REVISED PLAN FOR THE PUBLICATION OF A
CORPUS COMMENTARIORUM AVERROIS
IN ARISTOTELEM*

BY HARRY A. WOLFSON

AVERROES AS A NATURALIZED HEBREW AND LATIN AUTHOR

Bibliographers, by the practice of their profession, will always list Averroes among Arabic authors. But if there is a process of naturalization in literature corresponding to that in citizenship, the writings of Averroes belong not so much to the language in which they were written as to the language into which they were translated and through which they exerted their influence upon the course of the world's philosophy. In the original Arabic the career of Averroism was brief. It came to an end with the abrupt disappearance of philosophic activity among the Arabic-speaking peoples, which synchronizes with the death of Averroes. Arabic philosophy, unlike Hebrew and Latin, did not enjoy a fruitful though declining old age. It was cut off in its prime through untoward political conditions. Among his own people Averroes left no disciples to continue his teachings nor an active opposition to keep them alive. His name, it has been pointed out by Renan, is not even mentioned in the standard Arabic works of biography.¹ Of his commentaries on Aristotle the longest and the most important ones are lost in the original language, and of those extant the number of manuscripts is very small and some of them are written in Hebrew characters and have been preserved by Jews. Most of the manuscripts in Arabic characters had been unknown until very recently, when they were dug up in oriental libraries.

The tremendous influence which Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle had upon the history of Western philosophy was achieved through the Hebrew and Latin translations.

The earliest date of the completion of a Hebrew translation of an Averroian commentary on Aristotle is 1233,² but it has been shown that some translations were made at an earlier date.³ The latest date of the completion of a Hebrew translation of an Averroian commentary is 1337.⁴ Between these two dates, almost all of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle were translated into Hebrew, and four of the more important ones were translated twice. Ten translators are connected with this task: Jacob Anatolio, Jacob ben Machir Ibn Tibbon, Kalonymus ben Kalonymus, Moses ben Samuel Ibn Tibbon, Moses ben Solomon of Salon, Shem-Tob ben Isaac of Tortosa, Solomon Ibn Ayyub, Todros Todrosi, Zerahiah Gracian, and one whose name is not known. The bulk of the work, however, was done by Moses ben Samuel Ibn Tibbon (flourished between 1240 and 1283) and Kalonymus ben Kalonymus (1286-1328).

* The original plan, as submitted to the Medieval Academy of America, was published in Speculum, vi, 3 (July 1931).
¹ Cf. Renan, Averroès et Averroïsme, 2nd ed. p. 96 ff. He is, however, frequently mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn, who also made abridgments of his works. Cf. F. Rosenthal's translation of The Mugaddimah, i, xliii, and Index.
³ Ibid., p. 59.
⁴ Ibid., p. 68.
The popularity which these commentaries enjoyed among Jews is attested by the great number of manuscript copies that are extant to the present day — as, e.g., about twenty of the Epitome of the *Physics*, about eighteen of the Epitome of *De Caelo*, about thirty-six of the Middle Commentary on *De Caelo*, and about twenty-five of the Epitome of *Parva Naturalia*. The intensive study of these commentaries, which was pursued by individual scholars as well as by organized classes in schools, gave rise to critical and interpretative works which may be here referred to indiscriminately as supercommentaries. There are such supercommentaries on almost every commentary of Averroes, the only exceptions being the Epitomes of the *Metaphysics*, the Middle Commentary on *Meteorologica*, and all of the Long Commentaries. On some of the commentaries there is more than one super commentary, as, e.g., about a dozen each on the Middle Commentaries of the *Organon* and *Physics*, five on the Middle Commentary of *De Anima*, and four on the Middle Commentary of the *Metaphysics*. The writing of these supercommentaries continued for about three centuries, from the beginning of the fourteenth to about the end of the sixteenth. Some of the greatest names in Jewish philosophy are represented among the supercommentators, such as Narboni, Gersonides, and various members of the Shem-Tob family.

Besides these direct supercommentaries on Averroes, literary material relevant to the study of Averroes' teachings is to be found in almost every Hebrew philosophic text produced since the early part of the thirteenth century. Beginning with Samuel Ibn Tibbon’s commentary on the *Book of Ecclesiastes*, to which a translation of some of Averroes’ treatises on the Intellect is appended — and this before the first dated translation of a commentary of Averroes in 1232 — there is not a book in Jewish philosophy in which the views of Averroes are not discussed or in which some passage of his writings is not quoted or paraphrased, analyzed, interpreted, and criticized. An example of the use made of the writings of Averroes by independent Hebrew authors and of its importance for the study of Averroes may be found in Crescas’ *Or Adonai*.

The first Latin translations of Averroian commentaries on Aristotle appeared in 1230, but it has been suggested that they may have been made earlier. Three names are connected with this activity, those of Michael Scot, Hermann the German, and William de Lunis. All of them flourished during the thirteenth century. Among them they translated fifteen (see below) out of the thirty-eight titles into which we shall divide all of Averroes’ commentaries.

