

Françoise Hudry, *The Latin Translation of the Logica Avicennae and Its Author*, pp. 1-28

The *Logica Avicennae* or Latin translation of Avicenna's Commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* (*al-Madḥal*) in his *Kitāb al-Šifā'* or *The Cure* was presented in the second half of the 12th c. to the Archbishop of Toledo by *Avendauth Israelita*, who said then more precisely he was an *Israelita philosophus*. But who was Avendauth and how did he translate this text from Arabic into Latin?

Françoise Hudry, CNRS Paris
francoise.hudry@gmail.com

Silvia Di Vincenzo, *Is There a versio vulgata of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'? On the Hypothesis of a Double Recension of Kitāb al-Madḥal*

The present paper concerns the textual tradition of Avicenna's reworking of Porphyry's *Isagoge* (*Kitāb al-Madḥal*) opening the Logic section of Avicenna's *Book of the Cure* (*Kitāb al-Šifā'*). The present inquiry, conducted on 59 Arabic manuscripts and on the twelfth-century Latin translation of the work, has as its starting point the observation that the Latin translation, together with 11 Arabic manuscripts and the early indirect tradition of the work, witnesses the existence of a different, shorter, version of some passages of the text than that attested by most of the manuscripts. I shall suggest that one of the possibilities that should at least be considered in the attempt to explain this phenomenon is that of considering the short version of the text as an earlier recension of the text. In the frame of this hypothetical suggestion, the majority of the manuscript tradition would preserve an interpolated text, a *versio vulgata* that might not correspond to Avicenna's first version of the text. The existence and diffusion of two different recensions of the work might provide a clue of the compositional and editorial process that Avicenna's *Book of the Cure* underwent.

Silvia Di Vincenzo, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
silvia.divincenzo@sns.it

Niccolò Caminada, *A Latin Translation? The Reception of Avicenna in Albert the Great's De praedicamentis*, pp. 29-70

This paper presents an analysis of some quotations of Avicenna in Albert the Great's *De praedicamentis*. Many of these quotations have been thought by Mario Grignaschi to prove a direct knowledge, on Albert's part, of the Avicennan *Categories* (the *Maqūlāt* of his *Kitāb al-Šifā'*), a Latin translation of which is neither extant nor attested : Grignaschi presented these conclusions in a 1972 article on the Latin circulation of Arabic logical works, where he also hypothesized Albert's use of other sources apparently unknown to the Latins (al-Fārābī's *Greater commentaries* on the *Organon*, the logical sections of Avicenna's *Šifā'* posterior to the paraphrase of the *Isagoge*). Jules Janssens challenged these conclusions in a recent contribution (2013), arguing that Albert did not necessarily have access to versions of the concerned Arabic texts. The present research is thus aimed at reprising Grignaschi's *dossier*

and Janssens' reassessment, in particular as regards Albert's *De praedicamentis* and its relation with Avicenna's *Maqūlāt*: though Janssens' conclusions are substantially confirmed, further elements of discussion are given concerning Albert's sources, his use of the quotations and his understanding of Avicenna's philosophy.

Niccolò Caminada, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
niccolo.caminada@sns.it

Riccardo Strobino, *Avicenna's Kitāb al-Burhān, II.7 and its Latin Translation by Gundissalinus: Content and Text* pp. 105-47

The article discusses the relationship between chapter II.7 of Avicenna's (d. 1037) *Kitāb al-Burhān* (*Book of Demonstration*) and its 12th-century Latin translation by Dominicus Gundissalinus (fl. ca 1150), famously incorporated by the latter as an independent section in his own *De divisione philosophiae*. The text deals with the division of the sciences and their mutual relations, and is the only part of Avicenna's *Burhān* - his most extensive treatment of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* - ever to be translated into Latin. I shall examine different ways in which philosophical content and text relate to each other in the Arabic and in the Latin, focusing in particular on emendations, textual transmission, style of translation, and lexical usage.

