

GAIA CELLI

The Rhetoric Section of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*: Hermannus Alemannus' Latin Translation and the Arabic Witnesses*

1. HERMANNUS ALEMANNUS AND HIS LITERARY ACTIVITY

Hermannus Alemannus was active as a scholar during the 13th century, within the territories of the Crown of Castile¹. He was probably bishop of Astorga (in León) from 1266 to 1270 — the year of his death — and he is mainly known for having translated from Arabic to Latin philosophical texts concerning Aristotle's ethics, rhetoric and poetics. He began translating Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on *Poetics* spurred by the Bishop of Toledo and by the chancellor of the King of Castile. After achieving this work by 1256, with the goal of making all the sections of the Alexandrian *Organon* available to the Latin public, Hermannus Alemannus undertook to prepare a Latin version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* from Arabic, again for the crown of Castile. In this context, he also translated some short sections of Fārābī's *Kitāb al-Hiṭāba*², or *Book of the Rhetoric*, and of Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Rhetoric*, together with two excerpts from the rhetoric section of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, or *Book of the Cure* (II.2, 73, 7 - 75, 15 and IV.1, 206, 8 - 212, 16 of Sālīm's edition)³, in order to substitute or explain difficult sections of Aristotle's text⁴. Since the quotes from other sources are finalized to explaining Aristotle's text and not to the divulgation of those texts as such, Hermannus' attitude is sometimes rather paraphrastic when dealing with them.

* The elaboration of this paper benefited from many people's advice and discussion, but I especially want to thank Prof. A. Bertolacci, Prof. G. Ammannati, Prof. M. Aouad, Dr. H. Fadlallah, Prof. F. Woerther, and the late Prof. F. Del Punta for their generous input. I also wish to thank the two anonymous referees for their remarks and comments.

¹ On Hermannus' biography, see G. H. LUQUET, *Hermann l'Allemand* († 1272), « Revue del'Histoire des Religions », 44, 1901, pp. 407-422.

² This subject is discussed in depth by F. Woerther in her contribution to this volume.

³ M. S. SĀLIM, *Ibn Sīnā, Al-Šifā', la logique, VIII, Rhétorique (Al-Ḥaṭābah)*, Imprimerie Nationale, Il Cairo 1954.

⁴ The nature of these difficulties is discussed in W. F. BOGGESE, *Hermannus Alemannus' Rhetorical Translations*, « Viator », 2, 1970, pp. 227-250, in F. WOERTHER, *Les citations du Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote par Averroès dans la traduction arabo-latine de la Rhétorique d'Aristote par Hermann l'Allemand*, « Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph », 63, 2010-2011, pp. 323-359, and in G. CELLI, *Some Observations about Hermannus Alemannus' Citations of Avicenna's Book of the Rhetoric*, « Oriens », 40/2, 2012, pp. 477-513.

The goal of this contribution is to find out at which degree the textual relationship between the Arabic and the Latin witnesses of Avicenna's rhetorical work can be established and described, since better knowledge of the links between Hermannus' Arabic source and other Avicennian Arabic manuscripts would be, at the same time, very useful in editorial terms and extremely informative as far as the history of our text is concerned. These questions will be dealt with directly in sections 5 and 6 of this paper. Before addressing them, I will provide some preliminary information about the witnesses of the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, both in Latin (section 2) and in Arabic (section 4), while in section 3 I will describe the ways in which Hermannus acts on his source text.

2. HERMANNUS' WITNESSES

We know about Hermannus' yet unedited translation thanks to three manuscripts, namely ms. Paris, BNF, latine 16673, ms. Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulare, 47.15, and ms. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 90 Sup. 64, even if the latter copy only contains the citations from Averroes, to the exclusion of quotes from Fārābī and Avicenna, and of Aristotle's text itself. In Aegidius Romanus' commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, which mainly relies on Moerbeke's Greek-Latin translation⁵, there are short quotes from Hermannus' text as well, regularly drawn from the part of the translation regarding Aristotle rather than from his commentators cited by the translator⁶.

Ms. Paris, BNF, latine 16673 is a parchment codex dating to the 13th century. It was penned in gothic letters by two different copyists — the first active up to 61r and the second from 65r — and it is made up of 172 folia divided in two columns each. It contains no corrections, but sporadic glosses appear in the section that contains Hermannus' *Rhetoric*. This text — mistakenly named *Averroes in Rhetoricam* by *Aristoteles Latinus* — covers folia 65r-147r. The manuscript also preserves *Rhetorica Vetus* (ff. 1r-61r), a list of Greek words found in this text (f. 61v), and Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Poetics*, again translated by Hermannus. On the verso of the last folio we can read: «Explicit Deo gratias

⁵ The first Greek-Latin translation of the *Rhetoric*, from an unknown author and rarely copied, goes back to the beginning of the 13th century, while the much more famous version by William of Moerbeke is dated 1269. According to R. Kassel's stemmatic reconstruction, the anonymous version rests entirely within the γ branch, while Moerbeke's text derives both from γ and from Δ . Cfr. ARISTOTLE, *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*, ed. R. KASSEL, De Gruyter, Berlin 1976, and G. DAHAN, *L'entrée de la Rhétorique d'Aristote dans le monde latin entre 1240 et 1270*, in I. ROSIER-CATACH, G. DAHAN eds., *La Rhétorique d'Aristote. Traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au XVII^e siècle*, Vrin, Paris 1998, pp. 65-86.

⁶ Cfr. C. MARMO, *Retorica e poetica*, in L. BIANCHI ed., *La filosofia nelle Università. Secoli XIII e XIV*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1997.

anno Domini millesimo ducentesimo quinquagesimo sexto, septimo decimo die Marcii, apud Toletum, urbem nobilem». *Aristoteles Latinus* refers this statement to the translation of the commentary on the *Poetics* rather than to the copying of the codex, which goes back to the 13th century, as stated above⁷.

Ms. Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulare, 47.15 is a parchment codex dating to the 13th century, made up of 160 folia followed by two blank ones. It is a very large manuscript, its pages are organized on three columns and two different copyists penned sections ff. 1r-146v and ff. 147r-160. There are no marginal notes and the upper third of each page is hard to read because it was damaged by humidity. The translation of the *Rhetoric* covers folia 36r-53r, but many more texts are included in the codex. They vary in subject, but they are all philosophical in nature. Quite a few of them share the characteristic of being Aristotelian, translated from Arabic, or devoted to rhetoric subjects. The *Rhetorica Vetus* occupies folia 25r-35v⁸.

Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 90 Sup. 64⁹ is a paper codex going back to the 15th century, in chancery hand, made up of 106 folia preceded by 5 blank folia. Two copyists have been working on it. In the margins and in the interline there are *glossae* and *scholia* inserted by a hand slightly younger than the copyists'. It does not contain the whole of Hermannus' translation of the *Rhetoric*, but only quotes from Averroes taken from chapters I.1-5, which cover folia 105r-106v. The manuscript also preserves the Latin version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* prepared by George of Trebizond (ff. 1r-97r) and some *summaria* (97r-104v)¹⁰.

Aegidius Romanus' commentary on the *Rhetoric* is still unedited, but the edition printed in Venice in 1515 is easily available thanks to a reprint¹¹. However this witness is not — strictly speaking — pertinent to our task, since, at the best of my knowledge, Aegidius' quotes from Hermannus' version are always taken from the text of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* translated into Latin, and never from the philosophical quotes that are added from Averroes, Fārābī, and Avicenna.

When discussing Hermannus' text, I act on the presumption that the Paris and the Toledo manuscripts shared a common ancestor, for there are passages

⁷ Cfr. G. LACOMBE, A. L. BIRKENMAJER, M. DULONG, E. FRANCESCHINI, L. MINIO-PALUELLO, *Aristoteles Latinus*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1955, I.706.

⁸ Cfr. LACOMBE ET AL., *Aristoteles Latinus* cit., II.1243.

⁹ On this witness, see BOGESS, *Hermannus Alemannus*' cit., and B. SCHNEIDER, *Rhetorica: Translatio anonyma et Guillelmi*, Brill, Leiden 1978.

¹⁰ Cfr. LACOMBE ET AL., *Aristoteles Latinus* cit., II.2343.

¹¹ AEGIDIUS ROMANUS, *Commentaria in Rhetoricam Aristotelis*, Venice 1515, Unverändert Nachdruck, Minerva G.M.B.H., Frankfurt 1968.

where the text that they both preserve cannot be right¹². Moreover, the fact that they both have individual mistakes means that none of them is *eliminandus* in the reconstruction of the text. I am incapable of making reliable assumptions on the stemmatic position of Aegidius' commentary vis-à-vis Hermannus' translation, but, as said above, this could not be a relevant element when discussing Avicennian quotes in Hermannus' *Rhetoric*. On these premises, whenever I quote Hermannus translation of Aristotle's and Avicenna's *Rhetoric*, I make use of the text that I personally assembled by collating its witnesses. I wish to highlight that this version of the Latin text is, by all points of view, provisional: my goal is simply to provide the reader with a meaningful text and some information about the wording of its witnesses. For reference purpose, I always quote page and line number of the Paris manuscript. Whenever I adopt a reading from the Toledo manuscript, I specify it.