The incompleteness of the early Latin translations of Averroes, the loss of the original Arabic texts of his commentaries, the spurious views attributed to Averroes by the so-called Averroists, and the fact that Hebrew literature, through translations, had fallen heir to the entire tradition of Arabic philosophy — all this tended to make European scholars dependent upon Hebrew for a complete and accurate knowledge of Averroes. When, therefore, in the sixteenth century the translation of the works was resumed, all the new translations were made from the Hebrew. Of some works several translations were made; in some in-

---

7 Ibid., p. 308.
stances new translations were made from the Hebrew even when mediaeval translations from the Arabic were in existence. Moreover, his Middle Commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* were supplemented by translations of Gersonides' supercommentaries. The names of these new translators are Elias Cretensis (Elijah Delmiedigo), Jacob Mantinus, Abraham de Balmes, Paul Israelita (Ricius or Riccius), Vital Nissus, and Giovanni Francisco Burana.

**INVENTORY OF AVERROES' COMMENTARIES**

There is no authoritative contemporary record as to the number of commentaries written by Averroes. Whatever we know about it has been gathered by modern scholars, particularly Moritz Steinschneider, Maurice Bouyges, and Georges Lacombe, from a study of the extant manuscripts and printed editions in the various languages, particularly Hebrew MSS. Averroes is known to have written his commentaries on all the works of Aristotle accessible to him, including also the *Isagoge* of Prophyry, which was treated by him as an inseparable introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*. In some instances his commentaries are found in three forms, the Epitome, the Middle, and the Long the first of these not being really a commentary in the true sense of the term. In most instances, however, his commentaries are found in two forms, the Epitome and the Middle. In two instances there is only the Epitome and in one instance there is only the Middle.

The following is a complete list of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle:

**Organon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epitome</th>
<th>1. Isagoge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. De Interpretatione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Prior Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Posterior Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Sophistic Enlenchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Poetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>10. Isagoge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. De Interpretatione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Prior Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Posterior Analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Sophistic Enlenchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Poetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Posterior Analytics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Epitome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Caelo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Epitome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**De Generatione et Corruptione**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Epitome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meteorologica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Epitome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**De Animalibus** (including only *De Partibus Animalium* and *De Generatione Animalium*)

---

8 *Die hebraischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters* (1903).
9 *Notes sur les Philosophes Arabes Connus des Latins au Moyen Age* (1922), reprinted from *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, VIII (1922), 13 ff.
10 *Aristotels Latinus*, I (1939); II (1955).
11 On the question as to the chronological order in which these three types of commentaries were written by Averroes, see Jacob Teicher, "I Commenti di Averroè sul 'De Anima'," *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, III (1935), 233–256.
The works of Bouyges, Steinschneider, and Lacombe may also be used as guides to the location of the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin manuscripts and of the MSS of the Hebrew supercommentaries. Steinschneider has made use of almost all the public and private collections of Hebrew MSS known in his time. The only two collections which he seems to have left out are those of Spain and the Cambridge University Library. Since his time, however, many Hebrew MSS of Averroes have been acquired by Professor Alexander Marx for the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary from sources unknown to Steinschneider. The Averroes manuscripts of the Joseph Almanzi Collection, which are recorded in Steinschneider’s work, are now in Columbia University Library. Several manuscripts of Averroes commentaries are also in the Felix Friedmann Collection in Harvard University Library.

Certain translations and supercommentaries are given by Steinschneider as anonymous. In some instances he tries to identify them. It is not unlikely that when all the MSS are brought together and carefully studied, the identification of some of these anonymous works will become possible and some of Steinschneider’s identifications may have to be revised. A few illustrations of what can be done in that direction may be found in the writer’s paper, “Isaac ben Shem-Tob’s Unknown Commentaries on the Physics and His Other Unknown Works,” in Freidus Memorial Volume (1929), pp. 279–290, Samuel Kurland’s paper, “An Unidentified Hebrew Translation of De Generatione et Corruptione,” in Proceedings of American Academy for Jewish Research, v (1933–34), 69–76, and Appendices I and II at the end of this article.

Of the thirty-eight titles of Averroes’ commentaries, twenty-eight are extant in the original Arabic. Of these fifteen are in Arabic characters, four both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters, and nine only in Hebrew characters.

Those in Arabic characters are:

Epitome
1. Physics
2. De Caelo
3. De Generatione et Corruptione
4. Meteorologica
5. De Anima
6. Metaphysics

Middle
7. Categories

Long
8. De Interpretatione
9. Prior Analytics
10. Posterior Analytics
11. Topics
12. Sophistic Elenchi
13. Rhétoric
14. Poetics
15. Metaphysics

Those both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters are:

Epitome
1. Parea Naturalia

Middle
2. De Caelo
3. De Generatione et Corruptione
4. Meteorologica
Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem

Those only in Hebrew characters are:

Epitome
1. Isagoge
2. Categories
3. De Interpretatione
4. Prior Analytics
5. Posterior Analytics
6. Topics
7. Sophistic Elenchi
8. Rhetoric
9. Poetics

At the time this Plan for the publication of a Corpus of Averroes' commentaries first appeared in the Speculum (July 1931), the following commentaries of Averroes in the original Arabic existed in print: (1) Middle Commentary on Poetics, by Fausto Lasinio (Pisa, 1872); (2) Epitome of Metaphysics, by Mustafa al-Kabbani (Cairo, without date, but at about 1904); (3) Epitome of Metaphysics, by Carlos Quiros Rodriguez (Madrid, 1919). To these, since that time, the following have been added: (1) Middle Commentary on Categories, by Maurice Bouyges (Beirut, 1939); (2) Long Commentary on Metaphysics, by Maurice Bouyges (Beirut, 1938–1948); (3) Epitomes of Physics, De Caelo, De Generatione et Corruptione, Meteorologica, De Anima, and Metaphysics (Hyderabad, 1866: 1947); (4) Epitome of De Anima, by Ahmed Fouad El Ahwani (Cairo, 1950).