Riccardo Strobino, Tufts University, USA
Riccardo.Strobino@tufts.edu

Gaia Celli, *The Rhetoric Section of the Kitāb al-Šifā': Hermannus Alemannus' Latin Translation and the Arabic Witnesses* pp. 149-76

Hermannus Alemannus, active as a translator in 13th Century Castile, set himself to the task of preparing an Arabic-Latin version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, with the avowed goal of making all the sections of the Alexandrian *Organon* available to the Western public. In this context, he also translated some short sections of Fārābī's *Kitāb al-Ḥitāba*, and of Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Rhetoric*, together with two excerpts from the rhetoric section of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, in order to substitute or explain difficult sections of Aristotle's text.

The goal of this contribution is to find out at which degree the textual relationships between the Arabic and the Latin witnesses of Avicenna's rhetorical work can be established and described, for the sake of their historical and editorial value.

Hermannus' text seems to share a few innovative readings with ms. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2709. For some of them collation could have played a role, while other mistakes are potentially polygenetic. Nonetheless, in other cases, confusing forces like collation and polygenesis of errors are a less likely explanation.

Ms. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2709 also shares innovative readings with the much older mss. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822 and Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442, so that this triplet is probably interrelated. It is not clear whether all the mistakes shared by mss. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442, and Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2709 are in Hermannus' Arabic source as well. We must therefore assume that either the relationship between Hermannus and ms. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi does not

extend to the two older manuscripts (and is likely due to collation), or that these mistakes were present in Hermannus' Arabic source as well, but they have been hidden by the translation process.

Gaia Celli, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
gaia.celli@sns.it

Frédérique Woerther, *Quoting/Translating. The Arabo-Latin Translation of Aristotle's Rhetoric by Hermann the German and the Quotations from al-Fārābī and Averroes* pp. 177-

The Latin translation of the Arabic version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was made by Hermann the German between 1243 and 1256. It is extant in its entirety in two manuscripts preserved in Paris (P = *Parisinus Latinus* 16673, saec. xiii) and Toledo (T = *Toletanus* 47.15, saec. xiii). Two folios of the Florence manuscript (F = *Laurentianus Plut.* 90. Sup. 64, saec. xv) have preserved the passages of Averroes that Hermann utilized in his translation. This Latin translation was executed on the basis of an Arabic witness of the *Rhetoric* that belongs to the same tradition as the text of the *Rhetoric* that al-Fārābī, Avicenna and Averroes used in their commentaries.

After a brief discussion of Hermann the German and the goals he claims to follow in translating the Arabic version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* into Latin, the aim of this contribution is to study the way he uses al-Fārābī's and Averroes' Commentaries, by answering the following questions : how can one identify and delineate al-Fārābī's and Averroes' quotations?, what is the nature of these quotations?, and what function do they perform in Hermann's Arabo-Latin translation?

This study will thus provide a general framework for examining Avicenna's quotations in Hermann's translation of the *Rhetoric*.

Frédérique Woerther, UMR 8230, CNRS-ENS (Ulm)
frederique.woerther@cnrs.fr

Jules Janssens, *The Liber primus naturalium, i.e., the Physics of the Avicenna latinus* pp. 219-38

The Latin translation of *Al-Samā' al-tabī'ī* of Ibn Sīnā's major work *Al-Šifā'* is unique insofar as it has been translated in two phases at different places, i.e. Toledo and Burgos, and in different times, i.e. second half of the twelfth century and ca. 1270-1275. Moreover, it was never translated in its entirety. Despite the absence of any clear evidence, a plausible reason is sought for both the sudden stopping of the Toledo translation and the (at first sight, conscious) putting into end of the Burgos translation. It is, moreover, shown that the translation had only a limited influence on the Latin world. Finally, great attention is paid to the translation techniques, especially the phenomenon of 'double translation'. Generally speaking, one discovers many common elements between the translation techniques used in both phases of the translation. The only major difference seems to consist in a greater fluidity in translating technical terms in the later Burgos translation than in the earlier Toledo translation.

