at rebuking a neo-Philoponian trend among his contemporaries.

By taking as point of departure the contributions by J.-M. Mandosio on the topic, Silvia Di Donato assumes the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Al-Ma'ādīn wal-Ātār al-'ulwiyya* (*On Minerals and Upper Impressions*) as a privileged observation point to single out some characteristic aspects of the reception of Avicenna's *libri naturales* and, in particular, of the *Meteorology* in the Latin West. The analysis conducted on this work highlights that the Avicennian text played the role of an authoritative reference of Aristotelianism.

Elisa Rubino devotes her contribution to Alfred of Sareshel's commentary on Avicenna's *De mineralibus*, which is the last part of his more extensive commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica*. The glosses that constitute this commentary, identified by James K. Otte in 1993, have remained unedited until today. This contribution fills this gap in scholarship by offering the first edition of the Alfredian glosses on *De mineralibus*, which represent, together with the commented text (*De mineralibus*), an important step in the scientific study of mineralogy in the Middle Ages.

In his article Tommaso Alpina reconstructs the textual and editorial vicissitudes of chapters 2-9 of Avicenna's medical treatise *Maqāla fī l-adwiya al-qalbiyya* (*On Cardiac Remedies, De medicinis cordialibus* in the Latin translation) that al-Ġūzġānī inserted between the end of the fourth treatise and the beginning of the fifth treatise of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Nafs* (*Book of the Soul*). In particular, Alpina detects the reason why al-Ġūzġānī inserted this excerpt in this precise place of the *Book of the Soul* in the necessity of providing the brief outline of Avicenna's theory of emotions in *Nafs*, IV.4 with its medical background. Furthermore, Alpina provides a close scrutiny of the Arabic textual tradition of this insertion, and investigates its relation to the Latin manuscript tradition preserving the *Book of the Soul*, by which the insertion is unanimously attested.

The contribution by Aafke M. I. van Oppenraay provides an overview of the *status quaestionis* and the current research agenda of Michael Scot's Arabic-Latin translation of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* (*Book of Animals, Liber de animalibus* in the Latin translation), the eighth section of the natural philosophy of the *Šifā'*. Firstly, the author summarizes what has been already ascertained about this work and its author. Secondly, she offers a survey of the manuscript tradition and dissemination of this translation, and provides the proemium of the Latin translation as a sample of her forthcoming edition.

Rüdiger Arnzen analyzes the phenomenon of double translations (*leçons doubles*) in medieval Graeco-Latin and Arabic-Latin translations. In the first part of the article, the author deals in general with the nature and the correct way of understanding this phenomenon in Arabic-Latin translations, as well as with recent attempts at historical and philological explanations of its emergence. In the second part, he examines various types of double translations in the Latin

version of Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt* ([*Science of*] *Divine Things*), i.e. the metaphysics of the *Šifā'*, and provides some observations on their different causes.

The article by Alfonso Quartucci focuses on the original notion of 'first subject of science', which Avicenna elaborated in connection with the epistemological structure of metaphysics, and on its deep influence on Latin medieval philosophy. In the first part of the article, the author determines the exact meaning of the expression *al-mawḏū' al-awwal* (*first subject*) as it is employed in *Ilāhiyyāt*, I.1-2. In the second part, the Latin reception of the Avicennian notion is investigated by taking into account the Latin translation of Avicenna's work in order to explain how and to which extent Latin authors could and actually did understand the Avicennian notion of 'first subject'.

Amos Bertolacci analyzes the evidence available in Arabic sources that supports the hypothesis according to which the medieval Latin translation of the metaphysics of Avicenna's *Šifā'* is rooted in its Arabic background when it conveys an account of treatise V of the work (called 'Versio Latina') alternative to the one that can be found in the majority of codices and in current printings ('Versio Vulgata'). The author argues that the 'Versio Latina' is more ancient than the 'Versio Vulgata', and conclusively discusses the main issues that future research is asked to address in order to corroborate the hypothesis of a multiple recension of the *Ilāhiyyāt*.

Nicola Polloni devotes his article to the analysis of the peculiarities of Dominicus Gundissalinus' reading and use of Avicenna's writings in his original works. This article points out that Gundissalinus grounds his own speculation upon a structural bond with key-doctrines of the Persian philosopher as expressed in the Latin translation of the *Šifā'*. In particular, he stresses that Avicenna's psychology, epistemology, and metaphysics provide Gundissalinus with a different set of answers to at least two main questions, i.e. the problem of creatural existence and cosmological causation, and the necessity of a new system of knowledge.

Lastly, the article by Ivana Panzeca presents a preliminary study of the attested Persian translations of the metaphysics of the *Šifā'*, which have been carried out within the context of the Safavid cultural Renaissance (X/XVI-XII/XVIII).

The type of analysis proposed in the single articles is uneven, depending on the availability, or lack thereof, of a more or less trustworthy text of the translations under consideration in the critical editions of the Avicenna Latinus series, or in Renaissance printings like the one published in Venice in 1508 and later publications, and on the ensuing richness or scarceness of previous scholarly research. Thus, some contributions can rely on a greater amount of previous studies, which they evaluate critically or update with new discoveries, whereas others are real pioneering incursions into almost unexplored research avenues.

Likewise, some articles face the Latin translation of a particular section of the *Šifā* ' *ex professo*, whereas others use the Latin translation as evidential basis to unravel philological or doctrinal issues. The volume remains significantly 'open' at both its ends – with an initial investigation of the literary and philosophical background of the translation of the *Madḥal*, and a final analysis of the impact of Avicenna's philosophy on the original works of one of its Latin translators and earliest recipients (Gundissalinus), as well as of the first step of the circulation of his metaphysics in Iranian culture by means of Persian translations – to signify its nature of starting-point of a wider and deeper research.

We wish conclusively to thank the participants at the conference whose papers are not published here: Ghorban 'Ali Pourmarjan (former Director of the Istituto Culturale dell'Iran in Rome), and the professors Charles Burnett, Dag N. Hasse, Jean-Marc Mandosio, and Marwan Rashed. We are also grateful to the scholars who kindly accepted to chair the conference sessions, especially Maroun Aouad, and Mohammad J. Esmaeili. Our gratitude goes also to Maria Scermino and to the staff of the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa for their help in the organization of the meeting, and to Mario Bertagna for the editing of the volume and the preparation of the indices. A very special thought goes to the regretted Mauro Zonta, who had kindly accepted to publish in the present issue a contribution on the Hebrew translations of the *Šifā* '. A specimen of Zonta's outstanding scholarship, which will continue to nourish our understanding of the field of Arabic-Islamic and Hebrew-Jewish studies for the decades to come, would have greatly enriched the content of the present volume and substantially raised its level. Events have tragically decided otherwise: our sincere esteem and deep gratitude to Mauro, together with a profound sense of loss, remain.

AMOS BERTOLACCI
TOMMASO ALPINA
Scuola Normale Superiore