Hebrew translations from the Arabic are extant of thirty-six out of the thirty-eight commentaries. Those missing are the Long Commentary on De Caelo and the Long Commentary on De Anima, of neither of which is there the Arabic original; there are only Latin translations made from the Arabic. Whether no Hebrew translation of these two commentaries ever existed or whether they were lost cannot be ascertained. With regard to the Long Commentary on De Anima, the question will be discussed below in Appendix I. There is, however, an anonymous Hebrew translation of the Long Commentary on De Anima made from the Latin. The identity of the translator will be discussed below in Appendix II.

Out of these thirty-six commentaries of Averroes in Hebrew translation the following existed in print at the time this Plan first appeared in Speculum (July 1931): (1) Epitome of the Organon (Riva di Trento, 1559); (2) Epitome of Physics (Riva di Trento, 1560); (3) Middle Commentary on Rhetoric, by J. Goldenthal (Leipzig, 1842); (3) Middle Commentary on Poetics, by Fausto Lasinio (Pisa, 1872).

Fifteen out of the thirty-eight commentaries were translated into Latin during the thirteenth century directly from the Arabic. They are:

Epitome
1. Parva Naturalia
   by Michael Scot

Middle
2. Isagoge
3. Categories
4. De Interpretatione
5. Prior Analytics
6. Posterior Analytics
   by William of Luna
7. Rhetoric
8. Poetics
9. Nicomachean Ethics

by Hermann the German

Long
12. Physics
13. De Caelo
14. De Anima
15. Metaphysics
   by Michael Scot, except for the Proemium to the Physics, which is
   by Theodorus Antiochenus
Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem

Nineteen were translated during the sixteenth century from the Hebrew. The four of which there are no Latin translations are: (1) Epitome of Physics, (2) Epitome of De Caelo, (3) Epitome of De Anima, (4) Middle Commentary on De Anima.

The list below contains: (1) all the Latin translations of Averroes’ commentaries in the 1575 edition by the Juntas, (2) those in the 1560 edition by Cominus de Tridino which are not in the aforementioned 1575 edition, (3) those in the 1483 edition by Andreas Torresanus de Asula et Bartholomaeus de Blavis which are not in the aforementioned 1560 edition, and (4) those which are only in the 1481 edition of the Rhetoric and Poetics by Philipus Venetus. Names marked by asterisks are those of mediaeval translators from the Arabic; all the others are names of sixteenth-century translators from the Hebrew.

Organon

Epitome
1. Isagoge
2. Categories
3. De Interpretatione
4. Prior Analytics
5. Posterior Analytics
6. Topics
7. Sophistic Elenchi
8. Rhetoric
9. Poetics
   No. 4, by Burana, in Vol. I of 1560.

Middle
10. Isagoge
11. Categories
12. De Interpretatione
13. Prior Analytics
14. Posterior Analytics
15. Topics
16. Sophistic Elenchi
17. Rhetoric
18. Poetics
   No. 15, by (a) Balmes and by (b) Mantinus, the latter only Books I–IV, both in Vol. I, iii, of 1575.
   No. 16, by Balmes, in Vol. I, iii, of 1575.
   No. 17, by Balmes, in Vol. II of 1575; by *Hermann, in 1481.

Long
19. Posterior Analytics
   By (a) Balmes, by (b) Burana, and by (c) Mantinus, the last only Book I, 1, 71a, 1–22
   830b, 10, all in Vol. I, ii, of 1575.

Physics
20. Middle
   By (a) Mantinus, only Books I–III, in Vol. IV of 1575; by (b) Vitalis Daetolomelos, extant only in manuscript (cf. Renan, Averroes, p. 382; Steinschneider, Hebr. Uberes., p. 986).

21. Long
   By *Michael, minus Proemium, which was translated by (a) *Theodorus Antiochenus and by (b) Mantinus, all in Vol. IV of 1575.

De Caelo
22. Middle

23. Long

De Generations et Corruptione
24. Epitome

25. Middle
The result of this inventory is that of the thirty-eight commentaries twenty-eight are extant in the original Arabic, and of these fifteen are in Arabic characters, four are both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters, and nine are only in Hebrew characters. Hebrew translations from the Arabic exist of thirty-six out of the thirty-eight commentaries, the two missing are also missing in the Arabic, and of one of the two missing there is a translation from the Latin. Latin translations exist of thirty-four out of the thirty-eight commentaries, and of these fifteen are mediaeval translations made directly from the Arabic, including the two which are missing both in Arabic and in Hebrew; the remaining nineteen are sixteenth-century translations made from the Hebrew. Of these nineteen translated from the Hebrew four were translated two times, one was translated three times, and six were new translations of commentaries of which there had already existed mediaeval Latin translations directly from the Arabic. In addition to Latin translations from the Hebrew of whole commentaries, there are (a) two Latin translations from the Hebrew of Averroes' own Proemium to one of his Long Commentaries, which was missing in the mediaeval Latin translation from the original Arabic of that commentary; (b) a new Latin translation from the Hebrew of two Comments in a Long Commentary of which a Latin translation from the Arabic already existed in the mediaeval Latin translation of that commentary.