Jules Janssens, De Wulf-Mansioncentrum, KU Leuven
jules.janssens@kuleuven.be

Alessia Astesiano, *The Beginning of a Motion in the Physics of the Continuum : Avicenna reads Aristotle* (Book of the Healing, Physics, III, 6) pp. 239-72

In Book VI of *Physics*, Aristotle states that every motion has an end, but not a beginning. The problem of how to consider the beginning of a motion emerges when motion, inasmuch as it is a continuum, is considered infinitely divisible. Avicenna deals with this problem in Book III, Chapter 6 of the *Physics* in *The Book of the Healing*. The aim of the present article is to clarify the most significant passages of this chapter from a doctrinal as well as a textual point of view. We will show how Avicenna addresses the problem by adopting the strategy of a terminological disambiguation of what is meant by 'beginning'. In this sense, his account is inserted in the tradition of late- antique commentaries on Aristotle, but with some interesting differences. To achieve our aim, we have examined the most ancient witnesses of the manuscript tradition of Avicenna's *Physics*, many of which are not considered in the previous editions, as well as the Medieval Latin translation, which makes it possible to trace back to an ancient phase of the transmission of the text.

Alessia Astesiano, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
alessia.astesiano@sns.it

Cristina Cerami, *The De Caelo et Mundo of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā': An Overview of its Structure, its Goal and its Polemical Background* pp. 273-329

The present paper is devoted to Ibn Sīnā's (Avicenna's) *De Caelo et Mundo* (*al-Samā' wa-l-'ālam*), the second section of the physical books of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*. It aims at providing a study of its structure and goals and its place within the framework of Avicenna's natural philosophy. This inquiry shows 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. Against this background, Avicenna establishes the unitary nature of the active and passive powers of the simple bodies, as well as the relation between inclination, natural motion and form. By framing the text within a broader philosophical and historical context, this paper also suggests that Avicenna's investigation aims ultimately at rebuking a neo-Philoponian trend among his Arabic contemporaries. Two appendixes are devoted to the Latin heritage of Avicenna's text. The first one provides a general overview of the treatise wrongly transmitted as Avicenna's own *DCM* as part of the earliest Latin translation of his *Kitāb al-Šifā'*. The second one takes into account the Latin translation of the authentic *DCM* and highlights some of its peculiarities.

Cristina Cerami, umr 7219-spheRE : CNRS/Université Paris Diderot/
Université Paris 1-Panthéon Sorbonne
cristinacerami@hotmail.com

Silvia Di Donato, *The three Latin translations of Avicenna's Meteorology: notes for the history of the text* pp. 331-49

The present article deepens the perspective of the paper presented at the conference '*A Crossroad between East and West. The Latin Mediaeval Translations of the Kitāb al-Šifā'* (Book of the Cure) of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna)' (Pisa, 2015). It aims to take the Latin tradition of the *Meteorology*, through its different and discontinuous steps of translation, as an observation point to remark some

characteristic aspects of the reception of Avicenna's *libri naturales* and of the *Meteorology* among them. As a corollary, the analysis on the place of the *Meteorology* reception underlines the role of Avicenna's text as an authoritative reference of Aristotelianism, supporting the reading and the interpretation of Aristotle and of the ancient sources.

Concerning the phases of the *Meteorology* reception into Latin, the paragraph devoted to the discussion on the authorship of the anonymous translation of the *De diluviis* aims to verify the hypothesis of attribution, and to examine some significant elements of the doctrinal context and the intention behind the translation, in order to clarify at least part of the system of relations that the translation can reveal. The presentation of some textual and terminological aspects characterising the third phase of translation, through a comparison between the Latin and the original Arabic showing the work of the translators, occupies the last part of the article.

Silvia Di Donato, SPHERE (CNRS, UMR 7219)
sildido@gmail.com

Elisa Rubino, *The Commentary of Alfred of Shareshill on the Pseudo-Aristotelian De mineralibus* pp. 351-63

Alfred of Shareshill was a leading figure in the English intellectual culture of the 12th century. He is the author of two translations, one treatise and three commentaries. One of these works is a commentary on the Avicennian *De mineralibus* and represents the last part of the more extensive commentary on Aristotle's *Meteorologica*, as evidenced in the manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Selden supra 24 (ff. 113r-114v). The glosses that constitute this commentary were identified by James K. Otte in 1993, but they still remain unedited.

