

RÜDIGER ARNZEN

Double Translations in the Latin Version of the *Metaphysics* of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā* *

1. WHAT ARE DOUBLE TRANSLATIONS OR 'LEÇONS DOUBLES'?

The phenomenon of double translations has been known for quite some time¹. It was first described by Simone Van Riet in various publications of the 1960s² and again in varying intensity and with slightly changing approaches in her subsequent *Avicenna Latinus* editions. Later on, Charles Burnett described the phenomenon in a number of astronomical and mathematical translations³. Roland Hissette discovered and discussed double readings in Latin translations of the works by Ibn Rušd and other Arabo-Latin translations attributed to William of Luna⁴. And Jules Janssens provided an indepth study on the double

* I am most grateful to Prof. Amos Bertolacci and two anonymous referees for their corrections and helpful remarks.

¹ The following observations focus on double translations in Arabo-Latin translations. It is worth mentioning that the same phenomenon occurs also in scientific translations from Greek into Latin, which cannot be taken into consideration here. For examples cf. J. JUDYCKA ed., *Aristoteles, De generatione et corruptione. Translatio vetus*, Brill, Leiden 1986 (Aristoteles Latinus, vol. IX,1.), pp. XX-XXVI; F. BOSSIER, J. BRAMS, *Aristoteles, Physica. Translatio vetus. Praefatio*, Brill, Leiden 1990 (Aristoteles Latinus, vol. VII,1), pp. XLI-XLII, XLVI-LXXIX; G. VUILLEMIN-DIEM ed., *Aristoteles, Metaphysica lib. I-XIV. Praefatio*, Brill, Leiden 1995 (Aristoteles Latinus, vol. XXV,3.1), pp. 206-242.

² E.g. S. VAN RIET, *La traduction latine du « De Anima » d'Avicenne. Préliminaires à une édition critique*, « Revue philosophique de Louvain », 61, 1963, pp. 583-626.

³ E.g. C. S. F. BURNETT, *Literal Translation and Intelligent Adaptation amongst the Arabic-Latin Translators of the First Half of the Twelfth Century*, in *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel Medio Evo Europeo. Convegno internazionale promosso dall'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Fondazione Leone Caetani, e dall'Università di Roma « La Sapienza »* (Roma, 2-4 Ottobre 1984), Accademia dei Lincei, Roma 1987, pp. 9-28; *Id.*, *Translating from Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: Theory, Practice, and Criticism*, in S. G. LOFTS, P. W. ROSEMANNS eds., *Éditer, traduire, interpréter: essais de méthodologie philosophique*, Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve 1997, pp. 55-78.

⁴ E.g., R. HISSETTE ed., *Averrois Commentum medium super libro Peri Hermeneias Aristotelis. Translatio Wilhelmo de Luna attributa*, Peeters, Leuven 1996 (Averrois Opera. Series B: Averroes Latinus; vol. XII.), pp. 90*-106*, 120*-138*, 143*-146*; *Id.* ed., *Averrois Commentum medium super libro Porphyrii. Translatio Wilhelmo de Luna attributa*, Peeters, Leuven 2016 (Averrois Opera. Series B: Averroes Latinus; vol. X.), pp. 81*, 90*-94*, 110* n. 151, 117*-124*; *Id.*, *Des traductions doubles et Guillaume de Luna ou de Lunis*, in J. HAMESE ed., *Les traducteurs au travail. Leurs manuscrits et leurs méthodes. Actes du Coll. int. organisé par le "Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture" (Erice, 30 septembre – 6 octobre 1999)*, Brepols, Turnhout 2001, pp. 257-273.

translations occurring in the Latin version of Ibn Sīnā's *Physics* of the *K. al-Šifā'*⁵. Nevertheless, the conception of double translations — or 'leçons doubles' in Van Riet's terminology — is in a number of respects rather ambiguous. While there can be no doubt that the different phenomena subsumed under this term bring serious trouble upon the editor of the relevant Latin text, the exact delimitation of the concept and especially its distinction against the phenomenon of variant readings caused by palaeographic problems in the manuscript transmission are rather vague.

In what follows I apply the term to the phenomenon in which the manuscripts of an Arabo-Latin translation display two synonymous or semantically closely related Latin words or phrases rendering one and the same Arabic word or phrase at one and same place of the text in question (not to be confused with two synonyms occurring at disparate places, i.e. terminological inconsistencies by the translator). In some cases, the two Latin words or phrases occur together in one and the same manuscript, in others either of them is attested in one branch of manuscripts to the exclusion of the other. The phenomenon covers every-day language as well as technical terminology and concerns all parts of speech, no matter whether verbs (e.g. inflections of *ponere* or *ordinare* for *waḍa'a*), nouns (e.g. *quantitas* or *mensura* for *qadr*), adjectives and adverbs (e.g. *aliquando* and *fortassis* for *rubba-mā*), pronouns (e.g. *hoc* or *id* for *hādā*), particles (e.g. *vero* or *enim* for *fa-innahū* at the beginning of a sentence), prepositions (e.g. *sine* or *absque* for *bi-lā*), or conjunctions (e.g. *quod* or *ut* for *anna*).

For the sake of clarity it is noteworthy that the above definition of double translations differs in at least three respects from what Van Riet meant by 'leçons doubles', as becomes clear from the examples she provided in her *Avicenna Latinus* editions. According to Van Riet, 'leçons doubles' include also two semantically clearly distinct Latin words or phrases related — through their contextual position — to one Arabic word or phrase. E.g., *Annexe II* (*Deux recensions du « Tractatus primus »*) of her edition of Bk. I of Ibn Sīnā's *Physics* of the *K. al-Šifā'* provides the readings *infinitum* and *definitum* as examples of 'leçons doubles' for Arabic *maḥdūd*, or *suos profectus* and *suas perfectiones* for Ar. *kamālātihā*⁶. In my view, it is much easier and more plausible to explain different Latin readings of this type as the result of a faulty transmission of the Latin manuscripts than as competing translations of one and the same Arabic word.

⁵ J. JANSSENS, *L'Avicenne latin: particularités d'une traduction*, in J. JANSSENS, D. DE SMET eds., *Avicenna and His Heritage. Acts of the Int. Coll., Leuven - Louvain-la-Neuve, Septembre 8-11, 1999*, Leuven University Press, Leuven 2002, pp. 113-129.

⁶ AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber primus naturalium. Tractatus primus de causis et principiis naturalium*. Édition critique [...] par S. VAN RIET, Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve 1992, p. 89* ad p. 46.63, p. 91* ad p. 56.38.