3. HERMANNUS AND AVICENNA

In Hermannus' version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the translations from Fārābī¹³, Avicenna and Averroes are not finalized at divulging said sources for their own sake, but rather at explaining Aristotle's text. Accordingly, Hermannus' attitude is slightly more paraphrastic when dealing with them than when dealing with Aristotle himself. More specifically, in the first chapters of the first book of the *Rhetoric* Hermannus uses Averroes as a source of commentary notes for complex Aristotelian passages. In the later, more example-intensive books, it is Avicenna that will be employed, once to explain a difficult Aristotelian section, and once to substitute for Aristotle's text altogether. It is Hermannus himself that describes examples and foreign words in Aristotle's Arabic text as the main reason for which he was forced to enlist Avicenna's aid¹⁴. This approach seems quite sensible, if we consider the fact that Averroes' work on the *Rhetoric* is indeed structured as a commentary, aimed at making Aristotle's meaning easier to grasp, and that it is divided into Aristotelian *lemmata* and their explanation, while Avicenna's treatise, as a part of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, is built as a self-sufficient

¹² See for example the case of *decentia* (to be emended in *decentiam*) and of *significatum* (possibly to be emended in *dictio*) at paragraph 5.4 of this paper, and of *munus* and *minuscule* (to be emended in *minus* and *minuscule* respectively) at paragraph 5.6.

¹³ On quotes from Fārābī, see F. WOERTHER, *Les traces du Grand Commentaire d'al-Fārābī à la Rhétorique d'Aristote dans la traduction arabo-latine de la Rhétorique par Hermann l'Allemand*, « Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale », 54, 2012, pp. 137-154, and her contribution to the present volume.

¹⁴ This statement is made just before his second Avicennian quote, at 128ra11-16 of the Paris manuscript: « in hoc passu tot inciderunt exempla extranea et greca (grata PT) vocabula quod nullum nobis consilium fuit prosequendi textum Aristotilis. Unde coacti fuimus (fuerimus P) sequi illud quod Avicenna de hoc passu excerpserat et posuerat in libro suo Aschipse ».

text. On the other hand, as a reworking of the original, it was perfectly capable of substituting for it: this, after all, is what actually happened in the Arabic philosophical tradition after Avicenna's death¹⁵.

On four occasions, Hermannus also informs the reader that he is going to omit an especially troubling passage, as a last-resort tool to cope with the difficulties of the Greek-Arabic translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*¹⁶.

The following table sums up Hermannus' citations from Averroes and Avicenna, together with Hermannus' omissions. I also note which Greek passages are commented upon, and – between brackets – which passages are intentionally left without translation. For immediate reference purpose, I quote the pages and lines of the Paris manuscript for Hermannus' version, Bekker's numbers for Aristotle's Greek text, Sālim's edition for Avicenna, and Aouad's edition for Averroes' *Middle Commentary*¹⁷.

ARISTOTLE, <i>Ars Rhetorica</i> I		
65vb17-66ra3	I, 1, 1354a1-4	Ave. MCR, 1.1.1 (p. 1.6-14), and 1.1.2 (p. 2.4-5, and 2.7-8)
66vb15-67ra4	I, 1, 1354b22-28	Ave. MCR, 1.1.9 (p. 5.10-22)
67rb28-67va3	I, 1, 1355a18-20	Ave. MCR, 1.1.13 (pp. 8.8 and 8.11-13)
67va11-18	I, 1, 1355a20-24	Ave. MCR, 1.1.14 (p. 8.14-16)
67vb11-13	I, 1, 1355a29-32	Ave. MCR, 1.1.17 (p. 9.12-13)
72rb21-72va8	I, 4, 1359b2-18	Ave. MCR, 1.4.4 (pp. 32.23-33.11)
72vb7-10	I, 4, 1359b23-29	Ave. MCR, 1.4.6 (p. 34.10-11)
75rb (marginal note)	I, 5, 1361b27-34	Ave. MCR, 1.5.24 (p. 46.10)
75rb (marginal note)	I, 5, 1361b27-34	Ave. MCR, 1.5.24 (p. 46.9)
75rb20-75va4	I, 5, 1361b39-1362a12	Ave. MCR, 1.5.26 (pp. 46.19-47.3)

¹⁵ Hermannus himself addresses his activity as a translator of the *Rhetoric* and its commentaries in two cases. See CELLI, *Some Observations* cit., pp. 478-483.

¹⁶ These passages too have been pointed out by BOGGESE, *Hermannus Alemannus*' cit., p. 240.

¹⁷ See AVERROES, *Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote. Édition critique du texte arabe et traduction française*, ed. M. AOUAD, Vrin, Paris 2002.

75vb8-18	I, 5, 1362a12-14	Ave. MCR, 1.5.27-28 (p. 47.15-19)
76rb7-12	I, 6, 1362a29-31	Ave. MCR, 1.6.6 (p. 49.16-18)
76rb27-28	I, 6, 1362b5-1362b10	Ave. MCR, 1.6.9 (p. 50.5-6)
77va11-78va19	I, 6, 1363a17-1363b4	Avi. KH, II.2 (pp. 73,7-75,15)^a Ave. ^b MCR, 1.6.18-19 (pp. 53,6-54,5)
77va (marginal note)		
92vb12-18,	(I, 15, 1375b33-1376a8)	xxx
ARISTOTLE, <i>Ars Rhetorica</i> III		
128ra17-130rb28	(III, 2-4, 1405a31-1407a18)	Avi. KH, IV.1 (pp. 206,8-212,16)^c
134va24-28,	(III, 9, 1410a9-1410a20)	xxx
135va24-b7	(III, 10, 1411a4-1411b10)	xxx
143ra18-20	(III, 16, 1417a13-1417a16)	xxx

^a See paragraphs 3.1, 5.1 and 5.2 of the present contribution.

^b As Boggess points out, the manuscripts mistakenly state that this passage is taken from Avicenna as well.

^c See paragraphs 3.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7 of the present contribution.

We can see at a glance that, although quotes from Averroes are much more frequent (and grouped in *Rhetoric* I), the Avicennian citations are much longer, so that, on the whole, Hermannus translated much more Avicenna than Averroes. The extension of the Latin text available to us for Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* gives some ground to the hope of establishing genetic relationships between Hermannus' source and the Arabic manuscripts of this treatise. The first Avicennian citation refers to *Rhet.*, I, 6 but is located in *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, II.2, for in the Arabic commentary Aristotle's first book is divided into two separate treatises, the first one devoted to the general principles of rhetoric, and the second one to the three rhetorical genders, judiciary, deliberative and encomiastic. Likewise, the second Avicennian citation stems from a section of IV.1, but mirrors Aristotle III, 2-4, where stylistically appropriate words are discussed. I will analyze some textual peculiarities of the first quote from Avicenna (Ari. *Ars Rhetorica*, I, 6, 1363a17-1363b4/ Avi. *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, II.2, pp. 73, 7 - 75, 15) at paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of this contribution, while the second Avicennian quote (Ari. *Ars Rhetorica*, III, 2-4, 1405a31-1407a18/ Avi. *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, pp. 206, 8 - 212, 16) will be examined at paragraphs 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7.

3.1. Hermannus' First Avicennian Quote

The first quote from the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* (II.2, pp. 73, 7 - 75, 15 of Sālim's edition) encompasses a citation from Avicenna, one from Averroes, and some introductory words by Hermannus himself. Unlike what happens for the second Avicennian quote (*Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, pp. 206, 8 - 212, 16), here Aristotle's text was not omitted, possibly because in this case Hermannus had no problem with its examples, but rather with the general sense of the passage. This is what he states while introducing the citation:

Ms. Paris, BNF, Latine 16673, 77ra15-22:

«Dixit translator: In hoc passu invenimus textum Aristotelis vel ita corruptum, vel decurtatum, vel forte in se obscurum quod sententiam plane intelligibilem ex eo elicere non potuimus. Unde visum fuit verbum ex verbo transferre et post ipsum ad eius elucidationem textum Avi/scenne ex libro suo Asschiphe subiungere usque ad finem capituli».

Hermannus is stating that the Arabic text is so hard to understand that he is forced to transpose it word by word and to add Avicenna's text *ad eius elucidationem*. This could also serve as a motive for the contemporary insertion of the note from Averroes, which is not announced by Hermannus¹⁸.