For the first time, this contribution offers an 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. The main subject of the commentary is, in fact, the generation of minerals through the process of solidification, which in turn is due to the effects of heat and cold. The analysis is carried out in a highly technical and complex language. With the edition of the glosses on the *De mineralibus*, Alfred of Shareshill's entire legacy is now available to the public.

Elisa Rubino, Università del Salento, Lecce
elisa.rubino@unisalento.it

Tommaso Alpina, *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?* pp. 365-400

The aim of this article is to outline the textual and editorial vicissitudes of chapters 2-9 of Avicenna's medical treatise *On Cardiac Remedies* (*Maqāla fīl-adwiya al-qalbiyya*) that Abū 'Ubayd 'Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Muḥammad al-Ġūzġānī (fl. XI c.), Avicenna's disciple and secretary, inserted between the end of the fourth treatise and the beginning of the fifth treatise of Avicenna's *Book of the Soul* (*Kitāb al-Nafs*). In particular, this article firstly aims at detecting the reason why al-Ġūzġānī inserted a selection from Avicenna's *On Cardiac Remedies* in this precise place of Avicenna's *Nafs*, and the related question of why al-Ġūzġānī inserted in this place only an excerpt of this treatise and not all of it. The reason seems to be that of providing the brief outline of

Avicenna's theory of emotions in *Nafs*, IV, 4 with its medical background. Secondly, it provides a close scrutiny of the Arabic textual tradition of this insertion, which is by no means reflected in the current editions of the Arabic text of Avicenna's *Book of the Soul*. Lastly, this article offers an evaluation of the relevance of this insertion and, consequently, of the importance of studying it in relation to the textual tradition of both *On Cardiac Remedies* and the *Book of the Soul*.

Tommaso Alpina, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
tommaso.alpina@sns.it

Aafke M.I. Van Oppenraay, Avicenna's Liber de animalibus ('Abbreviatio Avicennae').
Preliminaries and State of Affairs pp. 401-16

In this article, I provide an overview of the status quaestionis and the current research agenda of Michael Scot's Arabo-Latin translation of Ibn Sīnā's (Avicenna's) Kitāb al-Ḥayawān, or Liber de animalibus (Book on Animals), as part of the Latin translation of the encyclopedia Kitāb al-Šifā'. I describe what has been ascertained so far on this topic in an explicit and documented way, opening up paths for future research. I deal with Ibn Sīnā's contribution to the transmission of Aristotle's zoology in the Arab world, with Michael Scot, the author of the Latin translation, and his Arabic model, and with the relationship between Scot's translation and Avicenna's Arabic version — as well as with the original Greek text by Aristotle -, with his style and with the Latin manuscript tradition and its dissemination. I outline the Nachleben of the treatise in commentaries, both incunable printings and its reception in the medieval period. In conclusion, I discuss the planned edition of the work, and provide as a sample, in an appendix, the beginning of both the Arabic and the Latin texts.

Aafke M.I. Van Oppenraay,
Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands,
Amsterdam aafke.van.oppenraay@huygens.knaw.nl

Rüdiger Arnzen, Double Translations in the Latin Version of the Metaphysics of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā' pp. 417-39

Among the touchstones of any critical edition of medieval Graeco-Latin and Arabo-Latin translations is the phenomenon of double translations (leçons doubles). In the first part of the present article, I deal in general with the nature and delimitation of the phenomenon in Arabo-Latin translations as well as with recent attempts at historical and philological explanations of its emergence. The second part analyses various types of double translations in the Latin version of Avicenna's Metaphysics of the K. al-Šifā' and provides some observations on their different causes.