Secondly, Van Riet counts among 'leçons doubles' Latin words or phrases that can be traced back to two different readings of the Arabic text. In the introduction to Avicenna's *Liber de anima*⁷, Van Riet mentions the competing readings *sursum* and *virtutes* which in all likelihood trace back to an Arabic manuscript in which the word *al-fawqu* (= *sursum*) was written without diacritical points, thus looking similar to *al-quwā* (= *virtutes*). Similarly, Van Riet includes in her list of 'leçons doubles' in Bk. I of Ibn Sīnā's *Physics* the competing readings *translativum* and *aequivocum*⁸. The Cairo edition of the Arabic text (p. 48.6) reads at this place *muštarak*, to which neither of the two Latin terms corresponds, since *muštarak* is usually translated through *communis* in the *Physics*. *Aequivocum* rather points to the Arabic term *mušakkak*. *Translativum* on the other hand corresponds neither with *muštarak* nor with *mušakkak*. In the *Liber de anima* of the *K. al-Šifā'* we find *translatum est* for Arabic *intaqala* (255.15-16 = 125.6). I therefore assume that the translation *translativum* is based on the Arabic reading *muntaqil*. In any case, *translativum* and *aequivocum* reflect different readings or interpretations of what the translator found in the Arabic manuscript, if not in two different Arabic manuscripts.

Thirdly, Van Riet links her conception of 'leçons doubles' to the editorial process of distinct recensions of the translation and — as a consequence — conceives also omissions and additions as testimonies of double recensions/translations⁹. This conception is methodically questionable, because it is often simply impossible to decide whether an omission or addition has been applied deliberately in an intentional process of translation or revision or whether it is rather the result of a mishap in the transmission of the text or a nonreflective intervention by a scribe.

Hence, double translations in the strict sense of the term should be kept apart from these three types of discrepancy between Arabic text and varying Latin translations. It goes without saying that the second type, that is competing Latin words tracing back to different Arabic readings, is of special interest not only for the history of Arabo-Latin translations, but also and especially for the consideration of the Latin testimonies as a relevant source for the establishment of a critical edition of the Arabic text (cf. below).

⁷ AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus I-II-III*. Édition critique [...] par S. VAN RIET, Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve 1972, p. 130* f.

⁸ AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber primus naturalium* cit., p. 88* ad p. 41.14.

⁹ Cf. *Annexe II (Deux recensions du « Tractatus primus »)* of her edition of Bk. I of Ibn Sīnā's *Physics*, which includes roughly 170 examples.

2. EXPLANATORY APPROACHES AND MANUSCRIPT EVIDENCE

As regards the question what might have caused the phenomenon of double translations we are faced principally with two models of explanation in the scholarly literature: *Hypothesis 1* may be called ‘One-Recension-Hypothesis’ and is advocated by Jules Janssens and Roland Hissette¹⁰. It assumes that most or all double translations trace back directly to the translator and were present altogether in one form or another in the translator’s original exemplar. As possible reasons for this procedure the following considerations are adduced: the translator hesitated (especially during the first stage of his work) as to which of the two alternative words or phrases represents the Arabic text more appropriately, or the translator was not sure about the exact meaning of the Arabic word, or the translator himself revised here and there his first provisional draft. What is common to all these assumptions is the fact that they impose the conclusion that the translator conceived his double translations as preliminary alternative options, which ideally should be replaced through a single uniform translation in the end. Alternatively, one may consider the possibility that at least some of the double translations were introduced not as either-or, but rather as deliberate combination of two related expressions aiming at a careful representation of different semantic nuances of one Arabic word or phrase. This phenomenon — the so-called figure of hendiadys — is a very well known and wide-spread technique of the 9th and 10th centuries Graeco-Arabic translations¹¹. As a matter of fact, the evidence of this technique in 12th century Arabo-Latin translations has been indicated long ago by Charles Burnett¹², yet to my knowledge it has not been taken into consideration in the context of double translations or ‘leçons doubles’.

Hypothesis 2 was advocated by Simone Van Riet and may be called ‘Multiple-Recensions-Hypothesis’. Unlike *Hypothesis 1* it assumes two or more chronologically remote recensions, i.e. an early recension or *texte ancien*, possibly identical with the translator’s version, which then has been revised once or in several successive stages by other hands and finally resulted in what

¹⁰ Cf. JANSSENS, *L’Avicenne latin* cit., and R. HISSETTE, *L’Avicenna Latinus et le livre I de la Physique* (Sufficientia). À propos d’une édition en cours, « *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* », 109, 2011, pp. 341-354.

¹¹ For examples cf. M. ULLMANN, *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung. Teil 2: Überlieferung, Textkritik, Grammatik*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2012, pp. 278-280; G. ENDRESS, R. ARNZEN, Y. ARZHANOV, *Glossarium Graeco-Arabicum*, <http://telota.bbaw.de/glossga/>. Select: Advanced search → under Arabic expression, enter: ‘hend.’ [i. e. hendiadys].

¹² BURNETT, *Literal Translation and Intelligent Adaptation* cit., p. 11 f. For further examples cf. also K. YAMAMOTO, C. BURNETT eds., *Abū Ma ‘šār on Historical Astrology*, 2 vols., Brill, Leiden etc. 2000, vol. II, Arabic-Latin Glossary, nos. 255, 576, 734, 1071, 1138, 1377, 1523, 1725, 1849, 2038, 2195, 2270, etc.

Van Riet calls *texte revu*. This redactional process aimed at smoothening the Latin style, eliminating semitisms, replacing literal translations through intelligent adaptations, and harmonising the terminology with the standard Aristotelian terminology. According to Van Riet it was performed partly with recourse to the Arabic text and partly without, that is, it included intralinguistic editorial modifications besides cross-linguistic (double) translation activities in the strict sense. However, Van Riet omits to provide any criteria (no matter whether linguistic, palaeographic or codicological) for a systematic differentiation between translational and editorial processes.

In addition to the above-mentioned qualms, both hypotheses suffer from three methodical shortcomings: 1. They tar all different kinds of double translations with the same brush, no matter whether we are faced with alternative translations of isolated technical terms, of a whole sentence including significant syntactic transformations, or with rather marginal replacements such as the substitution of *de* through *ex* corresponding to Ar. *min*. 2. They are conceived as being mutually exclusive, although — as far as I see — nothing speaks against the assumption that various types of translational and editorial processes took place in the course of the formation and transmission of the text (to be more precise, [i] *ad hoc* alternative double translations by the translator, [ii] intentional *ad hoc* use of hendiadys by the translator, [iii] the translator revising his first draft, [iv] modifications by a later reviser/translator on the basis of an Arabic manuscript, [v] intralinguistic modifications by a later reviser without recourse to the Arabic text). 3. They affect or even predispose the modern editor's approach to the evaluation and stemmatic assessment of the testimonies of the text in question by insinuating a systematic correlation between manuscript transmission and implementation of certain translation techniques.