Rhet., I, 6 is part of Aristotle's discussion of deliberative rhetoric. At the beginning of I, 4 (in 1359a30-b1), Aristotle establishes that the topics worth discussing in terms of deliberative rhetoric concern good and bad things whose obtainment depends on our behavior. Chapter four then analyzes those good and bad things that are of a political nature (1359b2-1360b3), while chapter five discusses happiness and its parts, as they are the goal of deliberation (1360b4-1362a14). Finally, chapter six examines the goal of deliberation in terms of goodness and usefulness, for this is the reference point employed by deliberating

¹⁸ Still, if we consider the subjects addressed concomitantly by Avicenna and Averroes, we find out that the only relevant passages are those about Homer as someone who knew how to remunerate both friends and enemies through the rhetorical devices of praise and blame. On the one hand, this passage seems to deserve particular attention inasmuch as it offers a specifically rhetorical way in which gratitude should be expressed. On the other hand, Hermannus must have found the Homeric example both puzzling and interesting, so that Averroes' passage, which gives little information about historical details, did not seem to him enough to clarify it and Avicenna's words had to be added. The idea that in his first citation from the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* Hermannus was chiefly concerned with Avicenna's words about Homer is strengthened by the fact that these are the lines on which the translator acts most intrusively. I discuss this subject in more detail in CELLI, *Some Observations* cit., where I also offer a provisional text of Hermannus translation of the Aristotelian, Avicennian and Averroistic passages.

people (1362a18-20). Single good things on which there is general agreement are then treated (1362b10-28). For good things that are not universally recognized, some individuation criteria are suggested: for example, that which is the opposite of a bad thing, or the opposite of what is desired by our enemies, are often a good thing (1362b29-37). The passage that reportedly stumps Hermannus explains that good things are often those that are appreciated by valuable people, those that take place in a preferred way, those easily obtained, and those desired by each one (1363a17-b4).

The structure of *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, II.2 resembles that of *Rhet.*, I, 6 inasmuch as its first section (pp. 64, 11 - 69, 14 in Sālim's edition) is devoted to good things that are recognized by everyone, while its second section (pp. 69, 15 - 75, 14 in Sālim's edition) analyzes more subjective criteria. However, the Avicennian and Averroistic passages quoted by Hermannus focus strongly on rewards for benevolent and malicious acts, which are not addressed at all in Aristotle's text¹⁹. The citation from Avicenna runs to the end of his chapter II.2, while the quote from Averroes is much shorter (1.6.18-19 or pp. 53, 6 - 54, 5 in Aouad's edition) and strictly focused on benevolence and its reward. The narrow scope of the citation from Averroes leads me to think that the passage Hermannus could not understand actually was 1363a16-24, in which it is stated that subjective criteria for recognizing a good are the fact that it is appreciated by valuable people and that it is easy to obtain.

3.2. Hermannus' Second Avicennian Quote

The second Avicennian citation, beginning in 128ra of the Paris manuscript, analyzes metaphors, periphrasis, diminutives, stylistic coldness, and comparisons. Unlike the previous case, here the Aristotelian text for III, 2-4 is completely substituted by Avicenna's words. At this point as well, Hermannus introduces the quotation with some explanatory phrases:

Ms. Paris, BNF Latine 16673, 128ra11-16:

« In hoc passu tot inciderunt exempla extranea et greca (grata PT) vocabula quod nullum nobis consilium fuit prosequendi textum Aristotilis. Unde coacti fuimus (fuerimus P) sequi illud quod Avicenna de hoc passu excerpserat et posuerat in libro suo Aschiphe ».

¹⁹ As J. Watt explains, this is probably due to the translation of τιμωρία (1363a26) as *mukāfa'a*, 'requit, reward' (p. 32.5 ed. Lyons). See BAR HEBRAEUS, *Aristotelian Rhetoric in Syriac*. Barhebraeus, Butyrum Sapientiae, *Book of Rhetoric*, ed. J. W. WATT, in H. DAIBER, R. KRUK eds., *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, Brill, Leiden - New York 2005, 2.3.7-8, p. 308.

Hermannus could not translate Aristotle's Arabic version because of the many examples and Greek words it contained²⁰. This is also the main difficulty Arabic commentators faced in dealing with the *Rhetoric*²¹, and the reason put forward by the translator for omitting the four Aristotelian passages listed in my table²². Hence, omission could be regarded as Hermannus' default solution for passages made unclear by the many references to Greek culture. However, while all the sections listed in my table were tolerably short and their absence did not prevent the global understanding of Aristotle's text, the problematic passage outlined in 128ra11-16 covers as much as three chapters of the *Rhetoric*. By merely leaving it out of the Arabic-Latin translation, therefore, Hermannus would have faced a structural problem, for the whole Aristotelian discussion of the stylistic choice of words would have been missing. Hence the extraordinary decision of substituting it with a commentator's text. It will not be hard to see why Hermannus sought an explanation for Aristotle's examples in Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* rather than in Averroes' *Middle Commentary* if we follow S. Stroumsa's discussion of the indifference shown by Averroes for Greek examples, literary references, and technical terminology in his writings on rhetoric and poetics, which very much differs from Avicenna's systematic attempt to offer an Arabic explicative equivalent for most of them²³.

²⁰ The anonymous Arabic translator's approach to this kind of difficulties is discussed in U. VAGELPOHL, *Aristotle's Rhetoric in the East*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2008, p. 206.

²¹ Hermannus states it in his prologue to the translation of the *Rhetoric*: ms. Paris, BNF Latine 16673, 65rb4-13: «Nec miretur quisquam vel indignetur de difficultate vel quasi ruditate translationis, nam multo difficilius et rudius ex greco in arabicum est translata. Ita quod Alfarabius, qui primus conatus est ex rethorica aliquem intellectum glosando elicere, multa exempla greca propter ipsorum obscuritatem pertransiens derelinquit et propter eandem causam multa dubie exposuit et, ut Avicenna et Avenrosd estimant, propter hanc etiam causam glosam usque ad finem negotii non perduxit ».

²² Here are Hermannus' explanations for his Aristotelian omissions. Ms. Paris, BNF Latine 16673, 92vb12-18: «Dixit translator: circa hunc locum plures scribebantur testes et exempla suorum testimoniorum que propter errorem antiquum scriptorum ita confusa fuerunt in omnibus exemplaribus quod non poterat haberi consilium ad ea transferendum. Ideoque fuerunt relicta ». 134va24-28: «Sermo translatoris: Plura talia exempla ad idem facientia quia grecam sapiebant sententiam non multum usitatum latinis dimissa sunt et subsequitur quasi conclusio auctoris ». 135va24-b7: «Inquit translator: Hic plura exempla dicte rationis confirmativa dimisit Ibiniscena in suo Aschipse et Avenrosd in sua determinativa expositione huius libri quia penitus grecam sententiam protendebant nec videbatur eis quam magnam habebant utilitatem in arabico eloquio. Hac quoque de causa ego dimisi ipsa. Qui autem magnum habebant auditorium per ipsa volentes in latino via procedere rethoricandi? ». 143ra18-20: «Et inducat probationem ad hoc exemplum notum in greco quemadmodum processit talis in causa contra talem ».

²³ See S. STROUMSA, *Avicenna's Philosophical Stories: Aristotle's Poetics Reinterpreted*, «Arabica», 39, 1992, pp. 183-206.

If citations from commentators and omissions of troubling Aristotelian passages are the tools employed by Hermannus when dealing with the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*, we still don't know how he intervenes on Avicenna's text. The second Avicennian quote, being the longest, provides the best basis for answering this question. I suggest that his activity revolves around three main axes, namely paraphrasis, explicative insertions, and substitution of Arabic *realia* with concepts either more familiar to the Latin reader, or more coherent with the sometimes fictitious Greek background in which Hermannus wanted to anchor his translation of logics. Since I have already extensively discussed the first two cases elsewhere²⁴, I will sum them up very briefly, while I will describe the third strategy in more detail.

Paraphrastic activity takes the form of an overall rephrasing of a passage which is unclear in its original shape or which, as it is, does not help the translator in making Aristotle's intentions easier to understand. On the other hand, explicative insertions are also employed for the translation of Aristotelian passages, but, while in that case they are effectively and explicitly marked by means of *rubricae* like *dixit interpretes*, within the Avicennian passages themselves no title introduces the sections inserted by the translator. This reinforces the conclusion that Hermannus viewed his relationship with Avicenna's text in rather different terms than that with Aristotle's text.

An example of substitution of Arabic *realia* with Greek *realia* is to be found in Hermannus' second Avicennian quote. Faced with the staggering list of culture specific examples that illustrate *Rhet.*, III, 2-4, the translator resorts to the omission of a section of Aristotle's text, and to its replacement with Avicenna's parallel passage (IV.1, pp. 206, 8 - 212, 16 of Sālim's edition). Here, Hermannus is confronted with a discussion of diminutive and augmentative substantives, like *duhayb*/*'iqyān* (a little bit of gold/pure gold, p. 209, 5-6) and *tuwayb*/*hil'a* (a little gown/a formal gown, p. 209, 6-7).

Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba, IV.1, p. 209, 5-8 Sālim:

وعلى هذا المجرى حال استعمال اللفظ المعظم والمصغر. فإذا قيل مثلاً: ذهب, وثوب, حقربه المعنى الواحد بعينه الذى يعظمه لو قيل: العقيان, أو قيل: الخلة. بل إذا قيل: ثعلبان, وقيل: ثعلب, وقيل: معطى, وقيل: معطى, وعنى تصغير معطى, اختلف المعنى بذلك شديداً

«Likewise for the augmentative and diminutive enunciation. And whenever one says 'a little bit of gold' and 'a little gown', the very same meaning decreases, that increases whenever one says 'pure gold', or whenever one says 'formal gown'.

²⁴ CELLI, *Some Observations* cit., pp. 487-492.

But whenever one says 'big fox' or 'little fox', and 'a bit' or 'a small bit' — and it means the reduction of the bit — in this case the meaning is very different ».

Ms. Paris, BNF Latine 16673, 129ra15-24:

« [15] Et hac via procedit usus dictionis amplificative et diminutive. Cum enim dicitur verbi gratia aurulum [diminutivum de auro] aut vestiolum [diminutivum de veste], diminuitur unum et idem significatum [20] quod amplificatur dicendo aurum eurizon aut vestimentum polimeton, [idem exametum]. Verum quando dicitur vulpes aut vulpecula, et quando dicitur minus (munus *PT p. c.*) aut minusculum (minusculum *PT*) diversificatur per hoc significatum diversitate non modica ».

We can see that the diminutives are translated by means of the standard Latin diminutive suffix *-ulus*, *-a*, *-um* as *aurulum* and *vestiolum*. The augmentatives could have been effectively rendered with periphrastic Latin expressions, as we would do when translating them in English, but Hermannus chose to translate them with Greek loanwords instead, namely *eurizon* and *polimeton*²⁵. Du Cange lists the expression *polymitus* in his glossary, that is *polymita vestis, multis variisque coloris filis et liciis contexta et variegata*. The term seems to be inspired by Greek and Du Cange reports that some *glossae* link it to ποικιλική and πολυμιταρικη. *Eurizon* is an alchemical term, which refers to a very pure kind of gold, or possibly to a kind of gold which has not been produced through alchemical means. Mandosio²⁶, discussing the presence of this word in the late 15th century author Jeroni Torella, states that it might be a neologism deriving from the Greek adjectives εὐρίζος (*with good roots*) or ὀβριζος (*very pure, said of gold*). The derivation of the Latin *obryzum* from either of these Greek expressions is uncontroversial. However, if Hermannus was already using this term, it cannot be seen as a 15th century neologism; moreover, it should be noted that in the Middle Ages the Greek pronunciation of ὀβριζος and εὐρίζος differed only for the first vowels, which had a very similar shape in minuscule writing, and that the two terms are also equated in the *Alphita*, a lexicon of botanical and medical *glossae* that originated in 11th century Salerno²⁷. Finally, since E. Trapp's *Lexikon zur Byzantinischer Gräzität*²⁸ also lists the adjective εὐριζος and translates it as *rein*,

²⁵ Both the Toledo and the Paris manuscripts bear the additional text *idem exametum*, which, in all likelihood, originated as a gloss. *Exametum* is probably a Greek loanword too, glossed by Du Cange as *pannus holosericus, Graecis recentioribus ἐξάμιτος*. See C. DU CANGE, P. CARPENTIER, L. HENSCHEL, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, L. Favre, Niort 1883-1887.

²⁶ See J.-M. MANDOSIO, *La création verbale dans l'alchimie latine du Moyen Âge*, « Bulletin Du Cange : archivum latinitatis medii aevi », 63, 2005, pp. 137-147 (p. 138).

²⁷ See J. L. G. MOWAT, *Alphita, a medico-botanical glossary from the Bodleian manuscript, Selden B, vol. II Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press 1887, p. 127.

²⁸ See E. TRAPP, *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*, Verl. der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2005.

pur (vom Gold) there is really no reason to worry about the relationship between *eurizon* and εὐρίζος, since our Latin word surely stems from the adjective with υ, whether it was linked to ὄβριζος or not. The choice of translating the Arabic augmentatives *‘iqyān* and *ḥil‘a* in such a way is not only due to the lack of a proper augmentative suffix in the Latin language, but also to Hermannus’s desire to provide an Hellenising veneer to his Aristotelian translations, even if they are actually translations from Arabic. This is also confirmed by the fact that these and other loanwords appear in the Latin version with the Greek neutral suffix -ov, which is sometimes quite preposterous. This is the case of the meters *agamenon* and *effron*, which never existed in Greek literature, and which — but for the suffix — are plausible looking transliterations of Avicenna’s *afā* and *afman*²⁹, since the final *yā*’ of *afā* could easily have been misread as a *rā*’ and the *fā*’ in *afman* could easily have been misread as a *ḡayn*. Although it is not clear how Avicenna’s *afman* originated from the expression διθύραμβοι/*dīṭūrāmbū* of Aristotle’s Greek-Arabic translation, the permanence of ἔπη/*afā* in the text of *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* leads us to assume that, in Avicenna’s eyes, *afman* is to be regarded as a Greek loanword as well.

4. AVICENNA’S WITNESSES

Although longer than the quotes from Averroes, the sections from *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* quoted by Hermannus are not long enough to allow us to draw a complete picture of the state and history of Avicenna’s text in the Arabic West, for there is a limit to how many unifying copying errors can take place in just a few pages. Nonetheless, a systematic and careful comparison of the Arabic manuscripts between each other and with the Latin version can tell us something about the Arabic source on which Hermannus built his translation.

The Avicennian *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* has been edited in 1954 by M. S. Sālim³⁰, who produced a very dependable text and gave us an uncommon lot of information concerning his manuscript sources, but did not put himself to the task of producing a stemmatic edition of Avicenna’s text, so that the relationship between his witnesses is not further analyzed. For a text that is preserved in a remarkable number of manuscripts, he only uses nine of them. Although Sālim gives us much useful information on the textual history of the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* in the preface to his edition, his witnesses do not seem selected on the basis of a reconstructed

²⁹ About the transliteration and translation for the names of Greek meters, see paragraph 5.7 of this paper.

³⁰ M. S. SĀLIM, *Ibn Sīnā, Al-ṣifā’, la logique, VIII, Rhétorique (Al-ḥaṭābah)*, Imprimerie Nationale, Cairo 1954.

stemma, but rather on the ground of their geographical collocation, since they are all preserved in Cairo, Istanbul, or London. This is the reason why, whenever discussing Hermannus as a witness for Avicenna, I quote Sālīm's text, but I add to it my own *apparatus*, based on my — still partial — collation of Avicennian manuscripts. Although my goal is to establish genealogical relationship between Hermannus and the rest of the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* tradition, I wish to stress that at present I do not have at my disposal a stemmatic reconstruction of the latter either, and that the present contribution is to be understood as just a small step in this direction.

Bibliographical sources testify the survival of over eighty copies of Avicenna's rhetorical section of the *Kitāb al-Šifā'*, and I have been able to collate sixteen of them, at least as far as the sections translated in Latin are concerned³¹. They are listed below in chronological order, each followed by the *siglum* by which I will reference it throughout this paper:

1. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 822 (12th-13th C.) (*Sh*)
2. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2710 (666H/1268) (*O*)
3. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442 (671-674H/1273-1276) (*S*)
4. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmet III 3261 (677H/1278) (*Vh*)
5. Cairo, Maktabat al-Azhar 331 *huṣūṣiyya*, 44988 Behīt (13th C.) (*Cb*)
6. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah 1424 (693H/1293-1294) (*Sf*)
7. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Damat Ibrahim Paşa 823 (697H/1298) (*Si*)
8. Tehran, Kitābhānah-i Mağlis-i Šhūrā-yi Millī 135 (871H/1467) (*E*)
9. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Şehid Ali Paşa 1748 (879H/1474) (*Sq*)
10. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek 1445, Golius 84 (881H/1476) (*La*)
11. Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Yeni Cami 770 (888H/1483) (*Sr*)
12. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2709 (886H/1481-897H/1492) (*Ob*)
13. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek 1444, Golius 4 (i, t, r) (before 10th/16th C.) (*L*)
14. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2708 (10th/16th C.) (*Oa*)
15. Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Ahmed III 3445 (11th/17th C.) (*Vi*)
16. London, British Museum Or. 7500 (11th/17th C.) (*Cm*)

The most ancient of these manuscripts are old enough to be chronologically proximate with Hermannus' Arabic source, which dates back to first half of the 13th century at least.