THE PROJECT

The facts brought out in the Inventory convince one beyond any doubt that the publication of a complete and properly edited corpus of Averroes' Commentaries in only one of the three languages is almost impossible. Both the Arabic and the Latin are dependent upon the Hebrew for the filling out of their respective lacu-
nae. All of them — the Arabic, the Hebrew, and the Latin — are dependent upon each other for the establishment of accurate texts — unless we think that the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts can be established independently of each other by merely counting the scribal errors in their respective manuscripts and adding to them some conjectural emendations. Furthermore, the Arabic, the Hebrew, and the Latin are in need of each other for the determination of the exact meaning of words and phrases and in general for the proper study of the text. Without such reciprocal help, the corpus would be only an additional shelf of unintelligible volumes, for the knowledge of Averroes' commentaries expired among the Arabic-speaking peoples with the death of the author at the end of the twelfth century, and among readers of Hebrew and Latin it has lingered only among a few of the initiate since the seventeenth century. Finally, no proper study of the commentaries of Averroes is possible without the help of the Hebrew supercommentaries. Not only do these supercommentaries contain all the important critical, historical, and interpretative material necessary for the study of the subject matter of the commentaries, but owing to their inclusion of great portions of the commentaries in the form of quotations, they are also valuable for the establishment of the text.

The object of the plan, therefore, is to prepare an edition of the commentaries of Averroes simultaneously in the three languages — the language in which they were originally written, the language in which they have been most thoroughly expounded and most completely preserved, and in the language through which they became known to Western philosophy. The edition, furthermore, is to be equipped with all the necessary textual and philological information that may be helpful to anyone who may wish to study these commentaries in their manifold bearings upon the various phases of the history of philosophy.

The method to be followed in editing the work can best be described by showing what critical apparatus, glossaries, and other equipments the edited volumes are expected to have.

**CRITICAL APPARATUS**

Each of the texts in the three languages is expected to have three critical apparatuses, which may be designated as A, B, C.

Apparatus A is to contain the variant readings of the MSS of a given text in one of the three languages. This Apparatus will naturally differ in the three texts, though occasionally the variant readings in the text of one language may be found to have some bearing upon the variant readings of the text of another language, in which case they will be recorded in more than one text.

Apparatus B is to show the relation between the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts. This apparatus will be divided into two parts, each part containing translations of the variant readings in the text of one of the other two languages into the language of the text that is being edited.

Apparatus C is to show the relation of Aristotelian passages contained in Averroes' commentaries to their corresponding Greek texts. Such an Apparatus will be necessary because of the occurrence of Aristotelian passages, in some form
or other, in every one of the three series of commentaries. In the Long Commentary the Aristotelian text is given in extenso and is on the whole distinguishable from the commentary proper. In the Middle Commentary the Aristotelian texts are either reproduced verbally or given in paraphrase form. Though quotations and paraphrases of Aristotle are supposed to be introduced by the word "dixit," still it is not always possible to distinguish them from the rest of the commentary. In the Epitome, quotations and paraphrases of Aristotle occur only casually. In preparation of this Apparatus, it will be necessary to compare the commentaries with the original works of Aristotle, to mark off, first, all the passages that are supposed to be translations of Aristotle, and, second, all the passages that are supposed to be paraphrases of Aristotle, and then, to mark these two off from each other and both of them from the commentary. The passages which are either translations or paraphrases of Aristotle are to be compared with the original Greek, word for word and phrase for phrase, and the differences discovered are to be recorded in Apparatus C.

While these three Apparatuses are to be kept distinct from each other, certain elements may have to be transferred from one Apparatus to another.

**TYPOGRAPHICAL DISPOSITION OF TEXT**

In printing, the three strata of the text, viz., (1) translations of Aristotle, (2) paraphrases of Aristotle, and (3) Averroes' own comments, are to be indicated by the use of different type or by a difference in spacing between letters or between lines.

**REFERENCES TO SOURCES**

Not many sources are mentioned by Averroes. But occasionally he refers to works of Aristotle, to some other place in his own commentaries, to Greek commentators of Aristotle, such as Alexander and Themistius, and to earlier Arabic authors, such as Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Avempace. In all such instances the sources are to be identified and whenever a printed edition or manuscript of the source in question exists, proper references are to be supplied.

**GLOSSARIES**

Each commentary is to have at the end a glossary in four languages, arranged as follows: (1) For the Arabic — Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, Greek. (2) For the Hebrew — Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, Greek. (3) For the Latin — Latin, Arabic, Hebrew, Greek. But in order to make the work also useful to the student of Aristotle, there should be a fourth glossary — Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, to be printed together with each text of the commentary.

**ORGANIZATION OF STAFF**

In order to carry out the work effectively it is necessary to have a staff organized along the following lines: (1) Editor-in-Chief, selected from among the (2) Board of Editors, consisting of the following three members: Editor of the Arabic
Series, Editor of the Hebrew Series, Editor of the Latin Series; (3) Advisory Board; (4) Editors of the individual works.

While in some cases it may be possible for one editor to edit the same work in the three languages, it is on the whole advisable to have an Arabist, a Hebraist, and a Latinist associated in the edition of any commentary which exists in the three languages. Among the three editors, however, there must be one who has a knowledge of the three languages, so that he may be able to coordinate the work on all three texts. It is the belief of the writer that there will be no difficulty in getting properly qualified men in sufficient number to carry out the program as laid out.