Once we turn from these models of explanation to the actual manuscript evidence, the situation is getting more complicated. In the manuscript transmission of Avicenna's *De anima*, *Physics* and *Metaphysics* of the *K. al-Šifā'* we are faced basically with two distinct scenarios, each of which requires different explanations depending on whether we follow *Hypothesis 1* or *2*. In the first scenario, which — in terms of frequency — is much better documented than scenario 2, we find one of the two words or phrases, which together constitute the phenomenon of a double translation, attested in one branch of manuscripts (e.g. Φ), and the other respectively in the other branch (e.g. Ψ). If we wish to explain this evidence on the basis of the One-Recension-Hypothesis, we have to assume that both branches of manuscripts depend ultimately on the translator's original or one of its copies containing both readings. On the basis of this version, the hyparchetype of Φ reproduced in each case only one of the two alternative or complementary readings, whereas the hyparchetype of Ψ

chose exactly the opposite way by reproducing the other word or phrase. This assumption seem to be quite unlikely and arbitrary, unless we modify it in such a way that the translator's original or its relevant copy clearly set apart the two readings, for example by placing one of the two readings consistently in the margins. This assumption entails important consequences. First, it precludes the above assumption of the translator's occasional deliberate use of the figure of hendiadys; and secondly it affects the evaluation of the manuscripts and their stemmatic relationship: the deliberate decision of the scribes of the hyparchetypes of Φ and Ψ to reproduce only one of the two words or phrases used by the translator constitutes in a certain way a 'conjunctive error' of each family. Since it is rather unlikely that the particular modes of handling the double translations are the only characteristic shared by the descendants of Φ and Ψ , one would expect, provided the inference is correct, further common errors in each branch of manuscripts. On the other hand, any manuscript differing from Φ and Ψ by containing one of the two readings in the main body of text and the other one in the margin or vice versa must be considered either as being close to the original and hence of relatively high relevance for the establishment of the critical edition or as being contaminated from the other side, depending on whether or not it shares the conjunctive errors of one of these families.

The opposite is true, if we explain scenario 1 on the basis of Van Riet's Multiple-Recensions-Hypothesis. Her explanation is much more straightforward such that branch Φ simply draws on one recension of the text, while the manuscripts of branch Ψ depend on the other recension. Accordingly, any critical edition must aim at constituting one of the two recensions to the exclusion of the other, whereas any manuscript containing both readings is judged by Van Riet as being contaminated and less important for the *constitutio textus*.

In a number of manuscripts we are faced with another situation, scenario 2: Such manuscripts — originating from the same period as those pertaining to scenario 1 — transmit the two words or phrases of a double translation together written by the same hand. Some of these manuscripts contain one reading in the main text, the other in the margins or between the lines, others contain both readings in the main text either simply juxtaposed or interlinked by conjunctions, again others display a combination of these two modes. Obviously, this scenario requires for a plausible explanation on the basis of Van Riet's Multiple-Recensions-Hypothesis the assumption of a contamination of the exemplar of one recension from an exemplar of the other recension. Three facts speak against this possibility: First, one would expect that the allegedly contaminated manuscripts derive from the later stage of manuscript transmission, while the manuscripts displaying scenario 1 originate from the earlier period. This, however, is not the case: on the contrary, some of the

allegedly contaminated manuscripts belong to the group of the oldest extant ones. Secondly, we encounter not only manuscripts following one reading *in textu* and adding the other reading *in margine*, but also manuscripts which have it exactly the other way around. As already pointed out by Jules Janssens¹³, this requires the assumption that not only one scribe was in the lucky position to use two manuscripts transmitting – according to *Hypothesis 2* – two different recensions, but even two scribes, and this exactly in both traditions, that is in the opposite directions of contamination, which of course cannot be precluded but is not very likely. Finally, one would be hardly pressed to find a plausible explanation for the different modes of contamination (juxtaposition vs. conjunction vs. separation *in textu/in margine/supra lineam*).

On the other hand, if we adhere to the One-Recension-Hypothesis in order to explain scenario 2, we can be relatively sure that the distinction between double translations added in the margins or interlinearly and those included in the main text by juxtaposition or interlinked through conjunctions was already part of the translator's original and may possibly reflect different stages in the process of translation or alternative translations as opposed to complementary translations via hendiadys.

To sum up these general remarks: At the current state of research it is difficult to provide incontestable proves in favour of one of the two controversial hypotheses. I agree with Janssens and Hissette that Van Riet's Multiple-Recensions-Hypothesis is less probable. However, the most important and decisive step proving the One-Recension-Hypothesis has still to be done, namely a new collation and filiation of the manuscripts. The corner-stone of Van Riet's editorial procedure is the division of the manuscripts into two groups each of which representing one of the two alleged recensions. But if there were no such recensions, but only one authorial version containing all or most of the double translations, the careful collation of the manuscripts in all likelihood will lead to an entirely different filiation displaying dependencies, conjunctive and separative errors etc. among manuscripts containing here this reading, there the other one and again in another case both readings together. Furthermore, one should take into consideration a combination of both hypotheses such that the different modes of transmission of the double translations summarized here as scenarios 1 and 2 and its different subvariants possibly point to the fact that we are indeed faced with both double translations introduced by the translator himself as well as those tracing back to one or more later revisions, especially in cases of mere stylistic retouching or of harmonising the translation with the standard Aristotelian terminology.

¹³ JANSSENS, *L'Avicenne latin* cit., p. 114.

3. DOUBLE TRANSLATIONS IN AVICENNA'S *METAPHYSICS* OF THE *K. AL-ŠIFĀ'*

As already stated above, double translations occur in the *Metaphysics* in the same way as in the other parts of *Avicenna Latinus*. Thus, the first and most important question for the critical edition of the text is whether we are faced with two distinct recensions of the text, or whether what seem to be distinct recensions are mere descendants of a faulty manuscript transmission of one and the same authorial version. In the first case, it would be the editor's task to decide whether to edit recension A or recension B, whereas in the second case the overall aim of the critical edition would consist in reconstructing the translator's original version including all his double translations, as – for example – done by Hissette in his Ibn Rušd editions. In order to solve this problem, one would have to make a fresh start and collate all manuscripts prior to any preconception regarding distinct recensions and see how the different modes of transmission relate to the stemmatic filiation of the manuscripts and their codicological evidence. It goes without saying that this first question goes far beyond the scope of the present paper.

Another question concerns the frequency and distribution of double translations in the *Metaphysics*. In the introduction to her edition of Avicenna's *Philosophia prima*, books V to X, Van Riet states that from Bk. V onwards she did not observe any consistent occurrence of double translations¹⁴. A similar statement – now concerning Ibn Sīnā's *Physics* of the *K. al-Šifā'* – is found in Van Riet's introduction to her 1992 edition of the *Liber primus naturalium*, where she maintains that the double translations which are numerous in Book I, disappear almost completely in Books II and III of the *Physics*¹⁵. As far as the *Physics* is concerned, this assertion has been disproved by Jules Janssens in the article mentioned earlier. In view of this fact, it seems advisable to check also Books V to X of the *Metaphysics* for further double translations.

Two further questions arise directly from my above considerations, namely whether all double translations in the *Metaphysics* trace back to one and the same Arabic exemplar, and whether they admit any inference regarding the two contentious hypotheses concerning their genesis.

Let us start with the second question. As indicated above, Van Riet distinguishes between two groups of manuscripts, the one transmitting what she calls *texte ancien*, the other transmitting the so-called *texte revu*. Since she

¹⁴ « A partir du livre V, nous n'avons plus observé la présence régulière de "leçons doubles" », AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina. V-X. Édition critique* [...] par S. VAN RIET, Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve 1980, p. 82*.