Rüdiger Arnzen, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
r.arnzen@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Alfonso Quartucci, Avicenna's Notion of al-mawḏū' al-awwal ('first subject') in Ilāhiyyāt, I, 1-2 and its Latin Reception pp. 442-80

Scholarship has recently underscored the relevance of Avicenna's achievements concerning the epistemological structure of metaphysics, as well as their deep influence on Latin medieval philosophy. In this paper, I focus on Avicenna's original epistemological notion of 'first subject of science'. The paper falls into two parts. In the first one, I determine the exact meaning of the expression 'first subject' as it is employed in Ilāhiyyāt, I, 1-2. In the second part, the Latin reception of the Avicennian notion is investigated 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'.

Alfonso Quartucci, Scuola Normale Superiore,
Pisa alfonso.quartucci@sns.it

Amos Bertolacci, The Latin Translation and the Original Version of the *Ilāhiyyāt* (Science of Divine Things) of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'* pp. 482-514

The present article analyzes the evidence available in Arabic sources (preliminary lists of contents in manuscripts ; texts of manuscripts ; later quotations) that supports the hypothesis according to which the medieval Latin translation of the metaphysics of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-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'). It is argued (i) that the Versio Latina is probably more original than the Versio Vulgata, for doctrinal and philological reasons ; (ii) that the Versio Vulgata might respond to a deliberate intention to make the content of treatise V more compliant with the account of universals provided by Avicenna himself in the logic of the *Šifā'* and, in general, with the traditional pre-Avicennian ways of expounding the doctrine of universals ; (iii) and that the Versio Vulgata was likely the product of Avicenna's school, rather than of Avicenna himself, as the result of shared concerns and theoretical debates that prompted the decision of modifying Avicenna's original text through the intervention, in all likelihood, of al-Ġūzġānī. Two further issues are conclusively discussed : (iv) how precisely the Latin translation relates to the Arabic background of the Versio Latina, (v) and whether the Versio Latina can be taken as the outlook of treatise V intended and licensed by Avicenna, or it also conveys elements of later, non authorial modifications.

Amos Bertolacci, Scuola Normale Superiore,
Pisa amos.bertolacci@sns.it

Nicola Polloni, Gundissalinus and Avicenna : Some Remarks on an Intricate Philosophical Connection pp. 516-52

This article analyses the peculiarities of Dominicus Gundissalinus's reading and use of Avicenna's writings in his original works. Gundissalinus (1120ca - post 1190) is indeed the Latin translator of Avicenna's *De anima* and *Liber de philosophia prima*, but also an original philosopher whose writings are precious witnesses of the very first reception of Avicennian philosophy in the Latin West. The article points out the structural bond with the Persian philosopher upon which Gundissalinus grounds his own speculation. This contribution stresses, in particular, the important role played by Avicenna's psychology, epistemology, and metaphysics in order to provide Gundissalinus with a different set of answers to at least two main questions. On the one hand, the problem of creatural existence and cosmological causation, concerning which Gundissalinus tends to doctrinally merge Avicenna with Ibn Gabirol. On the other hand, Avicenna's influence is crucial for Gundissalinus's attempt at elaborating a new system of knowledge, which was supposed to be able to include the new sciences made available by the translation movement, but that also needed to be internally organised through firm epistemological principles. Beside his crucial contribution as translator, Gundissalinus's first philosophical encounter with the Avicenna paved the road for the subsequent reception of the Persian philosopher's works, opening a hermeneutical perspective which would be pivotal for the thirteenth-century discussions on soul, knowledge, and being.

Nicola Polloni, Durham University
nicola.polloni@durham.ac.uk

This paper presents a preliminary study of the translations into Persian of the Metaphysics section of Avicenna's Šifā'. During the Safavid dynasty a considerable number of commentaries and translations from Arabic into Persian contributed to the spread of the philosophical works of the complex Islamic intellectual scenario. The Peripatetic legacy, the iṣrāqī current, the šūfī tradition and the Iṣfahān School deeply influenced both the reading of philosophical texts and the doctrinal and terminological choices of the time. The Persian translations of Avicenna's Metaphysics are undoubtedly to be inserted in this varied context. The present research provides a new focus on the transmission and reception of Avicenna's text in the Persian cultural environment, but the manuscript heritage of this production still remains to be explored in detail.

Ivana Panzeca, Scuola Normale Superiore,
Pisa ivana.panzeca@sns.it