**PUBLICATION**

The polyglot form, with the three texts printed one beside the other or one below the other, would perhaps be most ideal for the publication of this corpus. But practical considerations may make such a plan impossible. Besides, there is nothing tangible to be gained by it. The various apparatuses and glossaries will furnish to the student of any single one of the texts all the information that he may gather from the other two texts. Those few who are able to use themselves all the three texts will find it just as easy to handle three monoglot volumes as one polyglot one.

Consequently, while the editing of the texts must be done simultaneously in the three languages by editors working in association with each other, the publication of the texts may be treated, if necessary, as three independent undertakings. There will be three series of publications of the same corpus:

- A. The Arabic Series
- B. The Hebrew Series
- C. The Latin Series
- D. Translations and Studies

Whenever the Hebrew or the Latin possesses several translations of the same text, all the translations are to be printed, either one or all of them critically edited, as the case may require.

A special subdivision of the Hebrew Series will be supercommentaries on Averroes. These will have to be considered as an integral part of the Corpus. Similarly, the Latin Series will have to include the Annotations of Zimara and others as well as the Latin translations of the Hebrew supercommentaries of Gersonides.

While the present plan contemplates an edition of only the commentaries of Averroes, which is to include his Quaestiones to the various books of Aristotle, it may be extended to include also the publication of the other works of Averroes and of the works of other Arabic and Jewish philosophers, which happen to exist in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin.

**SERIES OF TRANSLATIONS AND STUDIES OF AVERROES**

As the Corpus is to be something more than a mere collection of texts, it should also have room for annotated translations into modern languages of selected
commentaries of Averroes and for monographs dealing with certain phases of Averroes' philosophy. The scholars who will be entrusted with the editing of the texts as well as other competent scholars are therefore to be encouraged to undertake translations or independent studies of the works included in the Corpus. Such works are to form a Fourth Series of the Corpus.

APPENDIX I

Was There a Hebrew Translation from the Arabic of Averroes' Long De Anima?

Steinschneider in his *Hebraische Uebersetzungen* offered evidence to show that there had existed a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of Averroes' Long Commentary on De Anima. We shall examine his evidence.

First, in the Bodleian Library (Neubaur 1353.6) there is a supercommentary by Joseph b. Shem-tob on the section dealing with the rational faculty in one of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle's De Anima. The manuscript contains no statement as to which of the three Averroes' commentaries on that work is the subject of the supercommentary. Neubauer in his catalogue of the Bodleian Hebrew manuscripts (1886) simply says "according to Averroes' paraphrase," where the term "paraphrase" is evidently used by him, as it is throughout the catalogue, in the sense of Epitome. Steinschneider in his *Hebraische Uebersetzungen* (1898) takes it to be the Long Commentary (§ 73, p. 150), on the basis of which he tries to show that in the latter part of the fifteenth century there was still in existence a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long De Anima, for at the end of his preface Joseph b. Shem-tob promises to write a super commentary on the whole book.

However, on the basis of the incipits quoted by Steinschneider himself (op. cit., nn. 725–730 on pp. 207–208) it can be shown that the commentary used as the subject of the supercommentary here is the Middle Commentary. According to these incipits, the supercommentary is described as a "Treatise on the Rational Faculty." It then begins with a passage which is introduced by the Hebrew word for "He says." Then follows a comment on the foregoing passage, which is introduced by the Hebrew word for "Commentary." Then follows another passage introduced by the Hebrew words for "Says Averroes," and this is followed again, by a passage introduced by the Hebrew word for "Commentary." Finally, there is a passage introduced, again, by the Hebrew words for "Says Averroes." Commenting on these incipits, Steinschneider says that "they agree with the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary" (ibid., p. 208). This, however, is not so. The description of the supercommentary as a "Treatise on this Rational Faculty," the words "He says," "Says Averroes," and "Commentary," and the passages which follow these words are all taken verbatim from Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Averroes' Middle Commentary (MS Jewish Theological Seminary.).

It may be added that Joseph b. Shem-tob's statement that there was no supercommentary on the commentary in question (quoted ibid., p. 207, n. 725)
applies equally to the Middle Commentary as to the Long Commentary, for at the time that the statement was made there were in existence only some annotations on it by Soloman b. Joseph Enabi (cf. *ibid.*, p. 150).

Second, the Junta editions of 1550 and 1575 contain two Latin translations of Comments 5 and 36 of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima* III, one by Michael Scot made directly from the Arabic and the other by Mantinus made from the Hebrew during the sixteenth century. This is taken by Steinschneider to show that a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long *De Anima* was still in existence during the lifetime of Mantinus (*ibid.*, p. 151). However, this is not conclusive. These two comments happen to deal with problems concerning the intellect and it is therefore quite possible that long before the time of Mantinus they had been detached from the rest of the commentary and translated into Hebrew, having been regarded as independent treatises on the intellect, on a par with other similar treatises on the intellect by Averroes, which exist in Hebrew translation. It may be added, in passing, that Mantinus' translation of Comments 5 and 36 are not made from the Hebrew translation from the Latin Long *De Anima* to be discussed in the next Appendix.