¹⁵ AVICENNA LATINUS, *Liber primus naturalium* cit., p. 55*.

decided to publish the *texte ancien*, she consequently relied for her edition on four manuscripts pertaining to this branch of the text transmission. In addition to these manuscripts, Van Riet used one manuscript representing the so-called *texte revu*, in order to illustrate the differences between the two versions and their double translations. This manuscript is the 14th century *Latinus 6443* of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris with the siglum *P* in Van Riet's edition¹⁶. Fortunately, Van Riet did not restrict herself to noting the different transmission of what she conceived as 'leçons doubles', but incorporated in her critical apparatus also all kinds of variant readings of manuscript *P*. Thus, a first step for checking Books V to X of the *Metaphysics* for double translations could be performed by examining the variant readings noted in the critical apparatus under the siglum *P* to the exclusion of the other manuscripts used by Van Riet. During this search, I left out of consideration all notes referring to additions and omissions in *P* because of the reservations explained earlier. Furthermore I ignored all readings added by another hand in this manuscript as we do not know how this hand relates to the rest of the tradition. Whenever the wording noted in the apparatus pointed not to a variant reading tracing back to a faulty manuscript transmission, but rather to the remnants of a double translation, I collated the reading in question with the following two other testimonies: first with the relevant Arabic text of the Cairo edition, and secondly with another Latin manuscript which has not been used by Van Riet. This additional Latin manuscript is the *Vaticanus latinus 4428*. According to Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny's description of the *Avicenna Latinus* manuscripts, it dates from the middle or second half of the 13th century, that is from the same period as the other four manuscripts used by Van Riet¹⁷. This manuscript belongs also to the tradition labelled as *texte revu* by Van Riet and seems to be closely related to manuscript *P*¹⁸. In what follows, I refer to it by the siglum *R*. The below conspectus shows the results of this collation.

¹⁶ On this manuscript see M.-T. D'ALVERNY, *Avicenna Latinus I*, « Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age », 28, 1961, pp. 310-314.

¹⁷ Cf. M.-T. D'ALVERNY, *Avicenna Latinus III*, « Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age », 30, 1963, pp. 266-268.

¹⁸ A probational collation exhibited a number of faults and omissions shared by these two manuscripts against the other four manuscripts used by Van Riet.

Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's *Metaphysics* (page & line ref. to ed. Van Riet):

Bk. V (64 pages)	278.19	345.57	406.28	481.45
228.21.22.24.36	283.24	347.93	413.84.86	486.54.62
229.47-48	284.46.57		414.08	488.2
230.64	290.72.82	VII (27 pages)	416.46	492.77.93
231.80		356.61	419.03	493.11
232.13	VI (58 pages)	359.22	424.10	497.79
233.24	291.10	361.44		501.68
236.92.07	292.33.37	365.33		504.28.51
237.12.18.21	294.63	366.69	IX (87 pages)	505.74
240.87.91.92	302.34	368.97.08	435.18.30	507.93
241.5	303.60	369.24.27	437.56.69.70	508.32
244.67.68.77	312.54	370.51	438.76	510.72
245.85	316.46	373.25	441.46	519.52
248.30	317.63		443.86	520.66.83
253.35	327.81	VIII (57 pages)	446.39	
255.59	328.06	376.04	450.23	
257.01.04	329.20	377.35	451.28	X (33 pages)
260.58	331.78	378.57.58	455.07	524.47.55
262.06	334.38	381.24	465.99.00	531.89.90
266.91	335.55.64	384.71	472.45	541.49
267.09	341.87	385.93.02(bis)	474.93-94	543.80
270.59	342.11	387.33	476.40	547.41.42
273.38	343.16	402.50	478.79	548.53

The transmission of Books V–X of Avicenna's *Metaphysics* of the *K. al-Šifā'* as attested in mss. *P* and *R* displays more than 130 variant translations not attested in any other manuscript used by Van Riet. As becomes clear from the number of pages given in this conspectus, the frequency of double translations is consistent and evenly distributed over all six books, which confirms the results presented by Jules Janssens regarding the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Physics* of the *K. al-Šifā'*, namely that we are not faced with a partial revision as maintained in either case by Van Riet.

At a closer look we see that these double translations concern all different parts of speech. The following tables display some examples for the major word classes. By far the largest group is formed by alternative uses of Latin conjunctions and particles.

Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's Metaphysics: Conjunctions & particles

Ar. Cairo ed. = Lat. ed. Van Riet	Arabic	mss. PR	mss. DFNV = ed. Van Riet
(1) 196.2 = 228.21; 265.10 = 302.34; 374.17 = 437.56, 394.3 = 465.99	anna (inna <i>after</i> qāla)	quod	ut
(2) 285.9 = 328.06	aw	vel	sive
(3) 220.4 = 255.59	al-āna	ergo	nunc
(4) 288.3 = 331.78	bi-ḥasabi	quod	quia
(5) 291.8 = 335.64	fa-	autem	enim
(6) 252.6 = 290.72	fa-	enim	autem
(7) 198.4 = 230.64	fa-	tamen	tunc
(8) 200.10 = 232.13	fa-	vero	autem
(9) 247.5 = 278.19; 257.7 = 291.10; 258.9 = 292.37; 259.7 = 294.63; 290.4 = 334.38; 357.4 = 414.08; 360.3 = 419.03; 425.15 = 510.72; 431.9 = 519.52	fa-	ergo	igitur
(10) 285.18 = 329.20	fa-idān	enim	autem
(11) 208.10 = 240.92	fa-inna	autem	enim
(12) 198.13 = 231.80	fa-inna	enim	vero
(13) 234.1 = 283.24	fī (+ n.d.)	ad hoc quod (ut R)	ad hoc ut
(14) 204.14 = 237.18	li-anna	autem	enim
(15) 273.1 = 312.54	li-anna	ergo	enim
(16) 298.10 = 345.57	li-anna	quod	quia
(17) 221.16 = 257.01	wa-	tamen	autem (om. N)
(18) 238.1 = 267.09; 234.15 = 284.46	wa-	autem	vero
(19) 266.7 = 303.60	wa-	autem	enim
(20) 203.15 = 236.92	wa-	enim	autem
(21) 258.6 = 292.33	wa-	enim	vero
(22) 291.1 = 335.55	wa-	ergo	autem
(23) 276.10 = 317.63	wa-	vero	autem
(24) 296.6 = 341.87	wa-ammā	vero	autem
(25) 276.1 = 316.46	wa-innamā	autem	enim

As one can see from examples 5-12 and 17-25, there are all kinds of double translations for the small conjunctions *fa-* and *wa-*, for which we find in most cases *autem*, *enim*, *ergo*, *igitur* and *vero* replacing each other in both directions, and this apparently quite systematically in the case of *ergo* and *igitur* for resumptive *fa-* (example 9). Another conspicuous issue is the replacement of *quod* through *ut* (or vice versa¹⁹, examples 1 and 13). In most cases, a mere confusion of Latin abbreviations can be precluded.

*Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's Metaphysics: Pronouns*²⁰

Ar. Cairo ed. = Lat. ed. Van Riet	Arabic	mss. PR	mss. DFNV= ed. Van Riet
222.1 = 257.04 197.4 (bis) = 229.47.48 347.11 = 402.50 400.15 = 474.93 327.4 = 376.04 320.1 = 370.51	bi-mā huwa min ḥayṭu huwa sā'iru c. gen. šay'un ḥādā wāḥidun wāḥidun	ex eo quod ex eo quod omnia P : ceteras R id hoc P : id R uterque	ex hoc quod ex hoc quod ceteras res id unusquisque

Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's Metaphysics: Prepositions

Ar. Cairo ed. = Lat. ed. Van Riet	Arabic	mss. PR	mss. DFNV= ed. Van Riet
336.3 = 387.33; 350.6 = 406.28 209.1 = 241.05 235.5 = 284.57 204.7 = 236.07 212.8 = 245.85 413.1 = 492.77 447.16 = 543.80	bi- bi-lā fī fī nafsihī min min min	propter sine cum per se ab de ex	per absque in in se ex ex de

Again, palaeographic problems or mere confusions of Latin abbreviations can be precluded in most cases. The question whether or not one of the two versions points to a more primitive or literal mode of translation or, conversely,

¹⁹ For the order of *texte ancien* and *texte revu* see also D. N. HASSE, *Avicenna's De anima in the Latin West. The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul 1160-1300*, Warburg Institute, London 2000 (Warburg Institute Studies and Texts, vol. 1), p. 8.

²⁰ For double translations in Ibn Sīnā's *Physics* using different types of Latin pronouns see also JANSSENS, *L'Avicenne latin cit.*, p. 120.

to a stylistic reworking is beyond my expertise. Perhaps more revealing or instructive in this respect are double translations using verbs and nouns.

Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's Metaphysics: Verbs

Ar. Cairo ed. = Lat. ed. Van Riet	Arabic	ms. PR	mss. DFNV = ed. Van Riet
(1) 334.15 = 385.93	bāṭilun	nihil debet	nihil valet
(2) 358.5 = 416.46	bāna	terminatum est	claruit
(3) 387.9 = 455.07	tabayyana	notum est	innotuit
(4) 424.10 = 508.32	yaḥinnu	elevatur	allicitur
(5) 200.16 = 233.24	ḥālaṭahū	sibi adiunctum	sibi admixtum
(6) 244.3 = 273.38	rudda	reducitur	redigitur
(7) 204.16 = 237.21	(naḥnu) bi-sabīlihī	credimus	intendimus
(8) 328.6 = 377.35	taṣṭariku	conveniunt	communicat
(9) 334.15 = 385.93	al-iṣṭigāl bi-ḍikrihī	veritati de eo	tractare de eo
(10) 402.5 = 476.40	ṣaḥḥa	scitum est	certain est
(11) 441.8 = 531.89 ; 441.9 = 531.90	ʿaqdun	uniri	vincire
(12) 384.12 = 451.28	qaddamnāhu	praediximus	supra diximus
(13) 214.9 = 248.30	muqawwamun	constructa	constituta
(14) 333.18 = 384.71	tukullima	legitur	loquitur
(15) 204.10 = 237.12	iktanafa	circumdederunt vel circumvenerunt P ; circumdederunt I' circumvenerunt R	circumdederunt
(16) 196.5 = 228.24	lahū	habeat	esse c. gen.

Example 15 is worth noticing, as manuscripts *P* and *R* give both competing translations connected through *vel*. However, in view of the similarity of the two words a mere addition by a scribe due to palaeographic problems cannot be ruled out. In general, the version transmitted in the four manuscripts in the right column seem to be more literal and closer to the Arabic than what is found in mss. *P* and *R* (see example 2 with *claruit* for *bāna* instead of *terminatum* in *P* and *R*, or ex. 4 with *allicitur* for *yaḥinnu* ['to desire, to be attracted by s.th.'] instead of *elevatur*). The same holds true for examples 9, 10, and 13 where the version transmitted in mss. *DFNV* is closer to the Arabic. Assuming that this version was the original one, so far nothing prevents us from conceiving the alternative translation attested in *P* and *R* as being done without recourse to the Arabic text.

Double translations in Books V-X of Avicenna's Metaphysics: Nouns, adjectives & adverbs

Ar. Cairo ed. = Lat. ed. Van Riet	Arabic	mss. PR	mss. DFNV = ed. Van Riet
(1) 196.4 = 228.22	al-ğuz' iyyu l-mufradu	individuum vel singulare	individuum (+ vel singulare s.l. N)
(2) 224.2 = 260.58	ğumlatun	genus	universitas
(3) 226.2 = 262.06	yağūzu an	rationale est	possibile est
(4) 237.5 = 266.91	ħaddun	designazione	definitione
(5) 297.3 = 343.16	ħuqqiqa wa-ħuṣṣila	vere inquiratur	diligenter inquiratur
(6) 309.8 = 356.61	fi l-ħaqiḳati	naturae	vere
(7) 208.7 = 240.87	ṭabi' atun	materia	natura
(8) 399.2 = 472.45	'ilmun	cogitatio	cognitio
(9) 208.10 = 240.91	ma' nan	essentiam	intentionem
(10) 284.12 = 327.81	fikrun	cognitio	cogitatio
(11) 284.12 = 327.81	tafakkurun	cognitio	cogitatio
(12) 421.2 = 504.28	ka-dālika	sic	similiter
(13) 240.4 = 270.59	kaṭratun	multitudo vel pluralitas	multitudo
(14) 209.6 = 241.12 ; 211.10 = 244.67 ; 211.12 = 244.68 ; 212.1 = 244.77	kulliyyatun	unitas	universalitas
(15) 315.10 = 365.33	māddatun	natura	materia
(16) 335.2 = 385.02	imkānun	possibilitas P: potestas R	potestas
(17) 419.2 = 501.68	namaṭ al-wuğūd	(!) in aula ^a essendi	maneria essendi
(18) 373.12 = 435.18	wuğūdiyyun	in existentia	inventicia (inventiva V)
(19) 196.13 = 228.36	al-wāḥidiyyatu	universalitas	unitas
(20) 318.8 = 368.08	muttafiqun	communis	conveniens
(21) 218.14 = 253.35	an yatawahhama	opinione vel putatione P: opinione vel permutatione (+ putatione s.l. R)	putatione DN ed. : opinione FV

^a Cf. PEDRO DE ALCALA, *Vocabulista*, Grenade 1505 ; Dozy, *Supplément*, 726b.