³¹ Access to the reproductions of these manuscripts and to information about them was possible within the framework of the PhiBor project (ERC AdvGr, www.avicennaproject.eu), and what I state here on this subject is in part the provisional result of the research pursued in that domain.

Most of the codices listed above either witness all the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* four sections on logic, natural philosophy, mathematics and metaphysics (this is the case of *Sh*, *O*, *S*, *Cb*, *Sf*, *Si*, *La*, *Sr*, *Ob*, *L*, *N*), or leave out mathematics (as in *E*, *Sq*, and *Cm*). The exceptions to this rule are *Vh*, which only preserves logic and natural philosophy – so that it could be the first half of a whole copy – and manuscripts *Vi* and *Cm*, which only preserve the logic section. For future research, it would probably be interesting to ascertain whether witnesses containing only one of Avicenna's four *ǧumal* form a coherent group or not.

5. HERMANNUS AS A TEXTUAL WITNESS OF AVICENNA'S *KITĀB AL-ḤIṬĀBA*: SOME CRITICAL PASSAGES

In the following pages, I will discuss a few textual problems suggesting that Hermannus' text is in some relationship with ms. Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2709 (*Ob*), which, according to its colophons, was produced in Shiraz between 1481 and 1491. In fact, although both Hermannus and *Ob* have individual mistakes, they do share a variety of errors.

Ob (and sometimes Hermannus) also shares mistakes with *Sh* and *S*, two very ancient Istanbul witnesses of the whole *Kitāb al-Šifā'*. *Sh* was copied before 1481 – probably much earlier – and is best known for the so-called 'Avicennian signature'³², while *S* was penned by Amīr al-Dīn Māniyūl between Marāḡa and Ḥarbūt from 1273 to 1276³³.

After presenting the evidence concerning common readings in Hermannus and other witnesses, in section 6 of this paper I will briefly discuss the nature of his relationship with the much more recent *Ob*, without discarding the role that collation could have played in the establishment of this link.

5.1. Omission of *bi-l-ǧafā'*, 'with harshness', in Hermannus' translation

The second chapter of the second book from the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* is devoted to the deliberation on things that are particular rather than general. The section preserved by Hermannus' first Avicennian quote, that is to say II.2, pp. 73, 7 - 75, 15, discusses what is good, what is useful, and their parts. The passage quoted below introduces an example of ingratitude (opposed to gratitude, which is a good).

³² On this subject, see G. C. ANAWATI, *Essai de bibliographie avicennienne*, Dār Al-Ma'ārif, Cairo 1950, pp. 73-74, and Appendix B in A. BERTOLACCI, *Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā' (Book of the Cure/Healing): The Manuscripts Preserved in Turkey and Their Significance*, « Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph », forthcoming, and the bibliography quoted therein.

³³ More information on this manuscript is gathered in G. CELLI, *The Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442: A 13th Century Copy of the K. al-Šifā' with Syriac and Greek Marginalia*, « Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph », forthcoming.

HERMANNUS

Quod ergo deficit a possibili in
beneficentia est ex impotentia, quod
autem pertransit necessitatem in
maleficentia est ex proposito.

Et quando perdurat molestatio
molestantis et intenditur debilitas
et metus donec pertranseat horam
necessitatis¹, adducit discordiam
procul dubio.

1 et intenditur... necessitatis] om. T

AVICENNA, p. 74, 3-6 Sālīm

فما قصر¹ عن الممكن في الإحسان² فهو
تقصير، وما جاوز الضرورة من الإساءة
فهو قصد³.

وإذا دام الإذعان للمحن⁴ واشتد⁵
الضعف⁶ والخوف⁷ حتى جاوز بالجفاء⁸
وقت الضرورة أورث الإستيحاش⁹ لا
محالة.

[الإحسان 2 om. Oa habet Oa sl. 1 فما قصر
[قصد 3 add. ShOSCbsSfESqSrObLVi
Sh وللمحن 4 om. Ob 4 ELVi, فضلته
واشد 5 واشتد 5 SRL mg. للمحسن E للمخير
[الخوف 7 SSr للضعف 6 LaObOa
[الإستيحاش 9 Ob ما بها 8 LaOa om.
SVh الاستعاش

AVICENNA : « Hence that which is less than what is possible in terms of benevolence is a [self-]imposed deficiency, while that which is more than what is necessary in terms of harm is an [evil] intention.

And whenever submission to misfortune is prolonged and feebleness and fright are reinforced, so that one exceeds the instant of necessity with harshness, aversion is surely triggered ».

This passage is full of textual and interpretative difficulties, but I will only bring up what is — or could be — relevant for establishing relationships between Hermannus and the Arabic manuscript tradition.

Firstly, the Avicennian text underlying the Latin *in beneficentia* seems to have been similar to Sālīm's text, also attested by Vh, Si, La, K, Ch, Oa and Cm (fī l-iḥsāni, 'in terms of benevolence', II.2, p. 74, 4) rather than that of Sh, O, S, Cb, Sf, E, Sq, Sr, Ob, To, L, Vi, which read fī l-iḥsāni li-l-muḥsini ('in terms of benevolence towards the benefactor'). However, in this case it is hard to make a clear-cut statement about which was the original Avicennian option and which was the innovative one, capable of proving the relationship between two witnesses. Accordingly, this observation cannot be used to investigate the history of the manuscript tradition.

Secondly, the translator's text did not share the omission of *qaṣd* with ms Ob. Moreover, the source text for this translation *molestatio molestantis* cannot be either *al-id'ān li-l-miḥan* ('submission to misfortunes', II.2, p. 74, 5), which we find in most witnesses, or *al-id'ān li-l-muḥayyar* ('submission to the person

who has the choice') as in mss. *E* and *To*, or *al-id'ān li-l-muḥṣini* ('submission to the benefactor') as in *Sr* and *L*. Maybe we could assume that Hermannus' Arabic source read *iḥzān al-muḥzin*, 'the affliction of he who afflicts', since in II.2, p. 74, 1 *wa-lā yaḥzunu* 'alay-hi is translated by *sine molestia*.

Finally, the Latin text offers no equivalent for the Arabic *bi-l-ḡafā* ('with harshness', p. 74, 5). If it is due to a misreading like that occurring in *Ob*, which has *mā bi-hā* instead, this would mean that Hermannus' Arabic source and *Ob* have a common mistake, and therefore that they share at least one ancestor.

5.2. Confusion between *bāb* ('domain') and *bāl* ('mind, attention'): Possible Traces of Collation

In *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, II.2, p. 75, 3-11, Avicenna discusses non-pecuniary ways of rewarding someone. Let's concentrate on the conclusion of this discussion, which is again included in Hermannus' first Avicennian quote.

HERMANNUS

Omnis enim homo delectatur in aliquo et ammiratur de aliquo, quod sibi placet, apropiato ei, aut per naturam suam aut per assuetudinem aut per experientiam ipsius. Multa enim delectant et placent propter experientiam, que, si non esset experientia, non delectarent nec placerent.

Et huius quoque capituli seu intentionis sunt directio exhortativa et consultiva fidelitas: sunt enim beneficentia et retributio quedam.

Et est quidem beneficentia et¹ eius retributiva responsio artificiosa et delectabilis valde cum sit in hora necessitatis et requisitionis sue; imo eximia est et honorabilis.

1 et] *om.* T

AVICENNA, p. 75, 7-11 Sālīm

فكل يلتذ بشيء ويتعجب من شيء يخصه. وإما بحسب ما اعتاده وتدرّب فيه، فإن الدربة قد تلذذ شيئا وتعجب منه، لو¹ لاها لم يلتذ به ولا تعجب منه،

ومن هذا الباب² أيضا الهداية والنصيحة فإنه إحسان ومكافأة ما.³

ولموافاة⁴ الصنيعة أو⁵ الجزاء وقت⁶ الحاجة اليه والرغبة فيه موقع لذيد، بل عظيم كريم.

om. [ما 3 Ob البال] الباب 2 OSf أو [لو 1 EObVi, وأما Oa، وافا الموافاة] ولموافاة 4 Vh 4 قا، الموافاة 5 La و [أو 6 SiLaOa وقت 6 Ob وقت] الموافاة

AVICENNA: « And everyone enjoys something and admires something that is fit for him. And if (this were) about what one is prepared for and used to, then, for what

concerns preparation, one would have found pleasant and would have admired something that one would not enjoy or admire if it were not for that.

And in this domain (there are) guidance and good advice as well: indeed, this is some kind of benevolence and reward. And at the arrival of the good deed and of the reward when they are needed and wished for there is a pleasant occasion, but sizeable and valuable as well ».