While the evidence advanced by Steinschneider does not prove the existence of a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long *De Anima*, there is the evidence of an eyewitness who testifies to his having seen a Hebrew translation of Book III of the Long *De Anima*. Isaac Abravanel (1437–1508), writing to Saul ha-Kohen Ashkenazi of Candia, in answer to a letter addressed him on the fifth day of the fifth day of the Second Adar of the year 5266 (2 March 1506), says as follows: "We in these lands have of works of Aristotle in our language, together with the Long Commentaries of Averroes, only the *Posterior Analytics* of the *Organon*, the *Physics*, the Third Book of *De Anima*, and the Tenth Book of the *Metaphysics*" (*She’elot ... Sha’ul ha-Kohen* [Venice, 1574], p. 15d). This quotation calls for the following comments: First, the phrase "in these lands" refers to Italy, where Abravanel lived after the banishment of the Jews from Spain in 1492. Second, for that which I have translated "in our language" the printed Hebrew text has the reading *bi-leshomo "in his language," which is quite evidently a misprint for *bi-leshonenu "in our language." Third, it is to be assumed that the translation of the Long commentary on the Third Book of *De Anima*, like the translations of the other Long Commentaries mentioned by him, was a translation made directly from the Arabic. Fourth, according to the catalogues of Hebrew manuscripts in Italian libraries, published long after the time of Abravanel, there is a Long *Posterior Analytics* in Parma, but no Third Book of the Long *De Anima* anywhere; as for the two other Long Commentaries mentioned by Abravanel, of the Long *Physics* there were in Turin, before the fire of 1906, only Books I–IV and of the Long *Metaphysics* there are Books VII–X and XII in the Vatican, wrongly ascribed to Alexander (cf. *Hebr. Ueber.*, § 87, p. 172, n. 488). There can be no question, however, of the trustworthiness of Abravanel's precise statement as to what he had seen in Italy of the Hebrew Long Commentaries. Abravanel was a close student of the Hebrew translations of Averroes' commentaries, to which he
refers and upon which he draws so frequently in his own works. His statement is evidently based upon manuscripts he saw in private collections. Many private collections of Hebrew manuscripts existed at that time in Italy.

APPENDIX II

The Identity of the Hebrew Translator from the Latin of Averroes' Long De Anima

In 1888 the then Royal Library in Berlin purchased through Ephraim Deinard from the library of Landsberg in Kremenetz, Russia, two manuscripts, one an anonymous Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long Commentary on De Anima and the other a Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long Commentary on Metaphysics made from the Arabic by Moses ben Solomon of Salon (cf. Steinschneider, Hebr. Uebers., pp. 151, 172). According to a note on the De Anima by its former owner, Mendl Landsberg, the manuscript was purchased by him from a bookseller in the month of Nisan of the year 5609 (March–April 1849) and that two folios missing in the manuscript were copied for him from another manuscript, which he had located after a long search. Nothing is known about that other manuscript. As a list of manuscripts owned by Bisliches Brody, which was published in Geiger’s Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie, iii (1887), 283, contains an item described as “Aristoteles de anima und dessen Metaphysik, übersetzt ins Hebr., mit einem ausführlichen Comm. von Moses ben Salomo aus Xilon in Spanien,” Steinschneider suggested that the two manuscripts purchased might be those originally owned by Bisliches (cf. Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin [1897], §§ 214, 215, p. 64).

The colophon in the Landsberg manuscript of the Long De Anima does not give the name of the translator nor does it say from what language it was translated. All that the copyist says in it is that “I Samuel Phinehas, the youngest of the scribes, have written this book of the Long De Anima for Abraham di Benevento, completing it on Thursday, second day of the month of Ab, in the year” and here follows a quotation of part of Lamentation 3:27, in which a dotted word amounts to the year 5285 (6 July 1475). It is not clear, however, whether Benevento was the city where the Abraham referred to lived and hence where the manuscript was written or whether it was only the family name of Abraham, and it was some other city where he lived and where the manuscript was written. A comparison of certain passages in this Hebrew translation with those in the Latin

1 “Xilon” here is a conjectural identification by Julius Fürst, who furnished the list, of the name of the city written in Hebrew as Shilon. It is now generally identified as Salon in France.
2 In his Hebr. Uebers. (1896), §§7, p. 173, however, Steinschneider lists the manuscript of the Long Metaphysics purchased by Berlin from the Landsberg collection and the Bisliches manuscript mentioned in Geiger’s Zeitschrift as two different manuscripts.
3 Steinschneider in his above-mentioned catalogue of the Berlin Hebrew manuscripts gives 1497 as the equivalent of the Hebrew anno mundi mentioned in the colophon, which is evidently a misprint.
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translation, supplied by Professor Samuel Rosenblat, led Professor F. Stuart Crawford, who edited the Latin translation for the Mediaeval Academy, to conclude that the Hebrew translation was made from the Latin translation. Nine of these comparisons are referred to by Crawford in the Prolegomena of his edition (pp. xi–xii). Some of these will be commented upon at the end of this Appendix.

In examining this Hebrew translation of the Long De Anima with a view to discovering some clues as to the identity of the translator, I found it contains the following peculiarities.

First, the three Books of the De Anima are divided into seventeen Summae (Hebrew kelalim) and each Summa is subdivided into chapters (Hebrew perakim). From Bouyges' edition of Averroes' Long Commentary on Metaphysics it may be gathered that no such divisions and subdivisions are used by Averroes in his Long Commentaries. Nor, as I am told by Crawford, are there any such divisions and subdivisions in the manuscripts of the Latin translations of the Long Commentary on De Anima. Nor, again, are there such divisions and subdivisions in the 1483 edition of the Latin translations of the Long Commentaries. They do appear, however, in the sixteenth century Latin editions, but, in the case of the Long De Anima, which I have examined, they do not agree with those in the Hebrew manuscript.

Second, while the Arabic name Ibn Bājjā appears in this Hebrew translation as a transliteration of Avenpace, the form in which this name occurs in the Latin translation, the names Empedocles and Hippocrates appear in it in their customary Hebrew transliterations from the Arabic as Ibn Dōkīs and Abukrat. Similarly the forename of Alexander Aphrodisiensis appears in it as Aleskander, the form used in some Hebrew translations from the Arabic.

Third, the Hebrew term ḥidah "riddle" appears in it as a translation of μισθός in De Anima I, 3, 407b, 23, for which the Arabic translation of De Anima has fiurāfah, "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22) and the Latin translation from the Arabic in Averroes' Long Commentary has apolɔgus (I, 53, ll. 3, 12). It seems that some student of this Hebrew translation, who may have known either the original Greek term or the Latin term, was puzzled by the use of the Hebrew term for "riddle" here, and so he put down between the lines of the manuscript, above the Hebrew word ḥidah, the word apoloγo, as if to warn the next user of the manuscript that ḥidah here is used in the special sense of the Latinized Greek word apoloγus.

With these peculiarities of the translator to go by, I began to look for some Hebrew translator from the Latin whose translations might show the same or similar peculiarities. Inasmuch as, according to the colophon, the manuscript was written in Italy during the fifteenth century, in order to shorten the search, I began to look for a possible translator of this work among Hebrew translators from the Latin who lived in Italy during the fifteenth century and who translated philosophic works. Baruch ben Isaac Ibn Ya'ish seemed to be the most likely candidate, for among the works which he translated from the Latin into Hebrew there was a Hebrew translation from the Latin of Aristotle's Metaphysics (MSS.
Bodleian, 1866; Leyden, 33; Bibliothèque Nationale, 891). Further information about him is as follows. In a manuscript of a Hebrew translation of Thomas Aquinas' commentary on the *Metaphysics*, Ibn Ya'ish is referred to by its translator Abrahaham Naḥmias as still living in 1490 (cf. *Hebr. Uebers.*, p. 158, n. 31b), that is, fifteen years after the date of the manuscript of the Hebrew Long *De Anima*. Then, in a manuscript of a Hebrew translation of a Latin commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Bibliothèque Nationale, 1001), there is a colophon which reads as follows: "I, Samuel b. Solomon Atortos, have translated it and written it down out of what as I have heard it from the mouth of my teacher, the accomplished and all-around scholar, the divine philosopher, Baruch ben Ya'ish, and finished it in the city of Benevento in the year 5245 (1485)." The meaning of the colophon is not quite clear. It may mean that Ibn Ya'ish was merely helping his student to translate the work from the Latin into Hebrew or it may mean that he orally dictated to his student his own Hebrew translation of the Latin work. But it is quite clear that in 1485, ten years after the manuscript of the Hebrew Long *De Anima* was written by one who describes himself as "the youngest of the scribes" for a certain "Abraham di Benevento," Ibn Ya'ish lived in Benevento. This creates a strong probability that already in 1475 he was there, that "the youngest of the scribes" was a student of his, and that this student of his was commissioned by a patron of learning in Benevento, named Abraham, to copy, or perhaps to take down from oral dictation, his master's translation from the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima*.

This tentative identification of Ibn Ya'ish as the translator in question was finally clinched by finding that his Hebrew translation of Aristotles' *Metaphysics* contains the three peculiarities we have noticed in the anonymous Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long *De Anima*. First, as in the anonymous Hebrew translation of the Long *De Anima* so also in his translation of the *Metaphysics*, each book is broken up into smaller divisions, in this case only into chapters, and this division of each book into chapters is described by him as an innovation which he himself has introduced (see quotation of his statement in Neubauer's catalogue of the Bodleian Hebrew Manuscripts 1866). Second, as in the Long *De Anima* so also in his *Metaphysics*, the name Empedocles appears as Ibn Dokles. Third, once more, as in the anonymous Long *De Anima* so in his *Metaphysics*, the Greek μυθός in XII, 8, 1074b, 1 and 4, for which the Latin translation has *fabula*, is translated by him from the Latin by the Hebrew hidah "riddle."  

4 It is to be added that the Greek μυθός is variously translated into Arabic. Though this term in *De Anima* I, 3, 207b, 22, is in the Arabic translation of *De Anima* translated by hurāfah "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22), in Averroes' Middle Commentary on *De Anima* it is translated by the Arabic lugha "riddle" (MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Heb. 1099.3) and hence hidah in Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of it (MS. Jewish Theological Seminary). In Averroes' Middle Commentary on the *Poetics*, however, in a passage corresponding to *Poetics* 6, 1450a, 4 μυθός is translated by the Arabic hurafah, "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Lasinio, p. 9, l. 5) and hence sippur teflut "superstitious tale" in Todros Todrosi's Hebrew translation of it (ed. Lasinio, p. 7, l. 24) and hence *fabula* in Mantinus' and Balmas' Latin translations.
Baruch ben Isaac Ibn Ya'ish is thus the Hebrew translator from the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary on De Anima.

Though this Hebrew Long De Anima is undoubtedly a translation from the Latin, some of its readings, rejected for good reasons in the Crawford edition, may represent the original Arabic text.

Here are a few examples:

In I 23, 15 (ed. Crawford), Averroes uses in his comment, according to the Latin reading, the expression "Homerus versificator," whereas according to the Hebrew reading he uses an expression which means "Homerus verificator." The Greek text upon which Averroes comment rests reads: διὸ καλῶς παντισμα τῶν Ὀμηρον (De Anima I, 2, 404a, 29), for which the Arabic translation of De Anima, if translated into Latin, would read: "et ideo bene fecit Homerus in suis versibus (aṣṣan ǧī shīʾriḥi) cum dixit" (ed. Badawi, p. 9, l. 6). But it will be noticed that the Arabic text used here by Averroes, as translated into Latin, reads: "et ideo dixit Homerus, et verum dixit" (I 23, 6–7). This shows that the text of the Arabic translation used here by Averroes, unlike the text of the extant Arabic translation of De Anima, did not take the term παντισμα in the underlying Greek text in the sense of saying in verse. Consequently the reading verificator in Averroes' comment on it is more likely to represent the original Arabic here than the reading versificator.

It is to be noted that in his Long Commentary on the Metaphysics IV, Comm. 21 (ed. Bouyges, p. 419, ll. 9 and 14), where Averroes definitely uses an Arabic expression meaning "Homerus versificator (al-shāʾir)"; the term 'eṣṣoṣnec applied to Homer in Metaphysics IV, 5, 1009b, 28–29, upon which Averroes' comment rests, is translated in the Arabic text used by Averroes by dhakar ǧī shīʾriḥi (ed. Bouyges, IV, Text. 21, p. 413, l. 11), for which the Latin translation from the Arabic reads: "dixit enim in suis versibus."

In I 29, 5 (ed. Crawford) the Hebrew and the printed editions and manuscripts read: "ignis enim est primorum partium inter elementa." The corresponding Greek reads: πῦρ . . . καὶ γὰρ . . . λεπτομερεῖστα τῶν (405a, 5–6), for which the Arabic translation of De Anima, if translated into Latin, would read: "... ignis, quia est subtilissimorum (dakīkah) partium" (ed. Badawi, p. 10, l. 17). On the basis of the Greek, Crawford emended the text to read: "parviorum partium." It is quite possible, however, that the text used by Averroes had the reading primorum from the Hebrew. In Averroes' Long Commentary on the Metaphysics, in a passage corresponding to XII, 8, 1074b, 1 and 4, ḫudūth is translated by the Arabic ḫadīth, "tale" (ed. Bouyges, p. 1687, ll. 3 and 4), for which the Latin translation from the Arabic has fabula (ed. 1574, p. 383 KM) and the Hebrew translation from the Arabic has ṣippur, "tale" (MS. Ebr. Vat. Urb. 46.1). Averroes in his comment on this text (Comm. 50, p. 384 AC) uses, as the equivalents of the Arabic ḫadīth of the text, two other Arabic terms: (1) lughz, "riddle" (p. 1688, ll. 5, 7, 11, 16; p. 1689, l. 4), Latin: apologia, but (p. 1688, l. 12), fabula, Hebrew: hidah; (2) ramz, "hint" (p. 1688, l. 11), Latin: sermo, Hebrew: remez, "hint." Ibn Ya'ish's translation of both the Latin apologia in De Anima and the Latin fabula in Metaphysics by the Hebrew hidah reflects the influence of the Latin and Hebrew translations of Averroes' Long Commentary on Metaphysics, reference to the Hebrew translation of which is made by him in his Introduction to his Hebrew translation of the Latin Metaphysics.
partium inter elementa, for it will be noticed that in his Comment on this text Averroes paraphrases it to read “quia reputabant ignem esse elementum ceterorum elementorum,” and this is followed by “et simplicorum partium” (I 29, 16–18), which seems to be an explanation of the preceding statement. Now the expression “elementum ceterorum elementorum” quite evidently implies the reading of “primorum partium inter elementa” in the underlying text. Such a reading of the text and its explanation as added by Averroes in his comment would reflect Aristotle’s statement in Metaphysics I, 8, 988b, 35–989a, 2, that fire is held by some to be “the most elementary of all” (στοιχειωδέστατον πάντων) and hence the “most minute in its parts” (μικρομερέστατον) and the “most subtle” (λεπτόστατον).

In I 53, 3 (ed. Crawford) after “Apologus quo utitur Pitagoras,” the Hebrew and some Latin manuscripts add: “scilicet apoloغو quem posuit ad corrigendum animas civium.” Though in the Arabic translation of De Anima this additional statement does not occur (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22), it is not necessarily an interpolation from Averroes’ comment on this text (I 53, 13). It is quite possible that the text used by Averroes contained this additional statement, where it was introduced from Themistius’ commentary on De Anima, for Themistius, right after quoting Aristotle’s κατὰ τούς Πυθαγωρείους μύθους, comments: οἱ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἔχρητο πολιτικῶς (ed. R. Heinze, p. 23, l. 33). The term utitur in Averroes Apologus quo utitur, which has nothing to correspond to it either in the Greek text of Aristotle or in its Arabic translation, shows the influence of the term ἔχρητο in Themistius’ comment.
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