Again, we find *P* and *R* in some cases transmitting both terms of a double translation joint through 'vel' as in examples 1, 13, and 21. Interestingly, in the first case one of the four other manuscripts, the manuscript *Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli VIII.E.33*, which dates also from the 13th century, transmits the alternative translation 'vel singulare' *supra lineam*, whereas in example 21 we find each of the two competing translations 'opinione vel putatione' for *an*

yatawahhama isolated in two of these four manuscripts to the exclusion of the other two. Note that the second term, 'putatione', at a first stage was incorrectly copied in manuscript R, then corrected there above the line. This may point to its interlinear or marginal transmission which is often characterized by a smaller and thus error-prone handwriting. In other cases it is not quite clear whether we are faced with real double translations or rather faulty transmissions due to ligatures or abbreviations in the Latin text. This concerns for example the words 'cogitatio' and 'cognitio' for Arabic *'ilm* (ex. 8) and for Arabic *fikr* and *tafakkur* (ex. 10 and 11), as well as the words 'materia' and 'natura' for Arabic *ṭabī'a* (ex. 7) and *mādda* (ex. 14). In many Latin manuscripts the two words are abbreviated in such a way that they can be easily confused with each other. Likewise, 'unitas' may be a misrepresentation of an abbreviated form of 'universalitas'. It occurs in manuscript P at least four times for Arabic *kulliyya* (ex. 14). However, a double translation cannot be precluded beforehand, as P and R use 'universalitas' to render Arabic *wāḥidiyyatun* (ex. 19) as opposed to 'unitas' in the other four manuscripts, and 'unitas' would be a tolerable interpretation of the Arabic term. Finally, one might also consider the opposite way, i.e. the reading 'universalitas' as a faulty resolution of an abbreviated form of 'unitas'. Example 17 is quite interesting for the lexicographer. The Arabic reads *namaṭ al-wuḡūd*. The four manuscripts in the right column transmit for Arabic *namaṭ* the medieval Latin word 'maneria' which is at other places in the *Avicenna Latinus* used for *bāb*, *ḍarb*, *naw'* and similar terms. Manuscripts P and R read instead 'in aula', while they transmit 'maneria' at other places correctly. Strange as it is, we learn from Dozy's *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* that according to Pedro de Alcalá's *Vocabulista*, *namaṭ* (with the plural form *anmiṭatun*) has the meaning 'vestibule' or 'space in front of the altar', which corresponds quite exactly with 'aula' in P and R. But if that is indeed the correct explanation for this strange double translation, then we must revise our previous assumptions and state that at least in this case none of the two versions can be explained as a mere stylistic revision of the other, but certainly requires the translator's or reviser's recourse to the Arabic text.

This brings us to our next question, that is whether the alternative translations have been prepared by consulting the Arabic text and, if so, whether all double translations trace back to one and the same Arabic exemplar. On this question the following four points are worth mentioning:

(i) In the overwhelming majority of the cases taken into account so far, the difference between the two competing translations does not give rise to the assumption that these are the result of two independent consultations of the Arabic text. This is especially evident in the case of particles, conjunctions,

pronouns and prepositions. Obviously neither the translator himself nor a later reviser would bother to go back to the Arabic manuscript in order to replace an *enim* by *autem*, *ex* by *de*, or *quod* by *ut*.

(ii) Another thing, which points rather to an intralinguistic revision than to a repeated consultation of the Arabic text is the fact, that almost all variant translations adhere to one and the same part of speech. In other words, a Latin conjunction is replaced by another conjunction, a verb by a verb, a noun by a noun and so on, and this even in those cases where the relevant part of speech in the Latin text differs from that of the translated Arabic word or phrase, that is, where one would expect that the more literal of the two competing translations sticks to the syntactic structure of the Arabic phrase as opposed to the more latinized second adaptation. This latter phenomenon is well-known from competing Arabic translations of one and the same Greek text, where both new or independent translations as well as revisions are marked by a much higher frequency of fluctuation between different word classes, while the strict conformity of the word classes in our case rather points to a mere terminological and stylistic revision.

(iii) In a number of cases, the double translations may have been introduced by the translator deliberately and in one and the same process of translation as a hendiadys, that is, in order to reflect different semantic nuances of the Arabic word or phrase, and not in order to replace each other.

(iv) In contrast to the above-mentioned cases, another group of competing translations evidently points to a direct recourse to the Arabic text in each version. The nature of some of these variant translations even suggests that they were prepared on the basis of different Arabic manuscripts or of an Arabic manuscript offering alternative readings/corrections *in margine* or *supra lineam*. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that a number of such double translations reflect variant readings of the Arabic manuscripts reported in the notes to the Cairo edition. One may call such cases 'false' double translations, because they are of course not double translations in the strict sense of the term as used so far, that is, they are not supposed to render one and the same Arabic word or phrase. The following 25 cases result from a cursory collation of Van Riet's critical apparatus with the Arabic text and the Latin manuscripts P and R and may be amplified by further evidence based on a systematic comparison of the testimonies (especially additional Arabic manuscripts)²¹.

²¹ Additionally, I took into consideration the variant readings of the Arabic text noted by A. BERTOLACCI, *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'*. A Milestone of Western Metaphysical Thought, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2006 (Islamic Philosophy Theology and Science. Texts and Studies, vol. 63), pp. 483-558. In the following list of examples, I give first page and

[1] 25.62 [A 22.7] post *DFNV* = ba' da ṣM: ante *PR* = qabla *codd. cett., ed.*

[2] 26.81 [A 23.4] scilicet *DFNV* = fort. a'nī (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*²², pp. 86, 311): sicut *PR* = ka-mā *codd., ed.*

[3] 53.30 [A 46ult.] vel *DFNV* = fort. wa-immā: si vero *PR* = wa-in *codd., ed.*

[4] 74.80 [A 64ult.] continuitatem terminatam, sive sit in sculptione, sive in materia plana *DFNV* = ittiṣālun maḥdūdun kāna fī naqšin aw fī māddatin ḠSM: continuitatem terminatam, sive sit in anima (in anima *PR*, alia lectio in anima *F*'), sive in materia *PR* = ittiṣālun maḥdūdun kāna fī nafsīn aw fī māddatin *P117 P125 L T*: ittiṣālun maḥdūdun muqaddarun kāna fī naqšin aw fī māddatin *B*, *ed.* (cf. BERTOLACCI, *Reception*, p. 496).

None of the Latin versions confirms the reading attested in ms. *B* and reproduced in the Cairo edition. The four manuscripts Van Riet relied on read *in sculptione* which corresponds to *fī naqšin* as attested in mss. ḠSM and add — without correspondence in the Arabic — *plana* after *materia*, obviously in order to explain how *sculptio*, which is of course also a material entity, differs from *materia*. Mss. *P* and *R* (and a later addition in manuscript *F*) read *in anima*, which corresponds to *fī nafsīn* as transmitted in three other Arabic manuscripts and the Tehrān lithograph. On the one hand, this suggests that none of the two competing translations has been prepared without recourse to the Arabic text (a Latin reader having in front of him the wording edited by Van Riet scarcely would be thinking of replacing the word *sculptio* through the word *anima* and deleting *plana* at the end of the phrase; and the same holds true all the more the other way around). On the other hand, we cannot infer from this fact that the person who changed the text either in this or in that direction used another Arabic manuscript than the person who prepared the first translation, because either of the competing translations might be derived from one and the same undotted Arabic manuscript (with *nafs* and *naqš* looking alike). We even cannot infer that two different persons have been at work, as the translator may have collated his first draft once again against the Arabic text and then come to the decision to interpret the undotted Arabic word differently from his first interpretation.

line numbers of the Latin edition by Van Riet, then between square brackets the reference to the Cairo edition. The abbreviation 'ed.' indicates which of the competing Arabic readings was adopted by the editors of the Cairo edition. The Arabic manuscripts are referred to by the sigla used by Bertolacci and in the Cairo edition. My own retro-versions of Latin readings without correspondence in the extant Arabic manuscript are marked by 'fort.'. In all 25 cases, Van Riet follows the wording transmitted in mss. *DFNV*.