Hermannus' translation for Avicenna's *min hādā l-bāb* (in 75, 9) is *huius quoque capituli seu intentionis*. Unsurprisingly, double translations are not uncommon in the Latin version of the *Rhetoric*, so that we cannot exclude that the expression *capituli seu intentionis* was indeed based on the single word *al-bāb*. However, whereas the semantic link between *al-bāb* and *capitulum* is quite straightforward, this is not the case for *al-bāb* and *intentio*, since elsewhere the latter translates words like *ma'nā* and *qaṣd*³⁴. It is therefore worth observing that the manuscript *Ob* does not read *al-bāb* but *al-bāl* ('mind, attention'), which — although graphically very similar to the original reading — actually comes much closer to Hermannus' *intention* in terms of meaning. Accordingly, rather than a double translation, *capituli seu intentionis* could be the product of the insertion in the main text of a word that had been copied in the margin because of collation with a witness that shared the reading we find in *On*. The opposite process, i.e. the insertion by collation of the reading *al-bāb* in a witness that, like *Ob*, testified *al-bāl*, is also a possibility, and maybe an even more likely one, for the phrase with *al-bāl* is not very clear, and could have pushed a conscientious reader to compare his copy of the text with other sources. The events I described most probably happened within the process of transmission of the Arabic manuscripts, or, at most, contextually with Hermannus' translation activity, for later contact with different streams of Arabic tradition could hardly have occurred.

Ultimately, the Latin rendition of *al-bāb* in 75, 9 is another hint of a possible relationship between Hermannus' Arabic source and *Ob*, but also a warning that this relationship could well be due to contamination rather than to genealogy.

5.3. *Kafā-hu* ('it has been enough for him') and *kifāya* ('sufficiency')

At the beginning of Hermannus' second quote from Avicenna (*Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, pp. 206, 8 - 212, 16) we find a discussion of 'borrowed' (Arabic verb *ista'ara*, p. 216, 10) expressions, which is followed by some suggestions on how to avoid explicitly referencing shameful subjects, for in rhetoric pointing

³⁴ On the subject, see the discussion at paragraph 5.4, concerning the words *aḥass*, *aḥsan* and *decentiam*.

at them by gesture rather than naming them is not an acceptable solution. Finally, Avicenna argues that antiphrastic references could be satisfactory for listeners. For example, in order to blame someone, it could be beneficial to state that integrity is better than depravation, building an opposition between integrity and depravation, or even that ‘more integrity is better’, thus leaving the opposition implicit.

HERMANNUS

AVICENNA, p. 207, 14-16 Sālim

Et fortassis coordinabit oppositum
opposito secundum prepollentiam
et dignitatem¹ prout dictum est in
predictis² exemplis, et fortassis non
faciet mentionem eius quod diversum
est, sed solummodo hoc quod melius et
nobilius est proponet et sufficiens erit
hoc in illo processu.

وربما ذكر¹ مقابل ما هو الأحرى والأولى,
مثل ما ذكر في المثالين. وربما لم² يذكر
ذلك المخالف, بل ذكر الأولى والأحرى
وحده, وكفاه³ في ذلك الباب بعينه

1 dignitatem] ut add. T 2 predictis] premissis
P

و كفاية [و كفاه 3 om. Ob 2 لم] add. في [ذكر 1
ShSVhSiESqObViL

AVICENNA : « And often the opposite of what is most proper and most apt is mentioned, like what was mentioned in the two examples. And often that different thing has not been mentioned, but only what is most proper and most apt [has been], and this has been enough for him [i.e. the listener] on this very question ».

The phrase وكفاه في ذلك الباب بعينه, *this has been enough for him on this very question*, printed by Sālim and attested — between others — by the manuscripts O, Cb and Sf, appears in a different form in the witnesses Sh, S, Vh, Si, E, Sq, Ob, Vi, and L. In the latter group, we find the infinitive *kifāya* (‘sufficiency’) instead of the perfect *kafā* followed by the personal pronoun *-hu*, which stands for the rhetor’s audience. *Kifāya* seems to me a simplification of *kafā-hu*, for the second case implies a more complex syntactical structure that could easily have been ignored by an absent-minded copyist.

Although Hermannus’ translation *et sufficiens erit hoc in illo processu* is characterized by a participle (*sufficiens*) rather than by an infinitive, the absence of any reference to who exactly will be satisfied hints to the fact that the Arabic source of the Latin translation read an infinitive like *kifāya* — without personal attached pronoun — rather than a perfect like *kafā-hu*. Although the words *kifāya* and *kafā-hu* have a very similar *rasm* — so that this mistake is potentially polygenetic — the fact that Sh, S, Vh, Si, E, Sq, Ob, Vi, L, and Hermannus share a wrong reading does lend some weight to the hypothesis that they could be related.

5.4. Aḥṣṣ ('viler'), aḥṣan ('better') and decentiam

In the course of the same chapter — and still within Hermannus' second quote from the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* — Avicenna also discusses which elements are relevant for the effectiveness of metaphorical expressions (*Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, pp. 208, 5 - 209, 9), namely whether they spotlight nobler or viler aspects of what is described. Introduced for metaphors, this mechanism is extended to already existing expressions in the following terms:

HERMANNUS

Dictio enim que presentat rem honoratioris¹ intentionis decentior existit. Significatum quippe ex significati relatione² decentiam³ nanciscitur⁴, quamvis per unamquamque dictionum proprie sumptarum non intendatur nisi veritas unius significati, prout dici potest de mulo quoniam est de genere equorum non connotando equam que ipsum genuit. Hoc quippe competentius videbitur quam si dicatur quod sit de genere asinorum non connotando asinum.

1 honoratioris] honorationis T 2 relatione] om. T 3 decentiam] decentia TP 4 nanciscitur] naciscitur T nascitur P

AVICENNA, pp. 208, 11 - 209, 1 Sālīm

فإن اللفظ الذى يقع على الشئ من حيث له معنى أكرم¹ هو أحسن من اللفظ الذى يقع عليه من حيث له معنى² أخس³ وإن⁴ كان كل واحد منهما يقصد به فى الحقيقة معنى واحد، مثل ما يقال للبلبل : إنه نسل⁵ فرس من غير فرس، فإنه أوقع من أن يقال له : نسل حمار من غير حمار .

om. Sh 3 [أكرم ... معنى 2 Obs الزم [أكرم 1
[وإن 4 Ob واحسن ShOSCbsfL احسن [أخس
[نسل 5 Sr واذا Si ولو ShOSCbsfESqObLVi
LaCm ينسل

AVICENNA : « Indeed, the enunciation that happens to something insofar as it has a nobler meaning is more beautiful than the enunciation that happens to the thing insofar as it has a viler meaning, even if both of these were oriented towards just one meaning, like the fact of saying of the mule that it is offspring of a horse from something that is not a horse. And this is surely more tangible than the fact of saying 'offspring of a donkey from something that is not a donkey' ».

Hermannus' text is somewhat problematic. Provisionally, I would translate it as follows: «namely, the enunciation which exhibits something that is more honorable is more respected. By all means, a meaning obtains respectability thanks to (its) relationship with the thing that is meant, although through any of the enunciations, if strictly understood, nothing else is meant but the truth of just one meaning». Please note that with the expressions 'meaning' and 'thing

that is meant' I render the same Latin word, repeated twice in the same phrase (*significatum*, apparent equivalent of the Arabic *lafẓ*, and *significati*, equivalent of *ma'nā*). This is why the meaning of the expression *significatum quippe ex significati relatione decentiam nanciscitur* is not clear at all. *Significatum* is often an equivalent for *ma'nā*³⁵, while *significatio* translates both *ma'nā* and *dalla/dalāla* (twice and four times respectively). However, in no other passage from Avicenna does Hermannus translate *lafẓ* with *significatum*. Actually, *lafẓ* is almost always translated with *dictio*, as here in the first line of the text³⁶.

I am therefore quite skeptical on the fact that in this passage the word *significatum* actually translates Avicenna's *lafẓ* in 208, 11. The problem is, of course, the second occurrence of this term, since, if it bears the same meaning of the first occurrence, it makes the phrase virtually senseless. If, on the other hand, it bears a different meaning, it could signify the thing that is meant (the 'reference', opposed to the 'meaning', in Kripkean terminology like in the rendering of Hermannus' passage offered above), which would give intelligibility to the phrase and, in a way, also a certain correspondence with Avicenna's original text. Still, this seems quite far-fetched, for, by giving to the same word two different values in such a short space, Hermannus would have been asking of his reader a really needless interpretative effort. The odds that he would do so in the only occasion in which *lafẓ* is translated as *significatum* are quite low.

