

# Studia graeco-arabica

7

---

2017

### *Editorial Board*

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli  
Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford  
Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London  
Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.  
Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa  
Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington  
Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum  
Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris  
Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem  
Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden  
Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa  
Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)  
Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

### *Staff*

Cristina D'Ancona, Elisa Coda, Giulia Guidara, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

### *Submissions*

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the transmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospect authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in chief.

### *Peer Review Criteria*

*Studia graeco-arabica* follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. *Studia graeco-arabica* does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

### *Subscription orders*

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 7 (2017), claims and customers service: [redazione@pacineditore.it](mailto:redazione@pacineditore.it)

Web site: <http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona ([cristina.dancona@unipi.it](mailto:cristina.dancona@unipi.it))

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.



© Copyright 2017 by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore, Pisa.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

### *Cover*

Mašhad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḡawī 300, f. 1v  
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *grec* 1853, f. 186v

## Table of Contents

Tiziano Dorandi, Issam Marjani <i>La tradizione siriana e araba delle cosiddette Divisiones Aristoteleae</i> <i>Analisi e commento della versione siriana (ed. Brock)</i> <i>e delle due traduzioni arabe (ed. Kellermann-Rost) .....</i>	» 1
Yury N. Arzhanov <i>Menander in Syriac: From Euthalian Apparatus to Scholia on Gregory of Nazianzus .....</i>	» 57
Andrea Rescigno <i>Nuovi frammenti del Commento di Filopono ai libri V-VIII della Fisica .....</i>	» 75
Henri Hugonnard-Roche <i>Un cours sur la syllogistique d'Aristote à l'époque tardo-antique.</i> <i>Le commentaire syriaque de Proba (VI<sup>e</sup> siècle) sur les Premiers Analytiques</i> <i>Édition et traduction du texte, avec introduction et commentaire .....</i>	» 105
John W. Watt <i>The Curriculum of Aristotelian Philosophy among the Syrians .....</i>	» 171
Alexander Treiger <i>Reconstructing Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn's Arabic Translation of Aristotle's De Anima .....</i>	» 193
Gerhard Endress <i>Ibn al-Ṭayyib's Arabic Version and Commentary of Aristotle's De Caelo .....</i>	» 213
Amir Hossein Pournamdar <i>Ṣaḥḥ: Its Origin and Development as a Logical Term .....</i>	» 277
Godefroid de Callataÿ <i>The Ṣābi'ans of Ṣā'id al-Andalusī .....</i>	» 291
Elisa Coda <i>The Soul as "Harmony" in Late Antiquity and in the Latin Middle Ages.</i> <i>A Note on Thomas Aquinas as a Reader of Themistius' In Libros De Anima Paraphrasis .....</i>	» 307
<i>Book Announcements and Reviews .....</i>	» 331
Silvia Fazzo <i>Mauro Zonta (1968-2017). In memoriam .....</i>	» 426
<i>Index of Manuscripts .....</i>	» 429
<i>Index of Ancient and Medieval Names .....</i>	» 431
<i>Index of Modern Names .....</i>	» 435

# Reconstructing Ishāq ibn Hunayn's Arabic Translation of Aristotle's *De Anima*

Alexander Treiger

## Abstract

The present contribution reconstructs several passages from Ishāq ibn Hunayn's lost Arabic translation of Aristotle's *De Anima*, based on the Hebrew and the Latin versions produced from Ishāq's Arabic, as well as on Ishāq's extant Arabic translation of Themistius' commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*. The relationship between these texts is carefully examined. One passage from Ibn Zur'a's supplement to Ishāq's translation of Aristotle's *De Anima* is similarly reconstructed. The reconstruction sheds light on Avicenna's commentatorial technique in his *Marginal Notes on the De Anima* and on Averroes' commentatorial technique in his *Long Commentary* on the same book.

## *Ishāq ibn Hunayn's Arabic Translation of Aristotle's De Anima: Testimonia and Textual Evidence*

The *Fihrist* – an indispensable tenth-century analytical inventory of Arabic literature, whose author, the bibliographer Ibn al-Nadīm (d. 995), was exceptionally well informed about the Aristotelian tradition – contains the following intriguing report on the Arabic (and Syriac) versions of, and commentaries upon, Aristotle's *De Anima*.<sup>1</sup>

الكلام على كتاب النفس وهو ثلاث مقالات نقله حنين إلى السرياني تامة، ونقله إسحق إلا شيئاً يسيراً، ثم نقله إسحق نقلاً ثانياً تامةً جود فيه. وشرح ثامسطيوس هذا الكتاب بأسره: أما المقالة الأولى ففي مقالتين، والثانية في مقالتين، والثالثة في الثلاث مقالات. [...] قال إسحق: نقلت هذا الكتاب إلى العربي من نسخة رديئة، فلما كان بعد ثلاثين سنة وجدت نسخة في نهاية الجودة فقابلت بها النقل الأول، وهو شرح ثامسطيوس.

**T1:** Report on [Aristotle's] treatise *On the Soul* in three books (*maqālāt*): (a) Hunayn translated it into Syriac in its entirety. (b) Ishāq translated it [into Arabic]<sup>2</sup> with the exception of a small part. (c) Then Ishāq produced a second, complete and revised translation. (d) Themistius commented on the entire treatise: on the first book in two books, on the second in two books, and on the third in three books. [...] (e) Ishāq said: I translated this treatise into Arabic from a poor manuscript; then after thirty years I found an excellent manuscript, so I corrected (*qābaltu*) the first translation against it, and this is the commentary of Themistius.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I express my deep gratitude to my esteemed Doktorvater, Professor Dimitri Gutas, whose seminar on Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* on Aristotle's *De Anima* at Yale I had the privilege of attending in 2001 and who offered valuable comments on an earlier draft of this article (originally submitted as a term paper for his seminar). I am also deeply grateful to Professor Cristina D'Ancona for accepting the article for publication in *Studia graeco-arabica* and for her encouragement and support all the way through, and to the anonymous reviewer for his or her critical comments.

<sup>2</sup> The text does not explicitly say that the target language of Ishāq's version of the *De Anima* was Arabic, but it is highly unlikely that both he and his father Hunayn would have produced independent Syriac versions. See also **T1e** and discussion below.

<sup>3</sup> Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitab al-Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel, F.C.W. Vogel, I-II, Leipzig 1871-72, vol. 1, p. 251. For a careful analysis

Ibn al-Nadīm's report ties the history of the Syriac and Arabic translations of the *De Anima* to two famous ninth-century translators: Ḥunayn ibn Iṣḥāq (d. 873) and his son Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. ca. 910-911). Ḥunayn is credited with an integral Syriac translation of the *De Anima*, while Iṣḥāq is apparently credited with two Arabic translations of the same work (one incomplete, the other complete and revised) and with an Arabic translation of Themistius' (d. ca. 387-388) Commentary on the *De Anima*.<sup>4</sup> While there is an extant Arabic translation of the *De Anima*, and this translation is indeed attributed to Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn, it is most certainly not by him (its language indicates that it is older). This version will therefore be referenced below as "Pseudo-Iṣḥāq".<sup>5</sup> Iṣḥāq's authentic Arabic translation(s) of the *De Anima* appear to be lost (as is, regrettably, Ḥunayn's Syriac version).<sup>6</sup>

We do have, however, a Hebrew version of the *De Anima* by Zeraḥya ben Yiṣḥāq ben Shealtiel Ḥen (d. after 1291)<sup>7</sup> and a Latin version of the *De Anima* by Michael Scot (fl. ca. 1217-1240), which is preserved in the lemmata of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *De Anima*.<sup>8</sup> As Alfred Ivry has shown, the Hebrew and the Latin versions (both translated from Arabic) represent more or less the same Arabic text, which is different from *Pseudo-Iṣḥāq's* old translation.<sup>9</sup> Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *De Anima*<sup>10</sup> and (the first part of) Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* on the

---

of this passage as well as parallels in Ibn al-Qifṭī (d. 1248) and Ḥāḡḡī Ḥalifa (d. 1658) see H. Gätje, *Studien zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen Psychologie im Islam*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg 1971, pp. 20ff.; F.E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus: The Oriental Translations and Commentaries on the Aristotelian Corpus*, Brill, Leiden 1968, pp. 40-3.

<sup>4</sup> The Greek original: Themistii in libros Aristotelis *De Anima paraphrasis*, ed. R. Heinze, G. Reimer, Berlin 1889 (*CAG*, V.3); English translation of the Greek text: R.B. Todd (trans.), *Themistius, On Aristotle's "On the Soul"*, Cornell U.P., Ithaca NY 1996.

<sup>5</sup> 'A. Badawī (ed.), *Aristūṭālīs fī l-naḡs*, "al-Ārā' al-ṭabī'iyya" al-mansūb ilā Flūṭarḡus, "al-Ḥāss wa-l-maḡsūs" li-Ibn Ruṣd, "al-Nabā' al-mansūb ilā Aristūṭālīs, Maktabat al-nahḡa al-miṣriyya, al-Qāhira 1954 (abbreviated: *Pseudo-Iṣḥāq*), pp. 1-188. Cf. R.M. Frank, "Some Fragments of Iṣḥāq's Translation of the *De Anima*", *Cahiers de Byrsa* 8 (1958-59), pp. 231-51, here pp. 231-2; Gätje, *Studien* (above n. 3), pp. 28-44.

<sup>6</sup> On Iṣḥāq's translation technique, see now: K. Eksell, "Pragmatic Markers from Greek into Arabic: A Case Study on Translations by Iṣḥāq ibn Ḥunayn", *Studia graeco-arabica* 5 (2015), pp. 321-44.

<sup>7</sup> *Aristotle's "De Anima" Translated into Hebrew by Zeraḡyah ben Isaac ben Shealtiel Ḥen. A Critical Edition with an Introduction and Index* by G. Bos, Brill, Leiden 1994 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 6).

<sup>8</sup> This commentary is preserved only in Latin (and in a Hebrew version produced from Latin): F.S. Crawford (ed.), *Averrois Cordubensis Commentarium Magnum in Aristotelis De Anima libros*, The Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge MA 1953; English translation: R.C. Taylor - Th.-A. Druart, *Averroes (Ibn Ruṣd) of Cordoba, Long Commentary on the De Anima of Aristotle*, Yale U.P., New Haven CT 2009; French translation of the third part: A. de Libera, *Averroès: L'intelligence et la pensée, Grand Commentaire du De Anima, Livre III (429 a 10 - 435 b 25)*, Flammarion, Paris 1998. For some Arabic fragments of the *Long Commentary* see A. ben Chehida, "Ikṭiṣāf al-naṣṣ al-'arabī li-aḡamm aḡzā' al-Šarḡ al-kabīr li-Kitāb al-naḡs, ta'lif Abī l-Walid Ibn Ruṣd", *al-Ḥayāb al-ṭaqāfiyya* 35 (1985), pp. 14-48 (not seen); C. Sirat - M. Geoffroy, *L'original arabe du Grand Commentaire d'Averroès au De Anima d'Aristote, Prémisses de l'édition*, J. Vrin, Paris 2005. See also D. Wirmer, "Le Grand Commentaire d'Averroès au *De Anima* et ses lecteurs juifs", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 17 (2007), pp. 135-58; C. Sirat, "Les Citations du Grand Commentaire d'Averroès au *De Anima* d'Aristote dans les *Croyances des philosophes* de Shem-Tov Ibn Falaquera", in J.-B. Brenet (ed.), *Averroès et les averroïsmes juif et latin*. Actes du Colloque international (Paris, 16-18 juin 2005), Brepols, Turnhout 2007, pp. 249-55.

<sup>9</sup> A.L. Ivry, "The Arabic Text of Aristotle's *De Anima* and Its Translator", *Oriens* 36 (2001), pp. 59-77.

<sup>10</sup> Abū l-Walid Ibn Ruṣd, *Talḡiṣ Kitāb al-naḡs*, A.L. Ivry, al-Maḡlis al-a'lā li-l-ṭaqāfa, al-Qāhira 1994 (cf. the more recent edition with an English translation: *Averroes' Middle Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*, ed. and trans. A.L. Ivry, Brigham Young U.P., Provo UT 2002).

*De Anima*<sup>11</sup> seem to be based on this text as well.<sup>12</sup> At a certain point (corresponding to 431 a 14, i.e., near the middle of *De Anima* III 7, very close to the end of the treatise) the following note occurs in the unique manuscript of Avicenna's *Marginal Notes*:

نسخة الفصّ كان (!) إلى هاهنا نقل إسحق بن حنين، ومن هاهنا نقل آخر بإصلاحات كثيرة للمفسّر.

**T2:** Up to this point, the version of the commented text (*nushbat al-faṣṣ*)<sup>13</sup> was that of Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn's translation; from here onwards, it is another translation, with multiple corrections by the commentator [i.e., Avicenna].<sup>14</sup>

From this point on, Avicenna indeed no longer follows the Arabic text on which both the Hebrew and the Latin versions of the *De Anima* are based, but rather *Pseudo-Ishāq*'s old Arabic translation.<sup>15</sup>

A somewhat similar note is preserved, at exactly the same point of Aristotle's text,<sup>16</sup> in the manuscripts of the Hebrew version of the *De Anima*:

השלמת מה שהעתיק יצחק בן חנין מזה המאמר מהעתקת אבי עיסי בן יצחק מן האשורי אל לשון הערבי.

**T3:** Supplement to what Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn translated from this treatise, [taken] from Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq's translation from Syriac into Arabic.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, the Arabic translation of Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima* is preserved, almost in its entirety, in one manuscript and has been published by M.C. Lyons. This translation comprises seven sections divided as indicated in the *Fihrist*. The third section bears the following title:

<sup>11</sup> On this text see D. Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*, Brill, Leiden 1988, p. 321a, *Index of Names and Places*, s.v. "Avicenna: Marginal Notes on *De Anima*"; Id., *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*, Second, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Including an Inventory of Avicenna's Authentic Works, Brill, Leiden 2014, p. 591a, *Index of Authors Cited, Names, and Places*, s.v. "Avicenna: Marginal Glosses on *De Anima*"; Id., "Avicenna's Marginal Glosses on *De Anima* and the Greek Commentatorial Tradition", in P. Adamson - H. Baltussen - M.W.F. Stone (eds.), *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, 2 vols., Institute of Classical Studies, London 2004, vol. 2, pp. 75-85; see esp. p. 80, n. 32 where Gutas points out that Avicenna follows the text of Themistius rather than that of Aristotle. This is quite significant given the relation between the Arabic translation of Themistius and the Arabic translation of the *De Anima* (both produced by Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn).

<sup>12</sup> Ivry, "The Arabic Text" (above, n. 9), p. 65: "[I]t is Ishāq's language and style which reappear in the majority of the citations from *De Anima* itself in both of Averroes' commentaries. This translation proves to be the same essentially as that found in most of the quotations and paraphrases of *De Anima* which appear in Avicenna's glosses to that work".

<sup>13</sup> On the term *faṣṣ* (pl. *fuṣūṣ*), "commented text", cf. A. Bertolacci, "From al-Kindī to al-Fārābī: Avicenna's Progressive Knowledge of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* According to His *Autobiography*", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 11 (2001), pp. 257-95.

<sup>14</sup> Avicenna, *Marginal Notes on the "De Anima" (al-Ta'liqāt 'alā ḥawāṣī Kitāb al-naṣf)*, ed. 'A. Badawī, in Id., *Aristū 'ind al-'arab*, Maktabat al-nahḍa al-miṣriyya, al-Qāhira 1947, pp. 75-116 (abbreviated: Avicenna), here p. 109, n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> *Pseudo-Ishāq*'s translation is also quoted by Avicenna at one point before 431 a 14 (see n. 32 below); it is also quoted on several occasions in Averroes' *Long Commentary* as "alia translatio" – see references in Ivry, "The Arabic Text" (above, n. 9), p. 60, n. 4.

<sup>16</sup> This has been noted by Gätje, *Studien* (above n. 3), p. 22.

<sup>17</sup> P. 127.325-326 Bos (cf. Bos' English translation of this note on p. 9). This note can be tentatively retranslated into Arabic as follows: تَمَّتْ ما نقله إسحق بن حنين من هذه المقالة من نقل أبي عيسى بن إسحق من السرياني إلى اللغة العربية. See also M. Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher*, Kommissionsverlag des bibliographischen Bureaus, Berlin 1893, p. 146.

المقالة الأولى من كتاب ثامسطيوس في تفسير المقالة الثانية من كتاب أرسطوطاليس في النفس،  
ترجمة إسحق بن حنين الثانية.

**T4:** First book of Themistius' commentary on the second book of Aristotle's *De Anima* [in] the second translation of Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn.<sup>18</sup>

All these *testimonia* present a coherent though not altogether clear picture. The manuscript note in Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* (**T2**) and the note in the Hebrew version (**T3**), both occurring at the same place near the end of the treatise and ascribing the preceding part of the Arabic text to Ishāq,<sup>19</sup> correspond clearly to the indication of the *Fibrist* (**T1b**) that Ishāq translated the *De Anima* "with the exception of a small part". If so, Avicenna seems to have had access to Ishāq's first and incomplete version of the *De Anima*, whereas Ishāq's second and complete translation (if it ever existed) was apparently unknown to him.

Some difficulties, however, remain. Thus, we have a very ambiguous phrase "and this is the commentary of Themistius" (**T1e**): it is unclear whether this phrase refers only to the second ("excellent") manuscript (the "poor" one having been that of the *De Anima*) or to both the excellent and the poor manuscripts, in which case Ishāq's entire statement in **T1e** would refer to Themistius' commentary rather than to the *De Anima* as such.

The first possibility would imply that Ishāq corrected his earlier translation of the *De Anima* on the basis of Themistius' commentary, but this is unlikely, for, as argued by Richard Frank, "Themistius did only a paraphrase, which, although considerably longer than the *de Anima* itself, does in no wise contain the integral text of the original".<sup>20</sup>

It is more plausible to assume that the entire passage (regarding both the "poor" and the "excellent" manuscripts) refers to Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima* rather than to the *De*

<sup>18</sup> M.C. Lyons (ed.), *An Arabic Translation of Themistius['] Commentary on Aristoteles [sic] De Anima*, University of South Carolina Press, Columbia 1973, p. 42. Similar titles are given to sections 4-7 – see pp. 88, 136, 169, and 214 Lyons (the first section has no title; the beginning of the second section is lacking).

<sup>19</sup> It should be noted, however, that the title of the first section of the Hebrew version seems to ascribe it to Ḥunayn rather than to Ishāq – see p. 45.2 Bos.

<sup>20</sup> Frank, "Some Fragments" (above, n. 5), p. 233. Frank himself, however, understood the text of the *Fibrist* in a hardly more plausible way, namely: "after 30 years I found another recension which was truly excellent in all respects; I compared this with the first translation and found it to be the 'commentary' of Themistius" (*ibid.*, my emphasis). As Frank's discussion makes clear, the pronoun "it" in the phrase "[I] found it to be the 'commentary' of Themistius" refers to the second manuscript (or, as he has it, "recension"). Frank then goes on to argue that "the translator [i.e., Ishāq], according to th[is] quotation, mentions how he came to notice that it [i.e., the excellent recension] was the work of Themistius rather than that of Aristotle, almost as if the manuscript which he had gave no indication of the author" (Frank, "Some Fragments" (above, n. 5), p. 234). Frank's interpretation is both implausible and incorrect. It is implausible because Ishāq would need no "comparison" to recognize that the second manuscript contained something else than Aristotle's text – it would be sufficient for him to have a glance at the first sentence of the text to realize that what he had in front of him was a Peripatetic commentary on Aristotle rather than an original composition by Aristotle himself (Themistius' commentary begins as follows: "In this treatise we must *try to follow Aristotle* on everything that can be systematically understood about the soul"). It is incorrect because Frank does not take into account the technical meaning of the verb *qābala*: in this context it clearly means "to correct" one manuscript (in this case: a translation) on the basis of another. Cf. similar use of this term in Ḥunayn's *Risāla*, §3 – G. Bergsträsser (ed. and trans.), *Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen*, F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1925, p. 5.5-6 (German translation, p. 4); J.C. Lamoreaux (ed. and trans.), *Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq on His Galen Translations*. With an Appendix by G. Kessel, Brigham Young U.P., Provo, UT 2016, p. 11; F. Rosenthal, *The Classical Heritage in Islam*, trans. from German by E. Marmorstein and J. Marmorstein, University of California Press, Berkeley 1975, p. 20.



*Anima* itself; the phrase “and this is the commentary of Themistius” is simply an explanation added (by Ibn al-Nadīm?) to clarify this. It is very likely that these words of Ishāq have their origin in a colophon of his (second) Arabic version of Themistius' commentary, a manuscript of which Ibn al-Nadīm may well have examined.<sup>21</sup> The disadvantage of this interpretation is that it fails to explain how, according to **T1c**, Ishāq managed to produce his “second, complete and revised” translation of the *De Anima*.

There is also a third possibility, suggested by Helmut Gätje, that the “excellent” manuscript contained both Themistius' commentary and the text of the *De Anima*. In this case, Ishāq could have translated the former into Arabic and subsequently used the latter to correct and complete his earlier translation of the *De Anima*.<sup>22</sup>

The Hebrew note (**T3**) is somewhat ambiguous as well. Two questions arise. First, does the text mean that the ending of the Hebrew version (after 431 a 14) (as well as the parallel section of the Latin translation)<sup>23</sup> reflect the Syro-Arabic version of Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq<sup>24</sup> or does it mean that they are based on Ishāq's translation made from Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq's Syriac version?<sup>25</sup> Second, do we have a proof (independent of **T3**) that the second part of the text (after 431 a 14) is not supplied from Ishāq's second and complete (presumably Graeco-Arabic) translation?<sup>26</sup>

The answer to the first question largely depends on Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq's identity. If Moritz Steinschneider is correct in his suggestion, adopted by the majority of scholars, that Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq is Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's pupil Abū 'Alī 'Īsā ibn Ishāq Ibn Zur'a (d. 1008),<sup>27</sup> then the second interpretation of the Hebrew note is ruled out on chronological grounds. The first interpretation, on the other hand, seems very plausible indeed: it stands to reason that Ibn Zur'a had at his disposal Ishāq's first and incomplete translation of the *De Anima* and completed it working from an unknown (possibly Hunayn's) Syriac version.

<sup>21</sup> The only extant manuscript of the Arabic version of Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima* (Ishāq's second version, according to **T4**) breaks off near the end of the book, and so this colophon, if it existed, is irreparably lost.

<sup>22</sup> Gätje, *Studien* (above n. 3), p. 24.

<sup>23</sup> A textual comparison of the Hebrew version with the Latin reveals that after 431 a 14 both versions reflect more or less the same Arabic text – see synoptic edition of Passage 8 in *Appendix III* below.

<sup>24</sup> This is the interpretation shared by Frank (“Some Fragments” [above, n. 5], p. 235, n. 1), Peters (*Aristoteles Arabus* [above, n. 3], pp. 41-2), and Ivry (“The Arabic Text” [above n. 9], p. 62, n. 16).

<sup>25</sup> Steinschneider (*Die hebräischen Übersetzungen* [above, n. 17], p. 146) understands this passage as meaning that the second part (after 431 a 14) contains Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq's Arabic rendering of Ishāq's (Syriac) supplement (השלמה) to the (according to Steinschneider, incomplete) Syriac version by Hunayn (rendered by the same Abū 'Īsā ibn Ishāq into Arabic for the first part of the text). This interpretation seems to me to be very far-fetched. It is nevertheless upheld by Bos (Bos, *Aristotle's "De anima"* [above, n. 7], p. 12). This interpretation agrees neither with the evidence of **T2**, which clearly ascribes the version of the text preceding 431 a 14 to Ishāq, nor with the evidence of the *Fihrist* (**T1a**), which states explicitly that Hunayn's Syriac version was a complete one.

<sup>26</sup> This is the opinion of Gätje (*Studien* [above, n. 3], p. 41): “Angesichts dieses Sachverhaltes und der oben dargestellten Parallelen aus Avicenna und A I [=the translation preserved in Averroes' lemmata before 431 a 14] halte ich es nach wie vor für wahrscheinlich, daß A I in einer Beziehung zur ersten, unvollständigen Übersetzung Ishāqs steht und daß A I + A II [=the translation preserved in Averroes' lemmata after 431 a 14] wohl doch eine spätere Redaktion Ishāqs darstellen”. Cf. criticism of Gätje's position by Bos, *Aristotle's "De anima"* (above, n. 7), pp. 11-12.

<sup>27</sup> Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen* (above, n. 17), p. 146. On Ibn Zur'a, see: C. Haddād, *'Īsā ibn Zur'a, philosophe arabe et apologiste chrétien du X<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Dār al-Kalima, Beirut 1971 (second ed. CERPOC, Beirut 2013); J.P. Monferrer-Sala, “Ibn Zur'a”, in D.Th. Mallett - A. Mallett (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 2, Brill, Leiden 2010 (The History of Christian-Muslim Relations), pp. 570-74; G. Endress, “Ibn Zur'a”, in U. Rudolph (ed.), *Philosophie in der islamischen Welt: I: 8.-10. Jahrhundert*, Schwabe Verlag, Basel 2012, pp. 325-33.



As far as the second question is concerned, to the best of my knowledge, no answer to it has been provided so far. The editor of the Hebrew text Gerrit Bos merely observes that the “Hebrew translation does not show a sudden change in style or vocabulary from 431a14 on”.<sup>28</sup> Ivry’s article does not address this issue at all. Even casual examination, however, is sufficient to establish that the second part of the Hebrew text cannot reflect the same translation as the first part (or even a revised version of the former). This becomes clear when one considers the ways in which both parts render key Greek terms, such as, e.g., the Aristotelian term  $\tilde{\eta}$  (=Latin: *qua*). Before 431 a 14 this term is rendered rather consistently by من طريق ما/أُن (=Hebrew: מדרך מה ש-, Latin: *secundum quod*).<sup>29</sup> From this point on, this term is rendered, also rather consistently, by بما (=Hebrew: במה ש- or באשר, Latin: *secundum quod*, but sometimes more literally: *in eo quod*).<sup>30</sup> One may conclude, therefore, that the second part of the text is certainly not by Ishāq. Most likely, we have here a Syro-Arabic version by a later translator who supplemented Ishāq’s incomplete version.<sup>31</sup> At present, there seems to be no reason to question Steinschneider’s suggestion that this translator was Ibn Zur’a. I shall therefore refer to this version as “Ibn Zur’a’s supplement”.

This being the case, one should note that we have absolutely no evidence of the existence of Ishāq’s second and complete translation of the *De Anima* mentioned in the *Fihrist* (T1c). Averroes, in both his *Middle* and *Long Commentary* on the *De Anima*, used, after 431 a 14, Ibn Zur’a’s Syro-Arabic version; and it is this version that is preserved in the Hebrew translation as well. Avicenna in his *Marginal Notes* used, from this point on, the old, *Pseudo-Ishāq*’s translation, though one cannot exclude the possibility that he was also familiar with Ibn Zur’a’s supplement.<sup>32</sup> The fact that Ishāq’s

<sup>28</sup> Bos, *Aristotle’s “De anima”* (above, n. 7), p. 12, n. 18. From this he concludes that the underlying Arabic version was produced by a single translator: in his view (following Steinschneider), Abū ‘Īsā ibn Ishāq [=Ibn Zur’a] – see n. 25 above.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., 403 a 13 = Bos p. 47.59 (- מדרך מה ש-), p. 18.5 Crawford (*secundum quod*); 405 a 23-24 (twice) = p. 53.177-178 Bos, p. 41.6-8 Crawford; 418 a 23 = p. 89.332 Bos, Crawford 227.4; 431a11 = p. 126.323 Bos, p. 467.2-3 Crawford; cf. n. 69 below. (I do not, of course, mention the cases in which Ishāq mistook  $\tilde{\eta}$  for one of its homographs). Cf. similar renderings in Ishāq’s translation of Themistius’ commentary: p. 45.6 Lyons (three times = Heinze 40.1-2, Todd 57), 90.4-5 (three times = Heinze 59.16, Todd 79), 91.3-5 (four times = Heinze 59.33-34, Todd 79), 91.14-15 (twice = Heinze 60.7, Todd 80), 96.10-11 (twice = Heinze 62.5-6, Todd 82), 98.1-2 (twice = Heinze 62.27, Todd 82), 116.5-6 (twice = Heinze 70.34, Todd 91), 118.3 (=Heinze 71.34, Todd 92), 130.10 (=Heinze 77.17, Todd 98), 182.6 (twice = Heinze 100.21-22, Todd 125), 209.5-6 (=Heinze 114.24, Todd 140). Sometimes, however,  $\tilde{\eta}$  is rendered by من جهة ما (e.g. Lyons 141.6, Heinze 82.9, Todd 104 – this expression is typically used by Ishāq to render the Greek  $\tau\tilde{\omega}$  + inf., e.g., in 430 a 14-15, cf. Passage 6 in Appendix II below) or by على أن (e.g. Lyons 130.15-16 [twice], Heinze 77.22, Todd 99). Elsewhere, من طريق ما/أُن is used to render  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{o}$  /  $\kappa\alpha\theta’\acute{o}$ . e.g. Lyons 91.5 (=Heinze 59.34, Todd 79), 129.1 (twice = Heinze 76.33, Todd 98).

<sup>30</sup> See, e.g., 431 b 13 = p. 128.352 Bos (באשר), p. 478.2 Crawford (*in eo quod*); 431 b 14 = p. 128.352 Bos (- במה ש-), p. 478.3 Crawford (*in eo ... quod*); 433 b 11 = p. 134.456 Bos (באשר), p. 522.1 Crawford (*secundum quod*); 433 b 18 = p. 134.463 Bos (- במה ש-), p. 523.12 Crawford (*secundum quod*); 433 b 27 = p. 134.473 Bos (to be emended to באשר [כאשר]), p. 527.1-2 Crawford (*secundum quod*).

<sup>31</sup> The possibility of Ishāq himself working from a Syriac version cannot be ruled out at this stage of research, but it is highly unlikely. The assumption that Ishāq worked from a Syriac version does not explain, e.g., the relative infrequency, after 431 a 14, of the ف ... أما construction, used by Ishāq rather consistently to render the Greek particle  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  (cf. n. 52 and n. 163 below): if it were he who translated the second part of the text as well, one might expect that he would render the Syriac *dēn* (the usual equivalent of the Greek  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ) in the same way.

<sup>32</sup> It is even possible that despite the fact that Avicenna’s commentary after 431 a 14 seems to be based on *Pseudo-Ishāq*’s translation, it is Ibn Zur’a’s version that was recorded in the manuscript of the *De Anima* at his disposal; the evidence of T2 that Avicenna’s manuscript of the *De Anima* after 431 a 14 contained “multiple emendations by the commentator” may explain why Avicenna may have refrained from using this translation, even if it was indeed recorded in his manuscript. Avicenna seems to have had *Pseudo-Ishāq*’s translation in a separate (and complete) manuscript, as is indicated by the fact that he refers to this translation on one occasion before 431 a 14 (at 429 a 11, cf. Avicenna, *al-Ta’liqāt ‘alā*

second and complete translation of the *De Anima* was not available to Avicenna and Averroes, and presumably to Ibn Zur'a as well (otherwise he would not have needed to supplement it), lends support to the assumption that it never existed.

In light of this, two possible explanations of the evidence of the *Fihrist* (T1c) present themselves. First, it is possible that the "Ishāq" in T1c has to be emended to "Abū [ʿAlī] ʿĪsā ibn Ishāq" [=Ibn Zur'a]. T1c could then be taken to allude, however imprecisely, to Ibn Zur'a's supplement to Ishāq ibn Hunayn's translation. Second, it is possible that T1c refers not to Ishāq's (non-existent) second translation of the *De Anima*, but to Ishāq's second translation of Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima*. This would dovetail well with the indication of T4, which specifically mentions that this is a manuscript of Ishāq's second translation of Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima*.

### *A New Method for Reconstructing Select Passages of Ishāq's Translation of the De Anima and Ibn Zur'a's Supplement*

Certain passages from Ishāq's translation (up to 431 a 14) and Ibn Zur'a's supplement (both lost in Arabic) can be reconstructed on the basis of two Arabic sources: Ishāq's translation of Themistius' *Commentary* on the *De Anima* (up to 431 a 14 only) and Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *De Anima*.<sup>33</sup> Both sources have verbatim or near verbatim quotations from Aristotle,<sup>34</sup> and in these cases the Arabic text of the quotations is sufficiently close to the lost Arabic text of Ishāq's and Ibn Zur'a's *De Anima* to allow reconstruction. In order to reconstruct these passages one has to modify the text of the Arabic quotations according to the Hebrew and the Latin versions which both reflect Ishāq's and Ibn Zur'a's Arabic *De Anima*.<sup>35</sup> In most cases the modifications required are very slight.

In Appendixes II and III below I have presented a synoptic edition of eight Arabic passages (Appendix II: seven fragments from Ishāq's translation of Themistius' *Commentary* for the section before 431 a 14; Appendix III: one fragment from Averroes' *Middle Commentary* for the section after 431 a 14) with their Hebrew and Latin parallels. A comparison between Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin allows a fairly precise reconstruction of the Arabic text of Ishāq's and Ibn Zur'a's *De Anima* for these passages – namely, the Arabic text underlying both the Hebrew and the Latin version.<sup>36</sup>

---

*ḥawāṣṣī Kitāb al-naḥṣ*, p. 98.21 Badawī, corresponding to *Pseudo-Ishāq*, p. 72.10-11 Badawī [in Badawī's text the words أو غير مفارق are omitted due to homoioteleuton]) and seems to consult it elsewhere as well. At 429 a 1 Avicenna even remarks that this version is more accurate [*aṣaḥḥ*] than Ishāq's (Avicenna, *al-Ta'liqāt 'alā ḥawāṣṣī Kitāb al-naḥṣ*, p. 98.22 Badawī).

<sup>33</sup> Because Avicenna often paraphrases the quotations from Aristotle, his *Marginal Notes* should be used with great caution and only when backed by other sources. Richard Frank's attempt to reconstruct fragments of Ishāq's version on the basis of Avicenna's text only has not yielded reliable results [Frank, "Some Fragments" (above, n. 5)].

<sup>34</sup> *Verbatim* quotations from Aristotle are conveniently marked by expanded spacing in Heinze's edition of Themistius' *Commentary*. In his edition of the Arabic translation of Themistius, Lyons does not identify them. Additional quotations are identified in Todd's English translation of Themistius' *Commentary*. Verbatim or near verbatim quotations from Aristotle in Averroes' *Middle Commentary* can only be identified on the basis of their agreement with the Hebrew and Latin versions.

<sup>35</sup> The Hebrew version is particularly important, for in most cases it is a word for word rendering of the underlying Arabic text.

<sup>36</sup> On two occasions, Alfred Ivry deals with passages from Ishāq's translation of Themistius' commentary that render Aristotle verbatim (Ivry, "Arabic Text" [above, n. 9], pp. 70-1 and 73); yet he seems to be unaware of the fact. See, e.g., his explanation of the similarity between Ishāq's translation of Themistius and the Hebrew and the Latin versions: "It is significant that the Latin of the *Long Commentary* (and essentially the Hebrew of Zerahyah) is a verbatim translation of [the Arabic version of] Themistius' text, which reads: [...] It is thus possible that Averroes adopted the Ishāqian translation

Why is Ishāq's translation of Themistius' quotations from Aristotle's *De Anima* so close to Ishāq's translation of the *De Anima* itself? There are several possible answers to this question: (1) (a) Ishāq translated both Themistius and the *De Anima* directly from Greek, and (b) he was so consistent in his terminology and translation techniques as to render the same Greek text in the same way; (2) (a) Ishāq consulted his own translation of the *De Anima* when translating Themistius' *Commentary*, or (b) *vice versa*. Statement (1a) seems to be correct. As far as (1b) is concerned, it seems that even though Ishāq's translations are indeed remarkably consistent, this in itself would not be sufficient to explain such a close alignment between the two texts as exhibited by the passages edited in Appendix II below. There seems to be a closer relation between the two translations, which goes beyond their having been produced by the same individual. In one case at least, textual evidence seems to point to the possibility (2a).<sup>37</sup> Presumably, when translating Themistius' *Commentary*, Ishāq took care that future Arabic readers of Themistius would be able to recognize and locate the relevant passages in the *De Anima*, and hence used the "standard" Arabic *De Anima* translation (his own!) for Themistius' quotations from the *De Anima*.<sup>38</sup> By contrast, it seems that the possibility (2b) is not borne out by textual evidence. It seems clear that Ishāq did not correct his translation of the *De Anima* according to Themistius' *Commentary*, as one interpretation of the evidence of the *Fibrist* (T1d) would have it. There are quite a few cases of textual disagreements between the two Arabic texts (in some cases even going back to a different Greek *Vorlage*).<sup>39</sup>

---

represented in Themistius' text when quoting Aristotle in the *Long Commentary*, and, like Avicenna, used Ishāq's other translation of the *De Anima* here for the lemma of his *Middle Commentary*" (Ivry, *ibid.*, pp. 70-1).

<sup>37</sup> In 429 a 31 - b 3 Aristotle's text reads: Ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἰσθησις οὐ δύναται αἰσθάνεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ σφόδρα αἰσθητοῦ, ὅσον ψόφου ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων ψόφων, οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν χρωμάτων καὶ ὁσμῶν οὔτε ὀρνῶν οὔτε ὁσμᾶσθαι. There are two possibilities to understand the genitive case of the underlined noun ψόφου:

as dependent on the verb αἰσθάνεσθαι: "for example, [it cannot perceive] a voice after [lit.: from] intense voices";

as dependent on the noun αἰσθησις: "for example, [perception of] voice [=sense of hearing] [cannot perceive] after [lit.: from] intense voices".

Modern translations of the *De Anima* usually follow the first possibility – e.g., the French translation by E. Barbotin reads here: "par exemple, on ne perçoit pas le son à la suite de sons intenses". Ishāq, on the other hand, chose the second option, as testified by the Hebrew version of this passage: the Hebrew השב לאחור המרגיש השב renders the Arabic الحس المنصرف, which itself is a corruption of الحس للصوت (see nn. 114 and 115 below). Now, Ishāq's *Vorlage* for Themistius' quotation, to judge from his Arabic translation, must have read slightly differently: οἷον τοῦ ψόφου τοῦ μικροῦ ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων ψόφων (see n. 113 below). Clearly, the addition of the adjective (τοῦ) μικροῦ makes the second possibility much less plausible, for there is no separate kind of perception for weak voices as opposed to strong and intense ones. Yet, Ishāq follows the second possibility in his translation of Themistius as he does in that of the *De Anima* – he supplies the adjective without changing the basic structure of the sentence: كأنك قلت الحس للصوت الصغير عن الأصوات العظيمة. The accuracy and precision with which Ishāq renders Greek texts into Arabic is well known, and, in my view, he would have hardly chosen the second possibility of translating the sentence had he been producing his translation independently, i.e., without using his own translation of the *De Anima*. It seems to me that this idiosyncratic rendering of Themistius' text can best be explained on the assumption that Ishāq followed his own Arabic translation of the *De Anima* and diverged from it in cases in which Themistius' text did not agree with it.

<sup>38</sup> Just as in modern translations into English, it is a standard practice not to translate, say, Biblical quotations literally but to supply the text from one of the standard English translations.

<sup>39</sup> See nn. 54 (?), 58, 65, 78, 82, 90, 91, 94, 98, 101, 102, 103, 115 (?), 116, 119 (?), 120, 124, 126, 134, 135, 137, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147 below.

### Appendix I: An Interpretation that Has Its Origin in Textual Transmission

The first part of Passage 6 (*De Anima*, III 5, 430 a 14-15) – perhaps the most crucial sentence in the entire *De Anima* – presents, in its Latin version, a tripartite division of the intellect:

Oportet igitur ut in ea sit [1] intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod efficitur omne, et [2] intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne, et [3] intellectus secundum quod intelligit omne, quasi habitus, qui est quasi lux. ...

On the other hand, both Aristotle's original text and the Hebrew translation of the *De Anima* (as well as Averroes' *Middle Commentary*) present a bipartite division of the intellect:

Καὶ ἔστιν [1] ὁ μὲν τοιοῦτος νοῦς τῶ πάντα γίνεσθαι, [2] ὁ δὲ τῶ πάντα ποιεῖν, ὡς ἔξινος τις, οἷον τὸ φῶς.  
ויהיה בהם [1] שכל הוא מצד שהוא נהיה כל דבר, ובהם [2] שכל הוא מצד שהוא ישימוני שכל כל דבר,  
כגון מה, הוא כמו האורה.

This idiosyncrasy of the Latin version certainly goes back to its Arabic *Vorlage*, for Averroes' *Long Commentary* (as opposed to his *Middle Commentary*) presupposes tripartition. Alain de Libera, in the introduction to his French translation of the third part of the *Long Commentary*, argues that the lemma of the *Long Commentary* is "strongly contaminated by the *De Intellectu* of Alexander of Aphrodisias (whose first sentence is no other than Νοῦς ἔστι κατὰ Ἀριστοτέλη τριττός: "Intellect is threefold, according to Aristotle")".<sup>40</sup> In his notes to the translation, de Libera argues further that it is the second intellect of the lemma (*intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne*) that is interpolated.<sup>41</sup> In what follows I shall attempt to show that this suggestion, tempting as it is, is incorrect, and the tripartition in the lemma of the *Long Commentary* is better accounted for by an accident of textual transmission than by alleged contamination of the text by Alexander of Aphrodisias' ideas.<sup>42</sup>

First of all, let us take note of the fact that the two intellects of the Hebrew translation correspond not to the first and third intellects of the Latin version, as de Libera's interpolation hypothesis requires, but rather to the first and the second. Clearly, the Hebrew שכל מצד שהוא ישימוני שכל כל דבר and the Latin *intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne* represent the same Arabic text that can be reconstructed as follows: عقل من جهة أنه يجعله يعقل كل شيء.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, the third intellect of the Latin version finds exact parallel in the Arabic version of Themistius: عقل من جهة أنه يفعل كل شيء.<sup>44</sup> Now, both Arabic fragments are plausible translations of the same Greek text – ὁ δὲ τῶ πάντα ποιεῖν – the first being more interpretative and the second more literal. It seems likely that one of these translations, most probably the second one (originating from Themistius' *Commentary*), was initially written in the margin of an Arabic manuscript of the *De Anima* and later on, but certainly before Averroes' time, was incorporated in the text in one or more manuscripts of this treatise.<sup>45</sup> These manuscripts thus came to refer twice to the same entity of Aristotle's original text. This reading was then adopted by Averroes in his *Long Commentary* but rejected in the *Middle Commentary* (for which he seems to have used a different, and perhaps superior, Arabic manuscript of the *De Anima*).<sup>46</sup>

<sup>40</sup> De Libera, *Averroès* (above, n. 8), p. 32.

<sup>41</sup> De Libera, *Averroès* (above, n. 8), p. 270, n. 411.

<sup>42</sup> This is not to say, of course, that Averroes could not have been influenced by Alexander in his interpretation of the tripartition.

<sup>43</sup> The verb לשים (literally: "to put") is often used in Zerahya's translation to render the Arabic جعل (for which the Latin translator commonly uses *facere*), cf. 430 a 16 (Passage 6: (שים המראים אשר הם בכח מראים בפועל: 431 a 5 (Passage 7: (המורגש שים המרגיש בפועל אחר היותו בכח: 431 a 5 (Passage 7: שים. *Index*, p. 188 Bos, *s.v.* שים.

<sup>44</sup> On the *יעقل* < *يفعل* corruption in both Themistius' text and the lemma (but after Averroes) see n. 128 below.

<sup>45</sup> But not in others, as the Hebrew version and Averroes' *Middle Commentary* testify.

<sup>46</sup> See n. 68 below.

*Appendix II: Reconstruction of Select Passages  
from Ishāq's Arabic Translation of the De Anima*

- A = Ishāq's Arabic version of Themistius' verbatim quotations from Aristotle, ed. Lyons  
 H = Zerahya's Hebrew translation of Ishāq's Arabic translation of the *De Anima*, ed. Bos  
 \*H = (presumed reading of) the Arabic *Vorlage* of H  
 L = the Latin *lemmata* of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *De Anima*, ed. Crawford  
 \*L = (presumed reading of) the Arabic *Vorlage* of L  
 LC = the textus of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *De Anima*, ed. Crawford  
 MC = Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *De Anima*, ed. Ivry (1994)  
 MN = Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* on the *De Anima*, ed. Badawī  
 PI = *Pseudo-Ishāq's* old Arabic translation of the *De Anima*, ed. Badawī

*Sigla* printed in low-case letters (a, h, etc.) refer to variant readings in the *apparatuses* of the respective editions. The synoptic edition below offers several corrections to Bos' and Crawford's editions.<sup>47</sup> It also provides some observations concerning Zerahya's and Michael Scot's terminology and methods of translation.<sup>48</sup> It should also be noted that Zerahya seems to have followed, on certain occasions, Averroes' *Middle Commentary* rather than Ishāq's translation.<sup>49</sup>

*Passage 1: De Anima, I 4, 408 b 18-30 (Ishāq's version)*

Bos, p. 62.380 - 63.389	Lyons, 21.12 - 22.6 <sup>51</sup>	Crawford, p. 87.1-10, 88.1 - 89.9 <sup>56</sup>
<p>אבל השכל ראוי שיהיה עצם אחד בדבר<sup>50</sup> ולא יפסד. כי אלו היה נפסד היה ראוי בזה בלבד בזמן העייפות אשר תהיה בזקנה.</p>	<p>فإنما<sup>52</sup> العقل فيشبهه أن يكون جوهرًا ما يكون في الشيء<sup>53</sup> ولا يفسد فإنه لو كان يفسد لكان حرًا بذلك خاصة<sup>54</sup> عن الكلال الذي يكون في<sup>55</sup> الشيخوخة.</p>	<p>Intellectus autem videtur esse substantia aliqua que fit in re et non corrumpitur. Si enim corrumpetur, magis dignum esset ut corrumpetur in fatigatione que est apud senectutem.</p>

<sup>47</sup> For Bos' edition (above, n. 7) see nn. 50, 57, 75, 105, 106, 122, 140 (misprint), and 151 below; cf. also n. 30 above. For Crawford's edition (which is altogether much more accurate – quoted above, n. 8) see nn. 73, 74, 96, and 150 below.

<sup>48</sup> See, e.g., n. 52 below, and cf. n. 43 above.

<sup>49</sup> See nn. 59 and 60 below. It seems less likely that someone prior to Zerahya had corrected the manuscript according to Averroes' *Middle Commentary*, or that someone after Zerahya corrected his translation of the *De Anima* according to (the Arabic original or a Hebrew translation of) Averroes' *Middle Commentary*.

<sup>50</sup> בדבר (في الشيء) scripsi] בלבד. H. Ivry, "Arabic Text" (above, n. 9), p. 70, n. 62 regards the version בלבד ("solely") as "idiosyncratic" and "equivalent to *shai' / res*", but does not suggest this emendation. For an explanation of the Arabic في الشيء see n. 53 below.

<sup>51</sup> (=p. 29.24-35 Heinze, Todd, *Themistius, On Aristotle's On the Soul* [above, n. 4], p. 46). Fragments of this passage are quoted in Lyons p. 22.14-17 (=p. Heinze 30.5-8, p. 46 Todd), p. 23.2-3 and ff. (=p. 30.12-13 Heinze and ff., p. 46-7 Todd), p. 184.4-8, 14-15, 17-18 (=p. 101.19-23, 31-32, 34-36 Heinze, p. 126 Todd), p. 186.1-3 (=p. 102.20-22 Heinze, p. 127 Todd), p. 191.14-16 (=p. 105.18-21 Heinze, p. 130 Todd). Cf. Lyons, *An Arabic Translation* (above, n. 18) p. X, n. 12, and MC 33.

<sup>52</sup> The *فإنما* construction is used by Ishāq quite consistently to render the Greek particle *δέ*; this construction is usually rendered by אבל in Hebrew and by *autem* in Latin (cf. n. 163 below).

<sup>53</sup> *يشبهه* (يشبهه) ~ *ἐπιγίγνεται*. The Greek verb is rendered etymologically (يكون في), and the neutral noun الشيء is supplied after the preposition rendering the Greek prefix.

<sup>54</sup> عند (عند?) \*L, and cf. MC 33.10: عند الضعف. عند (عند?) \*H (cf. p. 73.20 Bos in Passage 2 below for another occasion of عند) \*H, and cf. MC 33.10: عند الضعف.

<sup>55</sup> عند (عند?) \*L, and cf. MC 33:11: عند الكبير; LC 87.25, 88.35: *apud senectutem*.

<sup>56</sup> Fragments of this passage are cited by Averroes in the third part of his LC, cf. Crawford p. 408.630-633, 409.637-639 (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 77), 446.71-74, 76-81, 82-84 (=de Libera, *ibid.*, pp. 114-15), partially quoted in nn. 72 and 74 below.



Bos, p. 62.380 - 63.389	Lyons, 21.12 - 22.6	Crawford, p. 87.1-10, 88.1 - 89.9
<p>אבל אנו מוצאים מה שיקרה בחושים מזה, כי הזקן אלו היה לו עין ענין הבחור, לא היה רואה כמו שהיה רואה הבחור. ותהיה הזקנה אינו ענין שהתפעלה הנפש בו שום דבר אבל ענין הוא בה כמו שהיה בענין השכרות ובענין החוליה והצירור בשכל והעיון יותר ראויים שיהיו<sup>57</sup> נפסדים בפנים</p>	<p>لكنّا نجد ما يعرض فيه هو ما يعرض في الحواس<sup>58</sup> فإنّ الشيخ لو قبل عيننا مثل عين الشاب<sup>59</sup> لأبصر<sup>60</sup> كما يبصر الشاب، فتكون الشيخوخة ليست حالا انفعلت فيها النفس شيئاً مّا لكن<sup>61</sup> حالا هي فيها كما يكون في حال السكر وفي حال العلة<sup>62</sup>. والتصور بالعقل<sup>63</sup> والنظر فخليقان<sup>64</sup> بأن يفسدا فيما</p>	<p>See videmus quod illud quod accidit in sensibus ex hoc accidit in corpore. Senex enim si reciperet oculum iuvenis, videret ut iuvenis. Et sic senectus non est dispositio in qua anima patitur aliquid, sed dispositio in qua anima est sicut est apud ebrietatem et egritudinem. Et intelligere et considerare diversantur quando aliquid</p>

<sup>57</sup> [scripsi] שיהיו H (<ישתנו> כשיהיו [Bos marks his addition inaccurately, and it should be read <ישתנו כש> יהיו). Bos' addition of the verb *ישתנו* is based on the Latin *diversantur*, for which see n. 64 below.

H and probably \*L, the additions *illud quod* and *accidit in corpore* being, in all likelihood, due to the Latin translator. The first addition is absent in the manuscripts in the quotation of Aristotle's text in the commentary (lc 88.33, but Crawford follows here the Venetian edition that added these words to harmonize the text of the commentary with that of the lemma). The second addition is not quoted at all, and the only two manuscripts (D and G) that quote the text up to the words *ex hoc*, omit the word etc. that would indicate that the quotation is truncated. Neither has Averroes' commentary any indication that this addition (which hardly makes any sense) was known to him. For a text corresponding to A cf. LC 87.25-26: *accideret ei apud senectutem illud quod accidit sensibus*; Avicenna's *Marginal Notes*, p. 85.21-22: *من كلال فعل الشيخ إما - أي أحيانا - ما يعرض - أي أحيانا - من كلال فعل الشيخ إما* *ولكنّا نجد ما يعرض - أي أحيانا - ما يعرض فيه هو ما يعرض في الحواس* *يعرض كما يعرض في الحواس*.

(but possibly identical with A and shortened by the Latin translator, cf. shortening below: *videret ut iuvenis* ~ *كعين الشاب*), \*L, and cf. the identical text in MC 33.12-13: *لو كانت له عين كعين الشاب*: *لو كانت له عين كعين الشاب*. In certain cases (cf. n. 60 below), Zerahya's translation seems to follow the MC rather than the Arabic translation of the *De Anima*.

h (Bos suggests deleting the word *لا* to bring the text in accordance with the Greek original and the Latin translation, but this is incorrect – cf. the same variant reading in mc 33.13, corrected by Ivry on the basis of a marginal reading to *لا يبصر*; evidently here, as in n. 59 above, Zerahya's translation follows the MC).

<sup>61</sup> Lyons here (and on p. 23.3) mistakenly vocalizes *lākinna* instead of *lākin*.

<sup>62</sup> Both nouns are in the plural in the Greek original: *ἐν μέθαις καὶ νόσοις*.

<sup>63</sup> *τὸ νοεῖν* ~ *التصور بالعقل*.

<sup>64</sup> *يختلفان*, cf. MN 87:2-3: *العقلي*. Both the Arabic *فخليقان* (which underlies the Hebrew translation as well) and the Latin *diversantur* (<يختلفان>) are probably corruptions of the original *يخلفان* ("are worn out" ~ *μαραίνεσθαι*). A. de Libera's suggestion (de Libera, *Averroès*, p. 225, n. 227 with reference to the quotation of this passage in Crawford, p. 408.631-633, cf. n. 72 below) that "[I]e latin *diversari* correspond ici au grec *μαραίνεσθαι*, se consumer, s'épuiser (et non pas *διαφέρειν*). ... Averroès semble alléguer une version fautive qui expose *diversantur* (de *μαραίνεσθαι*) par *diversa sunt* (de *διαφέρειν*)" hardly seems tenable for the following two reasons: (1) such a meaning of the verb *diversari* is not attested in dictionaries of medieval Latin; (2) this suggestion seems to presuppose that Averroes wrote his commentary in Latin rather than in Arabic.



<p>שום דבר אחר, אבל הוא בעצמו אין עלה בו. אבל ההבדל או החיבה או השנאה אינו עלה לזה אבל לזה אשר לו זה מדרך מה שלו זה. ועל כן כשיפסד זה לא יזכור ולא יאהב, כי זה לא יהיה בעבור זה אבל למשותף אשר יתחברו.<sup>70</sup> אבל השכל ראוי יותר שיהיה דבר אלוהי ודבר בלתי מתפעל.</p>	<p>أحسب بشيء ما آخر،<sup>65</sup> فأما ما هو في نفسه فلا علة به.<sup>66</sup> وأما التمييز<sup>67</sup> أو المحبة أو البغضاء فليست عللا<sup>68</sup> لذلك لكن لهذا الذي له ذلك من طريق ما<sup>69</sup> له ذلك. ولذلك أيضا<sup>70</sup> إذا فسد هذا لم يذكر ولم يحب<sup>71</sup> فإنه لم يكن لذلك<sup>74</sup> لكن للمشترك<sup>75</sup> الذي تلف.<sup>76</sup> فأما<sup>77</sup> العقل فخليق أن يكون أحق بأن يكون<sup>78</sup> شيئا إلهيا وشيئا غير منفعل.<sup>79</sup></p>	<p>aliud corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur.<sup>72</sup> Distinctio autem et amor et odium non sunt cause<sup>73</sup> illius, sed istius quod<sup>74</sup> habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimur, neque diligemus alios.<sup>80</sup> Non igitur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amittebatur. Intellectus autem dignus est ut sit aliquod divinum et aliquod impassibile.</p>
---	--	--

\*L. The reading بأن يفسد داخلا شيء ما آخر, \*H. (?) بأن يفسد داخلا شيء ما آخر [A] بأن يفسدا فيما أحسب بشيء ما آخر<sup>65</sup> (in lieu of the original يفسد) is dependent on the corruption يخلقان < فخليقان (see n. 64 above), for it is the latter form that requires a dual after it. For the word داخلا (~εἶσω) in \*H and \*L cf. Lyons, p. 23.5; the idiosyncratic فيما أحسب in A seems to have its origin in the corruption εἶσω > εἶσωω (“deem, suppose”, =Epic form of ἴσχω) in Ishāq’s *Vorlage*.

<sup>66</sup> ~ ἀπαθές. For another rendering of the term ἀπαθές see n. 79 below.

<sup>67</sup> διανοεῖσθαι ... τὸ ... التمييز. This term was rendered in *Pseudo-Ishāq*’s translation (PI 20) by التفكر, and was subsequently emended by Averroes in the MC to التذكر (see quotation in n. 68 below). This emendation was obviously made on the basis of the following phrase لم يذكر ولم يحب, which Averroes regarded as parallel to the passage أو المحبة أو البغضاء (cf. n. 71 below), and cf. Lyons, p. 183.12-13 (=p. 101.8-9 Heinze, p. 125 Todd): المحبة والبغضاء والذكر.

<sup>68</sup> فعلا, cf. MC 33.17-18: وأما التذكر والمحبة والبغضاء <ف> ليست فعلا للعقل الذي لا يفسد لكن للشيء الذي له هذه الأفعال, من طريق ما له هذه الأفعال (for the term تذكر see n. 67 above). This reading فعلا is integrated in the text and therefore must have predated Averroes; it follows that Averroes used different manuscripts of Ishāq’s version of the *De Anima* for his *Middle* and *Long Commentary*. (Interestingly, however, one of the manuscripts of the *Long Commentary* has *actiones* in place of cause). Avicenna (MN, p. 89.14) has the correct reading عللا and interpreted it correctly.

<sup>69</sup> ~ ه, cf. n. 29 above.

<sup>70</sup> أيضا (~αἰ) A, \*L] om. \*H. Cf. similar case in n. 130 below. This word seems to be omitted in Averroes’ MC (p. 33.18) and Avicenna’s MN (p. 89.16).

<sup>71</sup> لم نذكر ولا أحبنا: \*L; cf. MC 34:1: لم نذكر ولم نحب [H] A, \*H] لم نذكر ولم نحب (~οὔτε μνημονεύει οὔτε φιλεῖ) A, \*H] (but see the textual variant recorded in the apparatus: ولا أبغضنا ولا أبغضنا indicates that, in Averroes’ view, this passage is parallel to the beginning of the previous sentence: وأما التمييز أو المحبة أو البغضاء, cf. n. 67 above).

<sup>72</sup> The Latin translation here seems to be somewhat less literal than elsewhere, and cf. quotations of this passage in Crawford, p. 408.631-633 and 446.76-78 for a more literal translation: *Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa ita quod intus corrumpatur* (p. 446: *corrumpetur*) *aliquid* (p. 446: *aliquod*) *aliud*; *ipsum autem in se nullam habet corruptionem* (p. 446: *occasionem*).

<sup>73</sup> cause l] esse L. The Latin translator has misunderstood the Arabic علة, which in this case means “defects” rather than “causes” and stands for the Greek πάθη, cf. in the preceding sentence له علة ~ ἀπαθές (n. 66 above; correctly rendered in Latin by *nihil patitur*).

<sup>74</sup> *quod scripsi] scilicet quod* L (Crawford’s emendation); cf. quotation of this passage in LC 446.79-80 for a more literal translation: *Distinctio autem et amor* (the words *et odium* are omitted) *non sunt cause* (cause lc] esse LC) *illius, sed istius cuius est hoc, secundum quod est eius*.

<sup>75</sup> H [Bos’ emendation יתחרב h] יתחבר (cf. n. 76 below).

<sup>76</sup> \*H. يلف [L] (~ἀπόλωλεν) A, \*L].

<sup>77</sup> This sentence is quoted almost verbatim in Averroes’ MC, p. 34.6-7: فأما العقل فخليق بأن يكون أحق الأشياء مما فينا بأن: cf. discussion of this passage in Ivry, “Arabic Text” (above, n. 9), pp. 72-3.

<sup>78</sup> A] أحق بأن يكون. \*H, \*L, and cf. Lyons, p. 184.7-8, where these words are omitted as well.