²² S. VAN RIET, *Avicenna Latinus. Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina I-X. Lexiques*, Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve 1983.

[5] 86.18 [A 75.3] praecederet *DFNV* = *fort. yataqaddamu* (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, p. 288): constituitur *PR* = *yataqawwamu codd.*, *ed.* (see also case [6] and *ed.* Van Riet, *app. crit.* ad 141.44 = A 127.12 with the same confusion).

[6] 20-87.19 [A 75.4] quod praecederet non habens terminum *DFNV* = *fort. mā huwa mutaqaddimun bi-annahū lā ḥadda lahū* (for *terminus* = *ḥaddun* cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, p. 331): quod constituta est non habens partem *PRF*¹ = *mā huwa mutaqawwamun bi-annahū lā ḡuz' a lahū BĠDŞT*: *mā huwa mutaqawwamun bi-annahū lā ḥayyiza lahū M, ed.*

As in case [4], the sources attest three different readings. The three variant readings *ḥadd*, *ḥayyiz* and *ḡuz'* may be easily confused in an Arabic handwriting without diacritical points. The wording of ms. *M*, accepted in the Cairo edition, is not confirmed by the two Latin versions. Unlike case [4], the version attested by mss. *DFNV* and edited by Van Riet is not supported by the six manuscripts used for the Cairo edition. In all likelihood it is based on the readings *mutaqaddim* instead of *mutaqawwam* and *ḥadd* instead of *ḥayyiz* or *ḡuz'* (I doubt that *terminus* translates also *ḥayyiz* as accepted by VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, pp. 33, 331; in most cases, this correspondence will be due to the reading *ḥadd* instead of *ḥayyiz*). The text transmitted in mss. *P* and *R* (and, by a later hand, in *F*) corresponds with the remaining five Arabic manuscripts. Again, both Latin versions must have been prepared through recourse to the Arabic text and certainly do not originate from an intralingual revision.

[7] 87.28 [A 75.10] in sua existentia *DFNV* = *fort. fī qiwāmiḥī* (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, pp. 108, 219): in sua potentia *PR* = *fī quwwatiḥī codd.*, *ed.*

[8] 99.62 [A 86.3] duarum causarum *DFNV* = *fort. sababayni*: duarum rerum *PR* = *šay' ayni codd.*, *ed.*

[9] 11-101.10 [A 14-88.13] forma per seipsam habeat esse in potentia *DFNV* = [inna] l-šūrata bi-nafsiḥā mawḡūdatun bi-l-quwwati *M*: forma per se semper (per se semper *P*: semper per se *R*) habeat esse in potentia *PR* = [inna] l-šūrata bi-nafsiḥā mawḡūdatun bi-l-quwwati dā'iman *codd. cett.*, *ed.*

The different positions of 'semper' (= *dā'iman*) in *P* and *R* possibly point to a marginal addition of the word in the original translation which was done on the basis of an Arabic manuscript omitting *dā'iman* (like ms. *M*) and revised on the basis of an Arabic manuscript transmitting *dā'iman* correctly.

[10] 45-115.43 [A 105.4] prius autem imaginamus multitudinem et prius intelligimus unitatem, sed unitatem intelligimus absque principio intelligibili

ad imaginandum eam (incipientes eam formare in intellectu *add. F*¹) *DFNV* = lākinna l-kaṭrata nataḥayyaluhā awwalan wa-l-waḥdata na'qiluhā awwalan wa-l-waḥdatu na'qiluhā min ḡayri mabda'in li-taṣawwurihā 'aqliyyin *ĠDṢṬ*: prius autem imaginamur multitudinem sed unitatem intelligimus non incipientes eam formare in intellectu *PR* = lākinna l-kaṭrata nataḥayyaluhā awwalan wa-l-waḥdatu na'qiluhā min ḡayri mabda'in li-taṣawwurihā 'aqliyyin *BM, ed.*

This case provides strong evidence for the assumption that certain passages were translated independently a second time, and this on the basis of another Arabic manuscript. The Latin manuscripts *P* and *R* provide an independent translation of this section, as becomes clear from the change of word classes and the completely different syntactic structure of the final phrase which renders Arabic *min ḡayri mabda'in li-taṣawwurihā 'aqliyyin* (= non incipientes eam formare in intellectu) more fluently and elegantly than the almost literal translation in mss. *DFNV* (again, a later hand added in ms. *F* the version of *PR*, omitting 'non'). What is most conspicuous is the omission of *wa-l-waḥdata na'qiluhā awwalan* in mss. *BM* and the absence of a corresponding Latin phrase in *PR*. This omission can be reasonably explained through the assumption of a *saut du même au même* in the Arabic text (awwalan ... awwalan), whereas it cannot have been caused — due to the different word order in the Latin text — by a *saut du même au même* within the Latin tradition. Taking into consideration that this fact correlates with the actual findings in the Arabic manuscripts and simultaneously coincides with the evidence of a new, independent translation of the final part of the sentence, the probability of an occasional use of different Arabic manuscripts is relatively high.

[11] 120.24 [A 108.8] eo quod *DFNV* = id *ĠDṢṬ*: tunc *PR* = fort. idan: idā *BM, ed.*

The version transmitted in *PR* is based on interpreting Ar. *idā* ('if') in the sense of *idan* ('then'). The two Arabic words are easily confused. As in the preceding case, the version of *PR* correlates with the Arabic mss. *BM* as opposed to the other Latin version corresponding with the remaining Arabic testimonies.

[12] 175.50 [A 153.15] comparatione *DFNV* = fort. bi-l-qiyās (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, p. 182): per dextrum *PR*¹ ≈ bi-l-tayāmun *codd., ed.*

[13] 185.24 [A 164.2] principio *DFNV* = fort. al-mabda': motori *PR* = al-muḥarrik *codd., ed.*: al-mutaḥarrik *DT*.

[14] 188.83 [A 166.6] igitur possibilitas rem essendi per causam *DFNV* = fort. fa-yakūnu imkānu kawnihī 'ani l-'illati: comparatio igitur possibilitatis rem essendi per causam *PR* = fa-takūnu nisbatu imkāni kawnihī 'ani l-'illati *P117 L T*: fa-takūnu nisbatun *P125*: fa-takūnu nisbatu kawnihī 'ani l-'illati *codd. cett., ed.* (cf. BERTOLACCI, *Reception*, p. 508)

[15] 249.67 [A 215.15] sensibilitas *DFNV* = ḥiss *codd.*, *ed.* : singularitas *PR* = fort. ḡuz' iyyun .

[16] 263.21 [A 226.11] naturam generis *DFNV* = ṭabī'at al-ḡins *codd.*, *ed.* : naturam corporis *PR* = fort. ṭabī'at al-ḡism.