To explain the riddle, if we assume the strict coincidence between the first and the second occurrence of *significatum*, we could imagine that Hermannus' Arabic text was somehow different from that of the other witnesses, offering something like *fa-inna l-mā'nā alladī yaqa'u 'alay-hi min ḥayṭu ma'nā aḥsanun*, but what seems most likely to me is that the mistake took place within the Latin manuscript tradition, and that, despite the agreement of the Toledo and the Paris manuscript on the reading *significatum*, the original text was ... *intentionis (ma'nā) decentior existit. Dictio (lafẓ) quippe ex significati relatione decentiam nanciscitur*. Later on, the alternative (or double) translation *significatum* (or *seu significatum*) for *ma'nā* would have been inserted above *intentionis*. Finally, a copyist took it for a correction of *dictio*, so that it entered the text instead of it. After all, double translations are very common in Hermannus' text, as we have seen in the case of *rationes seu intentiones* for *ma'nā* at 206, 13, cited in note.

Agreement on the textual history of Hermannus' text, however, is not a prerequisite for the genealogical point I am going to make.

³⁵ Hermannus does sometimes translate *ma'nā* with *intentio*: see, for example, *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 206, 13 (*rationes seu intentiones*), p. 207, 8 (*rerum intentiones*), and p. 210, 9 (*intentionem*), although in this text *intentio* can also stand for *qaṣd* (like in *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 206, 9).

³⁶ See for example *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 209, 14, *dictions*. Only once *lafẓ* is translated with a verbal periphrasis (*fa-idā sakata 'an-hu lafẓan, and if he does not refer to it with a verbal expression*, p. 208, 8-9, translated as *quando ... non sermocinando*).

It seems reasonable to me to understand the correspondence between Hermannus' *dictio enim que presentat rem honoratioris intentionis decentior existit. Significatum quippe ex significati relatione decentiam nanciscitur* and Avicenna's *فإن اللفظ الذى يقع على الشيء من حيث له معنى أكرم هو أحسن من اللفظ الذى يقع عليه من حيث له معنى أخس* as quite analytical. *Dictio enim que presentat rem honoratioris intentionis decentior existit* mirrors *فإن اللفظ الذى يقع على الشيء*, while *Significatum quippe ex significati relatione decentiam nanciscitur* mirrors *من اللفظ الذى يقع عليه من حيث له معنى أخس*. Otherwise, we could see both *dictio enim que presentat rem honoratioris intentionis decentior existit* and *significatum quippe ex significati relatione decentiam nanciscitur* as a global, double translation of *... معنى أخس* *فإن اللفظ الذى*, since this is a tool often deployed by Hermannus. I would rather discard this option, for the expressions *dictio enim ... decentior existit* and *significatum quippe ... decentiam nanciscitur* are not synonymous (a precondition for viewing them as a double translation), and for it would leave the second term of comparison *من اللفظ* without an explicit equivalent, probably on the ground that it could be extrapolated from the first term of comparison.

If my analytical understanding of Hermannus' translation is correct, then *rem honoratioris intentionis* stands for *ma 'nā akram*, *decentior* stands for *aḥsan*, and the presence of the substantive *decentiam* in the Latin text shows that its Arabic source must have read *من اللفظ الذى يقع عليه من حيث له معنى أحسن* («that happens to the thing insofar as it has a better meaning»), as in *Sh*, *O*, *S*, *Cb*, *Sf*, and *L*, rather than *من اللفظ الذى يقع عليه من حيث له معنى أخس* («that happens to the thing insofar as it has a viler meaning») as in *Sālim's* edition (p. 208, 12-13). The sense of the Avicennian paragraph requires a reading that could be semantically opposed to the comparative *akram* ('nobler', p. 208, 12), so that we can state with some confidence that *Sālim's* choice *aḥass* was right, and that all the witnesses in favor of the innovative text *aḥsan* share a common ancestor, namely *Sh*, *O*, *S*, *Cb*, *Sf*, *L*, Hermannus' Arabic source, and *Ob*, whose text is *wa-aḥsan*.

A possible side effect of the loss of the opposition between *akram* and *aḥass* is that a subset of witnesses, i.e. *S* and *Ob*, also reads *alzam*, *more necessary*, instead of *akram*, while *Sh*, that often agrees with *S* and *Ob*, has a lacuna that goes from the first to the second *من حيث له معنى*. Therefore, if we think that Hermannus' source was related to the group *Sh*, *S*, *Ob*, we must also assume that these three manuscripts had a further common ancestor that was not shared by Hermannus' source.

5.5. Identification of *Mutanabbī* as a poet

In *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 209, 3-4, part of Hermannus' second quote, Avicenna is still discussing metaphorical expressions, and reworking Aristotle's stance

that metaphors can be taken from better or worse species within the same gender³⁷. One of the many examples of this offered in our text is a poetry verse:

HERMANNUS

Et istud propiniquum est ei quod dixit
poeta Abultibi:

«O fili Kerusti, o semicece, et, ut
decentius dicam, o semividens».

AVICENNA, p. 209, 3-4 Sālim

وهذا قريب مما قال أبو الطيب¹:

أيأ² بن كروس، يا³ نصف أعمى وإن
تفخرو فيا⁴ نصف البصير

1 add. المتنبى [الطيب] add. شعر, ObCm

2 [يا] Ob 3 [يا] OcbSf 4 [يا] Ob

AVICENNA: «And this is similar to what Abū al-Ṭayyib said: “Oh son of Kurawwas, oh half-blind person, and, if he is proud, oh half-seeing person”».

In his translation, Hermannus points out Abū al-Ṭayyib's (or Mutanabbī's) identity as a poet, which is implicit in the Arabic text, partially because for Avicenna's readers this identity was very well known, and partially because the fact that the following quote is a verse emerges from its meter.

How did Hermannus himself come to the conclusion that he was dealing with a poetry text? Was his grasp of Arabic culture deep enough to include basic information about Abū al-Ṭayyib and his poetic activity? Abū al-Ṭayyib's fame notwithstanding, I do not think so. To begin with, his name is wrongly transliterated as *Abultibi*, which makes it unlikely that Hermannus was familiar with this historical personality. Moreover, the translator does not seem very interested in literary and poetical works as such, as we can see that other poetic examples are left untranslated (see e.g. Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 210, 4). If not from his personal culture, could Hermannus derive consciousness of Abū al-Ṭayyib's role as a poet from the immediate context? Actually, the word *šī'r* ('poetry') is sometimes cited in the previous pages, for poetry texts are the readiest source of examples for metaphors. However, although Hermannus could have been aware of the fact that poetry was somehow linked to Avicenna's subject thanks to these appearances of the word *poetry* itself, this does not explain why he recognized and marked this as a verse, while he neglected other poetic lines (see again *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1, p. 210, 4). What exactly could have alerted him to the fact that this words constituted a poetic text? Expecting Hermannus to recognize the metrical structure seems somewhat too optimistic.

³⁷ See ARISTOTLE, *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1959, 1405a15-16.

Accordingly, the most likely source for our piece of information seems to have been his own Arabic manuscript, that probably had an indication similar to what we find in *Ob* and *Cm*. These witnesses insert the word šī'r, 'poetry', immediately after the name Abū al-Ṭayyib. It seems like a title mistakenly inserted in the Arabic text, for it has no syntactic links to the rest of the phrase: this is probably also the reason why Hermannus feels free to translate it with *poeta* rather than with *poetria*. Therefore, the Arabic source of the Latin translation and the manuscripts *Ob* and *Cm* would share an innovative reading (and a likely sign of kinship), if it were not that the insertion of a title in the text could have happened multiple times in the Arabic tradition.

5.6. Plural or Dual Number

This passage refers again to Hermannus' second Avicennian quote. In the first chapter of the fourth book, the *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* Avicenna discusses the respective efficacy of altered, tropic expressions and standard, non-tropic expressions, like, for example, *red* as opposed to *beet red*. After discussing the evocative value of freshly minted and already established metaphors, he focuses on the effect of augmentative and diminutive nouns.

HERMANNUS

Verum quando dicitur vulpes aut vulpecula, et quando dicitur minus¹ aut minusculum² diversificatur per hoc significatum diversitate non modica. Oportet ergo in pluribus locis ut caveantur superfluitates utreque.

1 minus] munus PT pc. 2 minusculum] minusculum PT

AVICENNA, p. 209, 7-9 Sālīm

بل إذا قيل : ثعلبان, وقيل : ثعلب¹,
وقيل : معطى, وقيل : معطى, وعن
تصغير معطى, اختلف المعنى بذلك
شديدا. ويجب في أكثر المواضع أن
يتوقى الإفراطات² جميعا.

الإفراطان [الإفراطات] ShVi 2 ثعلب [ثعلب] 1
ShOSVhCbSfSqSrOb(a.c.)OaViCm

AVICENNA: « But whenever one says 'big fox' or 'little fox', and 'a bit' or 'a small bit' — and it means the reduction of the bit — in this case the meaning is very different. In most cases, the excesses should be globally avoided ».

The eye-catching difference between the likely text of Hermannus' Arabic source and Sālīm's edition is the use of the explicitly dual adjective *utreque* to specify the substantive *superfluitates*, while in the Arabic text the name is in the plural form *al-ifrātāt*. From the apparatus I provided, it can also be seen that the dual option *al-ifrātān* appears in a pretty large group of Avicennian witnesses,

so that we could be tempted to assume that Hermannus' ancestor was related to this sizeable (and ancient) group of manuscripts, because they happen to share a reading which also seems to be — crucially — wrong. However, it is not clear whether by printing the plural *Sālim* actually made the best choice. There is an obvious sense in which it can be said that the excesses that should be avoided here are two, for, while in the parallel passage Aristotle only discusses diminutives³⁸, in Avicenna augmentative and diminutive expressions are being discussed together. Moreover, the dual number, by clarifying which opposite excesses should be avoided, enables us to give a perspicuous translation of *ḡāmi* 'an as at the same time. Compared with 'in most cases, both excesses should be avoided at the same time', an expression like 'in most cases, the excesses should be globally avoided' (or, in R. Würsch's translation *In den meisten Fällen muss man sich vor Übertreibungen insgesamt hüten*)³⁹ could seem rather redundant. Moreover, the case for *al-ifrātān* is strengthened by the presence of a dual in the mirroring Aristotelian passage, both in Greek and in Arabic. Aristotle's text in 1405b34 is εὐλαβεῖσθαι δὲ δεῖ καὶ παρατηρεῖν ἐν ἀνφοῖν τὸ μέτριον, «however, in both cases care should be taken to preserve moderation», where the pronoun ἀνφοῖν probably refers to καὶ τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν («that which is good and that which is bad», 1405b30), both of which can be belittled by diminutives. The Arabic version of the *Rhetoric* in Lyons's edition⁴⁰ translates 1405b34 as follows: وقد ينبغي ان نتوقى هاهنا ونتوخى فى الأمرين جميعا القصد («and we should beware here and aim at frugality in both things at the same time»). Badawī prints *al-umūr* instead of *al-amrayn*, probably because of a different optical reading of the ms. Paris, BNF, Arabe 2346, but the Greek original ἀνφοῖν makes Lyons's solution more likely⁴¹. Finally, the dual number appears in the rhetorical section of Bar Hebraeus' *The Cream of Wisdom*, a Syriac summa that, as far as our subject is concerned, has Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba* and the Greek-Arabic translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as its main sources⁴².

If then *al-ifrātāt* is an easy trivialization of *al-ifrātān*, the fact that the latter, correct, reading is shared by Hermannus and a long list of Arabic witnesses does not tell us anything about the relationship of the source of the Latin translation

³⁸ See ARISTOTLE, *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica* cit., 1405b29-34.

³⁹ See R. WÜRSCH, *Avicennas Bearbeitung der Aristotelischen Rhetorik*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin 1991, p. 114.

⁴⁰ ARISTOTLE, *Aristotle's Ars Rhetorica: The Arabic Version*, ed. M. C. LYONS, Pembroke Arabic Texts, Cambridge 1982.

⁴¹ See ARISTOTLE, *Rhetorica in versione arabica vetusta*, ed. 'A. BADAWĪ, Maktabat an-Nahḍa al-Miṣriya, Cairo 1951.

⁴² See BAR HEBRAEUS, *Aristotelian Rhetoric in Syriac. Barhebraeus, Butyrum Sapientiae, Book of Rhetoric*, ed. WATT cit., p. 247.

and Avicenna's Arabic manuscripts. On the other hand, we can probably assume that the witnesses that erroneously read *al-ifrātāt* were somehow related⁴³, although allowances must be made for the possibility of a plural genesis of the mistake and for the effects of contamination. We see contamination in act in *Ob*, where the original reading *al-ifrātān* was substituted with *al-ifrātāt*.

5.7. Yurādu bi-hi ('through which one aims at')

In *Kitāb al-Ḥiṭāba*, IV.1 there is a long section devoted to the four species of 'cold enunciations' (*al-alfāz al-bārīda*, pp. 209, 10 - 212, 8 Sālim, parallel to III, 2 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*), like periphrastic expressions, foreign words, uncommon and tropic expressions, and whether or not they are appropriate in rhetoric and poetic contexts. The longest description is allotted to the third species of stylistically cold enunciations, whose frigidity does not derive from the fact that they are long, composite or metaphorical, but from the fact that their understanding is not immediate. At the same time, Avicenna broaches the subject of the relationship between these expressions and meter, which was already discussed in Aristotle's text in 1406b1-4. Aristotle uses the words διθυραμβοποιούς, ἐποποιούς and ιαμβεῖους, which, mirrored by the Arabic transliteration of Greek words *dīṭūrāmbū*, *afā*, and *ayāmbū*, were bound to be an obstacle for Hermannus. While Averroes overlooks them all, Avicenna does give a transliteration for all of them (based of course upon the Arabic version) explaining how the first two are to be used as well (in 211, 13, 212, 1 and 212, 3).

It is in this context that we find the following passage, which is relevant not so much for its content, but rather for the way in which Arabic manuscripts witness it and for the translation offered by Hermannus.

HERMANNUS

Dictio vero extranea pertinet metro nominato 'effron', et est metrum quo utuntur ad inducendum pavorem seu terrorem in legibus et constitutionibus rerum¹ publicarum, ad incitandum mentes hominum ut insistant rebus honestis et fugiant a contrariis...

1 rerum] om. P

AVICENNA, pp. 211, 15 - 212, 1 Sālim

وأما الغريب فيصلح للوزن المسمى
 "أفى" فإنه وزن يراد¹ به² تهويل الأمر في
 السياسات والشرائع، ليخشع³ أو يحذر
 ...

[ليخشع 3 ShSob به 2 ShSob لادنه] يراد 1
 ليخشع ESqVi

⁴³ The relevant witnesses are *Si*, *E*, *La*, *L*, and *Ob* (p.c.).

AVICENNA: «And as far as what is abstruse is concerned, it is good for the meter which is called Afā. Indeed, it is a meter through which one aims at making something scary in administrative things and laws, so that people will be submissive or fearful».

Instead of the relative clause *yurādu bi-hi* («through which it is aimed at ...», or «through which one aims at...»), in the manuscripts *Sh*, *S* and *Ob* we find لادنه, a likely *vox nihili*. Whether this innovation is based on the mere alteration of the *rasm* رادنه or rather on a meaningful and graphically similar expression like *li-adnā* (which would give rise to the translation «a meter for the lowest [possible level of] fear»), this mistake is hardly reversible or polygenetic, so that *Sh*, *S*, and *Ob* must share a common ancestor. The very fact that لادنه is a meaningless expression also rules out the possibility of its presence being due to contamination, while this could easily be the case for its absence from other witnesses eventually related to *Sh*, *S*, and *Ob*, for this unintelligible word could have prompted a zealous copyist (or reader) to check other sources and restore the correct reading. If Hermannus' Arabic source was indeed linked to the common ancestor of *Sh*, *S*, and *Ob*, this is possibly the reason why it still offered the correct reading *yurādu bi-hi*, which Hermannus correctly substitutes with words cognate of *induco* (*ad introducendum* and *inductio*) at p. 211, 2 of Sālim's edition as well. Of course, the possibility that Hermannus' translation conveys the right reading independently from mss. *Sh*, *S*, and *Ob* remains open.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Hermannus' text does share a few innovative readings with *Ob*, for some of which, however, collation could have played a role. This is the case of *capituli seu intentionis/al-bāb* (discussed in paragraph 5.2) and *poeta/šī'r* (discussed in paragraph 5.5). Other mistakes are potentially polygenetic, like in the case of *kifāya/sufficiens* (see paragraph 5.3). Nonetheless, in other passages confusing forces like collation and polygenesis of errors are a less likely explanation, as for the omission of *bi-l-ğafā* (at paragraph 5.1), for *aḥsan/decentiam* (paragraph 5.4), and for *al-ifratān/superfluitates utreque* (paragraph 5.6).

Ob also shares innovative readings with the much older *Sh* and *S*, so that this triplet is surely interrelated (see, for example, paragraphs 5.4 and 5.7). Since it is not clear whether all the mistakes shared by *Sh*, *S*, and *Ob* are in Hermannus' Arabic source as well, we must assume that either the relationship between Hermannus and *Ob* does not extend to *Sh* and *S*, or that these mistakes were present in Hermannus' Arabic source as well, but they have been 'hidden' by the translation process. In the first hypothesis, it would be more reasonable to

ascribe the similarity between *Ob* and the Latin version to collation. On the other hand, if the second hypothesis is true, and with the large dose of caution made mandatory by the brevity of Hermannus' Avicennian excerpts, the relationship between *Sh*, *S*, *Ob*, and the Latin translation could also be genealogical.

SISMEL - EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO

ABSTRACT

The Rhetoric Section of the Kitāb al-Šifā' : Hermannus Alemannus' Latin Translation and the Arabic Witnesses

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-Ḥiṭāba*, 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

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement n° 339621.