<sup>79</sup> ~ ἀπαθές. For another rendering of the term ἀπαθές see n. 66 above.

<sup>80</sup> The last word is probably added by the Latin translator. It is absent in a quotation of this passage in p. 446.81 Crawford.

Passage 2: *De Anima*, II 1, 412 a 23-24 (Ishāq's version)

Bos p. 73.20-21	Lyons, p. 48.2-3 <sup>81</sup>	Crawford, p. 143.5-6
כי בזמן מציאות הנפש ימצא היקיצה והשינה	إِنَّه بالطبع <sup>82</sup> عند وجود النفس وجود <sup>83</sup> النوم واليقظة	quoniam apud ipsum est esse anime <sup>84</sup>

Ishāq's version of the *De Anima* (reconstructed) seems to have been:

إِنَّه عند وجود النفس يوجد النوم واليقظة.

Passage 3: *De Anima*, II 2, 413 b 24-27 (Ishāq's version)

Bos, p. 76.91-93	Lyons, p. 59.12-15 <sup>86</sup>	Crawford, p. 159.1-160.5
אבל השכל והכח העיוני עדיין לא התבאר בו שום דבר מעניינו. אבל ידמה שיהיה סוג אחר מן הנפש, ויהיה זה לבדו יתכן שיהיה נפרד, כמו שיתכן <sup>85</sup> שיהיה נפרד הנצחי הנפסד.	فَأَمَّا العقل والقوة النظرية فلم يتبين بعد <sup>87</sup> شيء من أمره لكن يشبه أن يكون <sup>88</sup> جنسا آخر من النفس ويكون هذا وحده قد يمكن أن يفارق كما يفارق الأبدى الفاسد .	Intellectus autem et virtus speculative, nihil adhuc declaratum est de eis. Sed tamen videtur quod hoc sit aliud genus anime, et iste solus potest abstrahi, sicut sempiternum abstrahitur a corruptibili.

Passage 4: *De Anima*, II 5, 417 b 6-7, 12-15 (Ishāq's version)

Bos, p. 87.291-292	Lyons, p. 19.16-20.1 <sup>89</sup>	Crawford, p. 216.7-9
וזה או שלא תהיה שינוי, כי התוספת בו יהיה אל ההשלמה, או שיהיה סוג אחר מן השינוי. ...	وليس <sup>90</sup> ذلك باستحالة إذ كانت الزيادة إنما تكون فيه <sup>91</sup> إلى الاستكمال إلا أن ... يكون جنسا آخر من الاستحالة .	Et hoc aut non est alteratio, quoniam additio in ipso erit ad perfectionem, aut est aliud genus alterationis. ...

<sup>81</sup> (=p. 41.14-15 Heinze, p. 58 Todd).

<sup>82</sup> بالطبع A (~φύσει in place of φησί, cf. apparatus of Heinze's edition) om. \*H, \*L (not in the *De Anima*).

<sup>83</sup> وجود A] probably يوجد \*H (but may have been changed by the Hebrew translator).

<sup>84</sup> The Latin version seems to be based on a corrupt text, which may be tentatively reconstructed as follows: إنَّ عنده وجود النفس. The last part of the passage is missing altogether.

<sup>85</sup> This word has probably been added by the Hebrew translator.

<sup>86</sup> (=p. 46.3-5 Heinze, p. 64 Todd). Cf. Lyons, p. 185.11-13 (=p. 102.11-13 Heinze, p. 127 Todd), p. 187.4-6 (=p. 103.7-9 Heinze, p. 128 Todd).

<sup>87</sup> \*H probably adds فيه.

<sup>88</sup> \*L adds هذا, and cf. Lyons, p. 185.12 and 187.5, where this word is added.

<sup>89</sup> (=p. 28.29-31 Heinze, p. 45 Todd).

<sup>90</sup> \*H, \*L وذلك إما ألا يكون استحالة ... وإما [A (~Heinze, manuscript C: ὅτι ... ἢ)] ليس ذلك باستحالة ... إلا (~*De Anima*: ὅτι ἢ ... ἢ).

<sup>91</sup> \*H, \*L. The word فيه seems to render the Greek εἰς αὐτό (or, perhaps, a non-attested variant reading ἐν αὐτῷ).

<p>Bos, p. 87.296-298</p> <p>أبَلْ مَا هَاتِلْمَد آخَر هَوَا بَكْ، وَيَقْه الحكَمَا مَأشَر هَوَا بهسَلْمَا مَلْمَا، كِي هَوَا رَأِي أَوْ سَلَا يَأْمَر بُو كَلَل هَوَا يَتْفَعَلْ، أَوْ شِيَأْمَر هَهشِينِي سَنِي مِينِيَس.</p>	<p>Lyons, p. 20.1-3<sup>92</sup></p> <p>فَأَمَّا الَّذِي يَتَعَلَّم بَعْدَ أَنْ كَانَ بِالْقُوَّةِ<sup>93</sup> وَيَقْتَبِسِ الْمَعْرِفَةَ عَنِ الْعَالَمِ بِالْفِعْلِ<sup>94</sup> فَقَدْ يَنْبَغِي إِمَّا أَلَّا يُقَالَ فِيهِ إِنَّهُ يَنْفَعَلُ أَصْلًا<sup>95</sup> وَإِمَّا أَنْ يُقَالَ إِنَّ الْاِسْتِحَالَةَ ضَرْبَانِ.</p>	<p>Crawford, p. 217.7-11</p> <p>Qui autem addiscit postquam fuit in potentia, et accipit<sup>96</sup> scientiam ab eo qui est in perfectione doctor, oportet aut ut non dicatur omnino pati, aut ut dicatur quod alteratio est duplex.</p>
---	--	--

Passage 5: De Anima, III 4, 429 a 15-16, 24-26, 29-b5 (Ishāq's version)

<p>Bos, p. 120.219-220</p> <p>أَم كُن رَأِي شِيَهِيَا بَلْتِي مَتْفَعَلْ، أَبَلْ هَوَا مَقْبَل لَصُورَا. ...</p>	<p>Lyons, p. 191.4-5<sup>97</sup></p> <p>فَقَدْ يَجِبُ إِذَا أَنْ يَكُونَ الَّذِي يَتَصَوَّرُ بِالْعَقْلِ<sup>98</sup> غَيْرَ مَنْفَعَلٍ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ قَابِلٌ لِلصُّورَةِ. ...</p>	<p>Crawford, p. 381.1-2<sup>99</sup></p> <p>Oportet igitur ut sit non passivum, sed recipit formam. ...</p>
<p>Bos, p. 121.231-237</p> <p>وَعَل كُن يَهِيَا مَن رَأِي أَيْنُو مَعُورَب لِنُوقِ، كِي أَلُو هِيَا مَعُورَب لِنُوقِ هِيَا بَعْنِيْن مَوَا، أَوْ حَس أَوْ قَر، هِيَا لُو كَلِي أَحَا، كَمُو لِحُوش. ...</p>	<p>Lyons, p. 191.3-4<sup>100</sup></p> <p>وَلِذَلِكَ بِالْوَجِبِ لَيْسَ هُوَ مُخَالِطًا لِلْبَدَنِ<sup>101</sup> وَلَا<sup>102</sup> لَهُ آلَةٌ كَمَا لِلْحَاسِّ آلَةٌ مَا<sup>103</sup>.</p>	<p>Crawford, p. 413.1-5<sup>104</sup></p> <p>Et ideo necesse est ut non sit mixtum cum corpore. Quoniam, si esset mixtum cum corpore, tunc esset in aliqua dispositione, aut calidus aut frigidus, aut haberet aliquod instrumentum sicut habet sentiens. ...</p>

<sup>92</sup> (=p. 28.31-34 Heinze, p. 45 Todd).

<sup>93</sup>  $\sim \epsilon\kappa$  δυνάμει ὄντος.

<sup>94</sup> A العالم بالفعل (~τοῦ ἐνεργεία ἐπισταμένου, cf. p. 28.32-33 Heinze: τοῦ ἐντελεχεία ἐπισταμένου)] \*H, \*L (~De Anima: τοῦ ἐντελεχεία ὄντος καὶ διδασκαλικού).

<sup>95</sup> A [يقال فيه إنه ينفعل] \*H. It is unclear which reading underlies the Latin translation.

<sup>96</sup> accipit l] accept L.

<sup>97</sup> (=p. 105.7-8 Heinze, p. 130 Todd). Cf. Lyons, p. 163.10-11 (this passage belongs to the section 428 b 2 - 429 b 31 [Lyons, p. 160.5-166.16] that does not seem to have correspondence in Heinze's text, cf. Lyons, pp. XIII-XIV for a discussion of this phenomenon).

<sup>98</sup> A [الذي يتصوّر بالعقل (~τὸ νοητικόν)] om. \*H and \*L (not in the De Anima).

<sup>99</sup> (=de Libera, Auerroës [above, n. 8], p. 51).

<sup>100</sup> (=p. 105.5-7 Heinze, p. 130 Todd).

<sup>101</sup> \*H and \*L add a passage that may be reconstructed as follows: فَإِنَّهُ لَوْ كَانَ مُخَالِطًا لِلْبَدَنِ لَكَانَ بِحَالٍ مَا، إِمَّا حَارًّا وَإِمَّا بَرْدًا.

<sup>102</sup> A [οὐδὲ] (~Heinze 105:6) وَلَا \*H, \*L (~De Anima: καὶ ... εἶη, or, in some manuscripts, ἢ καὶ ... εἶη).

<sup>103</sup> \*H, \*L. A [آلة كما للحاسّ آلة مَا].

<sup>104</sup> (=de Libera, Auerroës [above, n. 8], p. 81).

Bos, p. 121.231-237	Lyons, p. 190:13-191.1 <sup>107</sup>	Crawford, p. 417.1-10 <sup>117</sup>
<p>אמנם אם נעדר הנפעל במרגיש ובמצייר בשכל אינו הוא מתדמה, ונראה<sup>105</sup> בחושים והחוש. כשהחוש לא יוכל לחוש אחר מורגש חזק, כאלו אתה אומר המרגיש השב לאחור בעבור הקולות החזקות ולא<sup>106</sup> אותם שחוזרים לאחור<sup>108</sup> בעבור המראים החזקים ובעבור ריחנים חזקים, לא יראו ולא יריחו. אבל השכל כשיצייר דבר חזק מן המושכלים לא יהיה ציורו למה שתחתיו יותר חסר, אבל יותר נוסף. כי המרגיש לא ימלט מן הגשם, וזה נבדל.</p>	<p>فَمَا<sup>108</sup> أَنْ عَدَمَ الانفعال<sup>109</sup> فِي الْحَاسِّ وَفِي الْمَتَصَوِّرِ بِالْعَقْلِ<sup>110</sup> لَيْسَ هُوَ مِثْلَهَا فِي الْحَوَاسِّ وَالْحَسِّ،<sup>111</sup> وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ الْحَسَّ لَا يَقْدِرُ أَنْ يَحْسَّ عَنْ<sup>112</sup> مَحْسُوسٍ قَوِيٍّ كَأَنَّكَ<sup>113</sup> قَلْتَ الْحَسَّ<sup>114</sup> لِلصَّوْتِ<sup>115</sup> الصَّغِيرِ<sup>116</sup> عَنِ الْأَصْوَاتِ الْعَظِيمَةِ وَلَا عَنِ الْأَلْوَانِ الْقَوِيَّةِ وَعَنِ الرَّوَاحِ الْقَوِيَّةِ الرَّوَاحِ وَالْأَلْوَانِ الَّتِي هِيَ أضعف،<sup>119</sup> فَمَا الْعَقْلُ فَإِنَّهُ إِذَا تَصَوَّرَ شَيْئًا مِنَ الْمَعْقُولَاتِ الْقَوِيَّةِ<sup>120</sup> لَمْ يَكُنْ تَصَوُّرَهُ لَمَّا دُونَهُ أَنْقَصَ بَلْ أَزِيدَ. وَذَلِكَ أَنَّ الْحَاسَّ لَيْسَ يَخْلُو مِنْ<sup>121</sup> الْجِسْمِ، وَهَذَا مَفَارِقٌ.</p>	<p>Quoniam autem privatio passionis in sentiente et in formatione per intellectum non est consimilis manifestum est in sensu. Sensus enim non potest sentire post forte sensatum, v.g. post sonos magnos aut post colores fortes aut post odores fortes; intellectus autem, cum intellexerit aliquod forte intelligibile, tunc non minus intelliget illud quod est sub primo, immo magis. Sentiens enim non est extra corpus; iste autem est abstractus.</p>

<sup>105</sup> ונראה [h] [נראה] H (Bos' emendation). The Hebrew translator has misinterpreted the *ف* as a mere conjunction, rather than a part of the *ف... أما* construction (possibly because he had *إِنَّمَا* in place of *أَمَا* in his *Vorlage*, cf. n. 108 below).

<sup>106</sup> ולא [h] [ולא] H (Bos' emendation).

<sup>107</sup> (=p. 104.31-105.4 Heinze, p. 130 Todd).

<sup>108</sup> فَأَمَا A, \*L] [فَمَا] H.

<sup>109</sup> \*H. *إِنَّ عَدَمَ الانفعال* A, \*L] [إِنَّ عَدَمَ الانفعال] H. The Hebrew translator has misunderstood the word *عدم* as a verb rather than as a noun.

<sup>110</sup> \*L] [التصوّر بالعقل] A, \*H] [التصوّر بالعقل] H.

<sup>111</sup> \*L] [الحسّ والحسّ] A, \*H] [الحسّ والحسّ] H (or abbreviated by the Latin translator).

<sup>112</sup> Although both the Hebrew and the Latin have here a word meaning “after” (אחר, *post*), the underlying reading seems to be *عن* rather than *بعد*, cf. Avicenna's testimony in MN, p. 101.23. In the text of the LC it is rendered by the preposition *a* (e.g. *a magno sono*). Cf. also n. 143 below.

<sup>113</sup> Themistius' quotation deviates here from Aristotle's text as found in modern editions – cf. p.104.34-105.1 Heinze: *οἷον τοῦ ψόφου τοῦ μεγάλου τῶν μικρῶν ψόφων οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν χρωμάτων καὶ ὁσμῶν τῶν ἀμυδροτέρων ὁσμῶν καὶ χρωμάτων; De Anima: οἷον ψόφου (τοῦ ψόφου – Mss.) ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων ψόφων, οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν χρωμάτων καὶ ὁσμῶν οὐτε ὄραῖν οὐτε ὁσμῶσθαι. Ishāq's *Vorlage* for Themistius seems to have differed from Heinze's text at the beginning of this passage, being a mixed version, in which Themistius' text had probably been corrected in accordance with Aristotle's: *οἷον τοῦ ψόφου τοῦ μικροῦ ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων ψόφων* in lieu of *οἷον ἐκ τοῦ ψόφου τοῦ μεγάλου τῶν μικρῶν ψόφων* in Heinze. Ishāq seems to have misinterpreted the genitive case of the expression *τοῦ ψόφου τοῦ μικροῦ* as dependent on the preceding noun *αἰσθησις* rather than on the verb *αἰσθάνεσθαι*; for an analysis of this misinterpretation see n. 37 above.*

<sup>114</sup> \*H] [om.] A, \*H] [om.] L. The Hebrew participle *מרגיש* (literally: = *حاسّ*) can render in Zerahya's translation both the participle *حاسّ* and the noun *حسّ*, cf. Bos, Index, p. 168, s.v. *מרגיש*.

<sup>115</sup> \*H, om.] [المنصرف للصوت] L. Yet, the variant *المنصرف* must have been known to Averroes, as is clear from both his MC and LC – cf. MC, p. 125.17-126.1,2-3: *الحواس إذا أحست محسوسا قويا لم تقدر على أن تحس ما هو دونه عند انصرافها عن: sensus non potest sentire sua sensibilia convenientia sibi quando senserit aliquod forte et recesserit ab eo subito ad aliud sensibile, v.g. quando sensus auditus recesserit a magno sono, aut visus a forti colore, aut olfactus a forti odore.*

<sup>116</sup> A (cf. reconstruction of the Greek *Vorlage* in n. 113 above)] om.] \*H, \*L (not in the *De Anima*).

<sup>117</sup> (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 85).

<sup>118</sup> The words *אותם שחוזרים לאחור* were probably added by the Hebrew translator.

<sup>119</sup> (or *لا ترى ولا تشم*) [A (p.105.1 Heinze: *τῶν ἀμυδροτέρων ὁσμῶν καὶ χρωμάτων*)] \*H (p.105.1 Heinze: *οὐτε ὄραῖν οὐτε ὁσμῶσθαι*), om.] \*L. Perhaps *لا يرى ولا يشم*.

<sup>120</sup> \*H, \*L. Both A and \*H+\*L are possible translations of the Greek *القوية* [A *شيئا قويا من المعقولات*].

<sup>121</sup> ... *τι ... σφόδρα νοητόν.*

<sup>122</sup> *οὐκ ἔνευ.* ~ *ليس يخلو من.*

## Passage 6: De Anima, III 5, 430 a 14-19, 21-25 (Ishāq's version)

<p>Bos, p. 123.272-124.277</p> <p>ויהיה בהם שכל הוא שכל מצד שהוא נהיה<sup>122</sup> כל דבר, ובהם שכל הוא שכל מצד שהוא ישימונו ישכיל כל דבר, כקנין מה, הוא כמו האורה. כי האורה בצד מן הצדדים ישים המראים אשר הם בכח מראים בפועל. וזה השכל גם כן נבדל, בלתי מעורב, ואינו מתפעל, והוא בעצמותו פעולה. כי הפועל לעולם יותר מעולה מן הנפעל, וההתחלה יותר מעולה מן ההיול. ...</p>	<p>Lyons, p. 192.11-16<sup>123</sup></p> <p>فَيَكُونُ<sup>124</sup> عَقْلٌ هُوَ عَقْلٌ مِنْ جِهَةٍ أَنَّهُ يَصِيرُ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ، وَ<sup>125</sup>عَقْلٌ<sup>126</sup> هُوَ عَقْلٌ<sup>127</sup> مِنْ جِهَةٍ أَنَّهُ يَفْعَلُ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ،<sup>128</sup> كَمَلِكَةٍ مَّا،<sup>129</sup> بِمَنْزِلَةِ الضَّوِّ فَإِنَّ الضَّوِّ أَيْضًا<sup>130</sup> عَلَى جِهَةٍ مِنْ الْجِهَاتِ يَجْعَلُ<sup>131</sup> الْأَلْوَانَ الَّتِي هِيَ بِالْقُوَّةِ أَلْوَانًا بِالْفِعْلِ. وَهَذَا الْعَقْلُ أَيْضًا مُفَارِقٌ غَيْرُ مُخَالِطٍ وَلَا مُنْفَعَلٌ وَهُوَ فِي جَوْهَرِهِ فِعْلٌ، فَإِنَّ الْفَاعِلَ أَيْدًا أَشْرَفُ مِنَ الْمُنْفَعَلِ وَالْمَبْدَأُ أَشْرَفُ مِنَ الْهَيُولَى ...</p>	<p>Crawford, p. 437.1-7, p. 440.1-4<sup>132</sup></p> <p>Oportet igitur ut in ea sit intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod efficitur omne, et intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne, et intellectus secundum quod intelligit omne, quasi habitus, qui est quasi lux. Lux enim quoquo modo etiam facit colores qui sunt in potentia colores in actu. Et iste intellectus etiam est abstractus, non mixtus neque passibilis, et est in sua substantia actio. Agens enim semper est nobilius patiente, et principium nobilius materia. ...</p>
<p>Bos, p. 124.278-281</p> <p>אבל בכלל אינו ולא בזמן ולא הוא פעם ישכיל ופעם לא ישכיל, וכשיהיה נבדל הוא מה הוא, וזה לבד בלתי מת נצחי, אבל לא יזכור, שזה בלתי מתפעל, והשכל המתפעל נפסד, וחולתי זה לא ישכיל שום דבר.</p>	<p>Lyons, p. 184.8-11<sup>133</sup></p> <p>وَأَمَّا بِالْمَجْمَلَةِ فَلَيْسَ<sup>134</sup> فِي زَمَانٍ وَلَا هُوَ مَرَّةً يَعْطَلُ وَمَرَّةً لَا.<sup>135</sup> وَإِذَا فَارِقَ فَهِيَ مَا هُوَ فَقَطْ<sup>136</sup> وَهَذَا فَقَطْ غَيْرُ مَائِتٍ أَبَدِيٍّ. وَإِنَّمَا صَرْنَا<sup>137</sup> لَا نَذَكُرُ<sup>138</sup> لِأَنَّ هَذَا غَيْرُ مُنْفَعَلٍ وَالْعَقْلُ الْمُنْفَعَلُ فَاسِدٌ وَدُونَ هَذَا لَيْسَ يَعْطَلُ شَيْئًا.</p>	<p>Crawford, p. 443.2-8<sup>139</sup></p> <p>... universaliter autem non est neque in tempore. Neque quandoque intelligit et quandoque non intelligit. Et cum fuerit abstractus, est illud quod est tantum, et iste tantum est immortalis semper. Et non rememoramus, quia iste est non passibilis, et intellectus passibilis est corruptibilis, et sine hoc nichil intelligitur.</p>

<sup>122</sup> scripsi (or can it be ינהיה – Zerahya's attempt to form an imperfect from ינהיה [?נהיה] H. Bos' suggestion (*apparatus ad loc.* and cf. p. 32) that the Hebrew ינהיה and the Latin *efficitur* originate from the Arabic variants *يقود* and *يكون* respectively is incorrect.

<sup>123</sup> (=p. 106.1-6 Heinze, p. 131 Todd). Cf. Lyons, p. 187.1-2 (=103.3-4 Heinze, p. 128 Todd), p. 197.9-10 (=p. 108.21-22 Heinze, p. 134 Todd).

<sup>124</sup>\*H and \*L add *فيها* (not in the Greek), which H interprets as inanimate plural.

<sup>125</sup>\*H adds *فيها* (not in the Greek), which H interprets as inanimate plural. Cf. MC, p. 129.8-9, where the word *فيها* is repeated twice: *فيكون فينا عقل هو عقل من جهة أنه يقبل كل معقول وفينا عقل من جهة أنه يفعل كل معقول*.

<sup>126</sup>\*H and \*L add *هو عقل من جهة أنه يجعله يعقل كل شيء*.

<sup>127</sup> \*L. *وعقل*, \*H. [A] *هو عقل* om.

<sup>128</sup> \*L. *من جهة أنه يعقل كل شيء*, \*H. [A] (*يعقل* being Lyons' emendation of *يفعل*) om. \*H. *يفعل*, as is clear from his commentary (and cf. the passage from MC quoted in n. 125 above), cf. discussion in de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 271, n. 411 (who, however, does not wish to exclude the possibility that Averroës read *يعقل* but corrected this reading in the commentary).

<sup>129</sup> *ως εἰς τὰς ~ κملكة ما*.

<sup>130</sup> \*H. Cf. a similar case in n. 70 above.

<sup>131</sup> *ποιεῖ ~ يجعل*.

<sup>132</sup> (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], pp. 105-6, 109).

<sup>133</sup> (=p. 101.23-27 Heinze, p. 126 Todd). Fragments of this passage are quoted in Lyons, p. 184.11-12,13-14,15-17 (=p. 101.28, 30-31, 32-34 Heinze, p. 126 Todd), p. 185.6 (=p. 102.5-6 Heinze, p. 126 Todd), 186.3-4 (=p. 102.22-24 Heinze, p. 127 Todd), p. 187.7,12 (=p. 103.9-10,15 Heinze, p. 128 Todd).

<sup>134</sup>\*H and \*L add *ولا*.

<sup>135</sup>\*H and \*L add *يعقل* (*~νοεῖ*).

<sup>136</sup> \*H. [A] *فقط* (*~μόνον*) om. \*L. (but added by Bos from the Latin), and cf. Lyons 184:14 (=p. 101.30 Heinze), where the word *فقط* is omitted. Heinze, in the *apparatus* (both here and in p. 101.30), notes that this word is omitted in one of the manuscripts.

<sup>137</sup> \*H and \*L, and cf. Lyons, p. 184.15, where this word is omitted.

<sup>138</sup> \*H. *يذكر* (*~μνημονεύομεν*) A, \*L. *يذكر*.

<sup>139</sup> (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 112).

Passage 7: *De Anima*, III 7, 431 a 4-7 (*Ishāq's version*)

Bos, p. 126.317-320	Lyons, p. 20.3-7 <sup>141</sup>	Crawford, p. 465.1-6 <sup>149</sup>
<p>והנה נמצא המורגש ישים המרגיש בפועל אחר היותו בכח, והוא לא יתפעל ולא ישתנה. ועל כן זה מין אחר מן התנועה. כי התנועה אמנם היא פעולה מבלתי תמה. אבל הפעולה הגמורה היא תנועה אחרת והיא פעולת<sup>140</sup> התמות.</p>	<p>وقد نجد المحسوس يخرج الحاسّ إلى الفعل<sup>142</sup> عن ما<sup>143</sup> بالقوّة فإنّه ليس ينفعل ولا يستحيل. ولذلك فإنّ هذا نوع آخر من الحركة إذ كانت الحركة إنّما هي فعل الناقص،<sup>144</sup> وأما الفعل المطلق<sup>145</sup> فهو حركة أخرى وهي الحركة التي تكون<sup>146</sup> من<sup>147</sup> الكمال.<sup>148</sup></p>	<p>Et videmus sensatum facere sentiens in actu postquam erat in potentia, neque patiendi alterationem. Et ideo iste est alius modus motus. Motus enim est actio non perfecta;<sup>150</sup> actio autem simpliciter est alius motus, et est actio perfecti.</p>

<sup>140</sup> Bos has פאולת, which seems to be a misprint (in his apparatus the word is spelled correctly).

<sup>141</sup> (=p. 28.34-29.1 Heinze, p. 45 Todd).

<sup>142</sup> يجعل الحاسّ بالفعل [يخرج الحاسّ إلى الفعل] \*H, \*L (the latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ ποιοῦν).

<sup>143</sup> A [عن ما] (or possibly كونه) \*H, \*L. Both A and \*H+\*L are possible translations of the Greek ἐκ (δυνάμει) ὄντος.

<sup>144</sup> ناقص (or perhaps غير كامل) \*H, \*L. A [~τοῦ ἀτελοῦς] (the latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek ἀτελοῦς).

<sup>145</sup> \*L. A [~ἄπλως] (the latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek ἀπλωῦς).

<sup>146</sup> A [الحركة التي تكون] om. \*H, \*L.

<sup>147</sup> \*H, \*L. Both A and \*H+\*L are possible translations of the Greek ἡ (scil. ἐνεργείᾳ) τοῦ τετελεσμένου.

<sup>148</sup> \*L. A [الكامل] (the latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ τετελεσμένου).

<sup>149</sup> (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 134).



### Appendix III: Reconstruction of a Passage from Ibn Zur'a's Supplement

Passage 8: De Anima, III 8, 431 b 20-22 (Ibn Zur'a's version)

ed. Bos, p. 129.359-361	Averroes, MC, p. 136.5-6	ed. Crawford, p. 503.1-4 <sup>159</sup>
ונקבץ עתה על צד המשא הענינים אשר נאמרו בנפש, ונאמר שהנפש היא על צד <אחד> <sup>151</sup> שאר הנמצאים. כי הנמצאים או שיהיו מושב- לים או מורגשים.	فلنجمع <sup>152</sup> الآن <sup>153</sup> على جهة الجمل <sup>154</sup> الأشياء التي قيلت <sup>155</sup> في النفس. فنقول <sup>156</sup> إن النفس هي على نحو ما جمع <sup>157</sup> الموجودات. وذلك أن الموجودات إما أن تكون معقولة أو محسوسة. <sup>158</sup>	Congregemus igitur secundum summam ea quae dicta sunt in anima. Dicamus igitur quod anima est quoquo modo alia entia. Entia enim aut sunt intellecta aut sensata.

The following comparison proves that Ibn Zur'a's translation is not identical with *Pseudo-Ishāq*'s translation and shows that it differs substantially from Ishāq's style of translation and terminology. The table below compares the reconstructed fragment of Ibn Zur'a's translation with the corresponding passages from *Pseudo-Ishāq*'s translation and Ishāq's translation of Themistius' verbatim quotation of this passage in Aristotle.<sup>159</sup> The Greek text of this passage of the *De Anima* reads as follows: Νῦν δὲ περὶ ψυχῆς τὰ λεχθέντα συγκεφαλαιώσαντες, εἰπωμεν πάλιν ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ὄντα πῶς ἐστὶ πάντα · ἡ γὰρ αἰσθητὰ τὰ ὄντα ἢ νοητὰ. The *Vorlagen* of the translators may have been slightly different from this text and from each other.<sup>160</sup>

Ibn Zur'a (Passage 8)	<i>Pseudo-Ishāq</i> (p. 78.20-21)	Ishāq (ed. Lyons, p. 210.11-14)
فلنجمع الآن على جهة الجملة <sup>162</sup> الأشياء التي قيلت في النفس. فنقول إن النفس هي على نحو ما سائر <sup>163</sup> الموجودات. وذلك أن الموجودات إما أن تكون معقولة أو محسوسة.	أما في وقتنا هذا <ف>لنوصل ما قلنا في النفس ولنردّد القول فيها: إن النفس هي جميع الأشياء. والأشياء إما محسوسة وإما معقولة.	وأما في هذا الموضوع <sup>164</sup> فقد ينبغي أن نجمل ما قلناه في أمر النفس. فنعود <sup>165</sup> فنقول إن النفس على جهة من الجهات هي الأشياء كأهلها فإن الموجودات إما أن تكون محسوسة وإما أن تكون معقولة.

<sup>150</sup> Bos. <מן הצדדים> [scripsi] <אחד><sup>150</sup>

<sup>151</sup> \*H, \*L. فنجمع [MC] possibly

<sup>152</sup> MC, \*H] om. \*L. الآن (~νῦν)

<sup>153</sup> \*H, probably الجملة \*L (which seems to be the original reading). فلنجمع ... على جهة الجملة. MC] الجمل corresponds to the Greek participle συγκεφαλαιώσαντες.

<sup>154</sup> τὰ λεχθέντα ~ الأشياء التي قيلت<sup>154</sup>

<sup>155</sup> The Greek πάλιν seems to be omitted.

<sup>156</sup> \*H, \*L. سائر [MC] جميع

<sup>157</sup> In Greek the order is different: ἡ γὰρ αἰσθητὰ τὰ ὄντα ἢ νοητὰ.

<sup>158</sup> (=de Libera, *Averroës* [above, n. 8], p. 169).

<sup>159</sup> Of course, this passage has no correspondence in Ishāq's incomplete translation of the *De Anima*.

<sup>160</sup> For observations on Ibn Zur'a's *Vorlage* see nn. 156 and 158 above.

<sup>161</sup> Averroës' *Middle Commentary* has الجمل – see n. 154 above.

<sup>162</sup> Averroës' *Middle Commentary* has جميع (as in *Pseudo-Ishāq*'s translation) – see n. 157 above.

<sup>163</sup> For this rendering of the Greek νῦν δὲ in Ishāq's translation cf., e.g., *De Anima*, II 7, 419 a 7 (=p. 92.371 Bos, p. 240.1 Crawford) and II 8, 419 b 4 (=p. 93.398 Bos, p. 247.1 Crawford) rendered by אביל בזה המקום / *in hoc loco autem* (or: *in hoc autem loco*).

<sup>164</sup> πάλιν ~ فنعود<sup>164</sup>

<sup>165</sup> Lyons adds أيضا – see n. 70 above.

Appendix IV: Avicenna's Commentatorial Technique in His Marginal Notes on the *De Anima*

One may now compare the reconstructed text of fragments of Ishāq's Arabic translation of the *De Anima* with passages from Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* on the *De Anima*.

<p>Ishāq (Passage 1, section)</p> <p>وأما التمييز أو المحبة أو البغضاء فليست عللا لذلك لكن لهذا الذي له ذلك من طريق ما له ذلك. ولذلك<sup>166</sup> إذا فسد هذا لم يذكر ولم يحب فإنه لم يكن لذلك لكن للمشترك الذي تلف. فأما العقل فخليق أن يكون<sup>167</sup> شيئا إلهيا وشيئا غير منفعل.</p>	<p>Avicenna (p. 89.13-21)<sup>168</sup></p> <p>وأما التمييز (وقد عرفنا ما يريد به) والمحبة والبغضاء فليست عللا (أي آثارا وانفعالات) لذلك (أي للنفس الأصل) لكن (إنما) هي علل وآثار لهذا (البدن) الذي له ذلك (النفس الأصل) من [حيث] له ذلك (...). ولذلك إذا فسد هذا (أي البدن) لم يبق لذلك الذي هو النفس أن يتذكر [أو أن] يحب [فإن هذا] لم يكن لذلك [بل للحالة المشتركة التي بينهما]<sup>169</sup> (...). فأما (قوة) العقل فخليق أن [تكون] شيئا إلهيا وشيئا [لا يتأذى بالانفعالات الجسمانية].</p>
<p>Ishāq (Passage 5, section)</p> <p>وذلك أن الحس لا يقدر أن يحس عن محسوس قوي... فأما العقل فإنه إذا تصوّر شيئا قويا من المعقولات<sup>170</sup> لم يكن تصوّره لما دونه أنقص بل أزيد. وذلك أن الحاس ليس يخلو من الجسم، وهذا مفارق.</p>	<p>Avicenna (pp. 101.23, 102.1 - 2,13-14)</p> <p>(قال:) "وذلك لأن الحس لا يقدر أن يحس عن محسوس قوي" (...), (فقال:) "لكن العقل إذا تصوّر [القوي] [كان] تصوّره [للضعيف] أزيد" (...). (فهو يقول:) "وذلك أن الحاس ليس يخلو من جسم، وهذا مفارق".</p>

These comparisons shed light on Avicenna's commentatorial technique. In the first fragment we see that Avicenna inserts his commentary in between the words of Aristotle's text (in Ishāq's translation).<sup>170</sup> One can see that he follows Ishāq very closely, and only occasionally paraphrases. The second passage from Avicenna's *Marginal Notes* is a collation of three quotations from Aristotle's text between which lengthy interpretations are inserted. One may note that even when Avicenna uses such formulas as *قال* / *فقال* / *فهو يقول*, this does not mean that he quotes Aristotle verbatim. In some cases he may paraphrase or shorten the original quotation.<sup>171</sup>

<sup>166</sup> Lyons adds *أحقّ بأن يكون* – see n. 78 above.

<sup>167</sup> Parentheses mark interpretational additions by Avicenna; square brackets enclose the cases in which Avicenna most likely paraphrases rather than quotes verbatim. Major differences between Avicenna and Ishāq are underlined (I have not underlined the cases in which Avicenna uses *ذلك* instead of Ishāq's *ذلك*).

<sup>168</sup> This text does not seem to agree with either the original *تلف* or with the variant *يلفّ* preserved in the Hebrew version (cf. n. 76 above). One has to check if this is indeed what is written in the manuscript of Avicenna's *Marginal Notes*.

<sup>169</sup> Lyons has *شيئا من المعقولات القوية* – see n. 120 above.

<sup>170</sup> This technique is used in some Qur'an commentaries, e.g., in the commentaries by al-Nasaʿi and by "al-Ġalālayn" (the two Ġalāls: Ġalāl al-Dīn al-Maḥallī and Ġalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī).

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Ivry, "Arabic Text", p. 72, n. 76, citing D. Gutas, "Aspects of Literary Form and Genre in Arabic Logical Works", in Ch. Burnett (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic, and Medieval Latin Traditions*, Warburg Institute, London 1993, pp. 29-76, here p. 56. A similar analysis of interpretational techniques in Averroes' *Middle Commentary* can be undertaken (in this case, to avoid a vicious circle, one should use passages reconstructed on the basis of Ishāq's translation of Themistius' Commentary).