[17] 297.31-32 [A 261.15] res cui acquisita est inceptio *DFNV* = al-šay' qad ḥašala lahu l-ḥudūt *codd.*, *ed.* : res cui assignata est inceptio *PR* = fort. al-šay' qad ḡu'ila lahu l-ḥudūt (cf. assignemus ... differentiam 247.13 = naḡ'alu bayānanā A 213.14, assignatur 277.13 = ḡu'ila A 247.2²³).

[18] 301.6 [A 264.12] pater etiam *DFNV* ≈ wa-ammā l-abu *codd.*, *ed.* : generatum (ex generator ?) enim *PR* = an wa-ammā kā' inun ?

[19] 314.89 [A 274.5] possumus mittere manus nostras *DFNV* = nudḥilu aydaynā *codd.*, *ed.* : possumus calefacere manus nostras *PR* = fort. nusaḥḥinu aydaynā (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, pp. 54, 173).

[20] 340.66 [A 295.10] perventione eius *DFNV* = ma'a ntiḥā' ihā *codd.*, *ed.* : per unionem eius *PR* = an ma'a ttiḥādiḥā ? (cf. VAN RIET, *Lexiques*, pp. 142, 336).

[21] 380.92 [A 330.7] aqueitatis *DFNV* = al-mā' iyya *codd.*, *ed.* : quidditatis *PR* = fort. al-māhiyya.

[22] 426.50 [A 365.4] de universitate ... intellectorum *DFNV* = min ḡumlat ... al-ma' qūlāt *codd.*, *ed.* : de singularitate ... intellectorum *PR* = fort. min ḡuz' iyyat ... al-ma' qūlāt.

[23] 431.55 [A 368.16] quemadmodum convenit ei *DFNV* = 'alā mā yaḡibu lahū *codd.*, *ed.* : quemadmodum congruit ei *PR* = fort. 'alā mā yuḥaqqu lahū (vel yaḥuqqu 'alayhi; 'alayhi pro lahū ms. D) (cf. congruit enim nobis 107.66 = fa-innahū yaḥuqqu 'alaynā A 95.15).

[24] 502.00 [A 420.4] ex duabus causis *DFNV* = min sababayni *codd.*, *ed.* : in duabus causis *PR* = fort. fī sababayni.

[25] 512.9 [A 426ult.] degustemus aliquid *DFNV* = ṭāla' nā šay'an *codd.*, *ed.* : deiecerimus aliquid *PR* = an aṭlaqnā/ṭallaqnā šay'an ?

²³ For assignare = ḡa'ala see also VAN RIET, *Avicenna Latinus. Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus I-II-III cit.*, pp. 302, 390.

None of the above 25 cases taken by itself proves in an incontestable way that the Latin translator(s) had recourse to more than one Arabic manuscript. However, the collected evidence taken as a whole points in this direction and leaves little doubt that in addition to the above considered reasons for double translations and terminological and stylistic reworkings by later revisers a third category of double translations must be taken into account, namely a partial or cursory revision based on (possibly even provoked by getting access to) a second Arabic manuscript.

Most of these competing Latin translations may trace back to different interpretations of one and the same unclear or unpunctuated Arabic manuscript due to the translator's changing understanding of the (con)text in the course of a revision of his first draft or due to the fact that different translators/revisers interpreted the same manuscript in different ways. Nevertheless, some others undoubtedly reflect two scarcely confusable variant readings, which either occurred in different Arabic manuscripts or in a manuscript with marginal or interlinear corrections (which as such represents also distinct manuscript branches, albeit indirectly). Examples of this latter type are found in cases [1], [2], [7], [9], [10], [14]. In seven cases the competing Latin versions coincide with variant Arabic readings attested in the manuscripts and taken into account in the Cairo edition and in Amos Bertolacci's collation²⁴. However, the correspondences provide no clear-cut result as to possible dependencies of the versions. The correlations displayed are as follows:

Case no.	Arabic mss. corresponding with version PR(F ¹)	Arabic mss. corresponding with version DFNV
[1]	B Ğ D Ṭ	Ş M
[4]	P117 P125 L Ṭ	Ğ Ş M
[6]	B Ğ D Ş Ṭ	—
[9]	B Ğ D Ş Ṭ	M
[10]	B M	Ğ D Ş Ṭ
[11]	B M	Ğ D Ş Ṭ
[14]	P117 L Ṭ	—

4. CONCLUSIONS

(1) The *Vaticanus latinus* 4428 (R) and the *Parisinus latinus* 6443 (P) show that the double translations do not come to an end with Book IV of Ibn Sīnā's *Metaphysics* of the *K. al-Şifā'* as maintained by Van Riet. Tentatively, we may state that variant

²⁴ Cf. note 21.

translations transmitted in *PR* to the exclusion of *DFNV* tend to render the relevant Arabic word or phrase less appropriately than the competing version.

(2) A number of double translations in these two manuscripts (not including what I called ‘false’ double translations in the last section) is transmitted in the main body of text interlinked through *vel*, which proves that the joint transmission of the competing translations is already attested for the 13th century, that is for the period of time from which the oldest extant manuscripts date. On the other hand, in the vast majority of double translations we find consistently only one of the two competing translations attested in either branch of manuscripts. In my view, this suggests the existence of one authoritative version which served simultaneously as common hyparchetype of all extant manuscripts and in which the two competing translations were clearly set apart, probably by presenting one translation *in textu*, the other one in the margins or between the lines. Otherwise, one should expect to find much more occurrences of an interlinked transmission of the double translations in both branches. As a matter of fact, the very same conclusion was reached by Jules Janssens on the basis of his examination of the double translations in Ibn Sīnā’s *Physics*. However, this conclusion does not provide any hint as to the question whether this authoritative version or hyparchetype was the translator’s original or a 13th century revision authored by somebody else.

(3) The vast majority of ‘real’ double translations consists of mere stylistic and terminological retouchings which do not require a fresh recourse to the Arabic text and may have been applied by the translator himself or by a later reviser as well.

(4) In a number of cases spread over the entire text of the *Ilāhiyyāt* we find what I called ‘false’ double translations. Unlike the preceding cases, we are faced here with alternative translations both of which definitely prepared by consulting the Arabic text, in some cases probably due to different interpretations of one and the same Arabic manuscript, in other cases — as it seems — on the basis of different Arabic manuscripts. These cases must be carefully kept apart from the ‘real’ double translations, because the two types of double translations may have entirely different causes or histories. The question, how they are related to each other and whether they support the theory of One Authorial Recension or rather the hypothesis of Multiple Recensions by different revisers can only be answered on the basis of a careful stemmatic analysis of the extant Latin manuscripts. What is clear, however, is the fact that not all variant translations trace back to only one integrative act or process of translation so as if made from one piece. This brings me finally back to what I proposed at the outset, namely that a complementary combination of the two conflicting theories, expanded by admitting also the translation technique of hendiadys as a possible explanation, might come near to the truth.

ABSTRACT

Double Translations in the Latin Version of the Metaphysics of Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'

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

SISMEL – EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO

