

Studia graeco-arabica

The Journal of the Project

Greek into Arabic

Philosophical Concepts and Linguistic Bridges

European Research Council Advanced Grant 249431

5

2015



Published by
ERC Greek into Arabic
Philosophical Concepts and Linguistic Bridges
European Research Council Advanced Grant 249431

Advisors

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

Elisa Coda
Cristina D'Ancona
Cleophea Ferrari
Gloria Giacomelli
Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

studiagraecoarabica@greekintoarabic.eu

Web site: <http://www.greekintoarabic.eu>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, Area Serra - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

© Copyright 2015 by the ERC project Greek into Arabic (Advanced Grant 249431).

Studia graeco-arabica cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

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.

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

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona.

Cover

Mašhad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v

The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions.

Reviews

S. Alexandru, *Aristotle's Metaphysics Lambda. Annotated Critical Edition based upon a Systematic Investigation of Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew Sources*, Brill, Leiden 2013 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 135), x + 296 pp.

The investigation of the Greek, Latin, Arabic and Hebrew sources for the knowledge of *Metaphysics Lambda* promised in this volume is an important contribution to the field and deserves to be gratefully acknowledged.

The volume falls into three main parts: *Prolegomena*, edition of *Book Lambda*, and Appendix. The *Prolegomena* consist of the description and transcription of a “new, independent manuscript” of *Book Lambda* of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* (pp. 3-21), and of a section entitled “Affiliations of the hitherto known codices” (pp. 23-69). Then comes the critical edition announced in the title (pp. 71-111),¹ accompanied by a commentary (pp. 115-51). The Appendix contains the transcription of the Latin version of *Lambda* authored by Fabius Niphus (second half of the 16th century), the grandson of Augustinus Niphus (pp. 155-83), followed by a new description of the manuscript Mount Athos 4508 (pp. 185-91). The bibliography and indexes occupy pp. 193-296. This volume is devoted exclusively to *Lambda*: the A. works on the assumption that the critical edition of an individual book of the *Metaphysics* is legitimate – an assumption that the present writer does not intend to challenge, but whose rationale is not accounted for: the words with which the Prefatory Note opens, “The twelfth book of the *Metaphysics*, which was originally an independent treatise, is crucial for the understanding of Aristotle’s philosophy” (p. vii) might even suggest the idea that since in the beginning, when Aristotle wrote it down, this book was an independent treatise, then it can be dealt with from the philological point of view in isolation from the other books. It is surely not so in the view of the A., but more explanation on this point would have been welcomed.

The reader is expected to be already acquainted with the structure of the textual tradition of the *Metaphysics* – which has luckily been studied in a number of foundational works² – because at p. 9

¹ Another edition of this book of the *Metaphysics* has been published recently: S. Fazzo, *Il libro Lambda della Metafisica di Aristotele*, Bibliopolis, Napoli 2010 (Elenchos. Collana di testi e studi sul pensiero antico, 41, 1). This work is not taken into account by the A., nor does it feature in the *Bibliography*.

² Among these foundational studies, I will limit myself to mentioning here the well-known essay by D. Harlfinger, “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik”, in P. Aubenque (ed.), *Études sur la Métaphysique d’Aristote. Actes du VI^e Symposium Aristotelicum*, Vrin, Paris 1979, pp. 7-36, duly acknowledged by the A. at p. 3, n. 1 and on various occasions later on. It is also necessary to mention an important article, which on the contrary is surprisingly ignored by the A.: C. Luna, “Observations sur le texte des livres M-N de la *Métaphysique* d’Aristote”, *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 16 (2005), pp. 553-93. This essay contains the results of the collation (books M-N) of the two manuscripts Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, F 113 Sup. (gr. 363), siglum: M, and Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, B. VII. 23 (siglum: C) as well as of the three basic manuscripts of the *Metaphysics*, namely Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1853 (siglum: E), Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, *Phil. gr.* 100 (siglum: J), both belonging to branch α , and Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 87, 12 (siglum: A^b), belonging to branch β until the middle of *Lambda* 7. The fact that the A. is not acquainted with this study is especially regrettable, because it deals with the same issue to which is devoted the present volume, namely the importance of later independent manuscripts belonging to branch β : see below, n. 9.

branch β is mentioned without any previous information on the A.'s part about the existence of other branches or, more in general, about the number and known dates of the manuscripts through which Aristotle's *Metaphysics* has come down to us. Such information is partially provided in the section devoted to the affiliations of the manuscripts,³ where the reader is informed that the direct tradition is bipartite, and a list of manuscripts belonging to branch α is given; but for the moment, in Chapter I, the reader finds himself directly *in medias res*. As mentioned before, this volume begins with the description of what is labelled as a "new, independent manuscript" of *Metaphysics Lambda*, namely Città del Vaticano, *Vat. gr.* 115 (V^k). V^k is presented in the title of this section of the *Prolegomena* as a "new" manuscript, but obviously it is not: as noticed by the A., it had already been taken into account by no less an Aristotelian scholar than Christian Brandis,⁴ as well as by other specialists in the field. V^k features in the studies on the textual tradition of the *Metaphysics* chiefly as a testimony of books A-E, but it contains also (fols. 144r - 155v) a section entitled *παρασημειώσεις ἐκ τῶν ὑπολοίπων στοιχείων τοῦ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά*. This section too is known to the scholarship; if the A. speaks of a "new" testimony it is because "a close inspection of the manuscript *in situ* reveals on fols. 151r - 152v and 154r - 155r extensive passages from the twelfth book of this Aristotelian work" (p. 8), something that raises V^k to the rank of "hitherto neglected evidence" (p. 9) of the textual tradition of this part of the *Metaphysics*. The parts of *Book Lambda* attested by V^k are transcribed at pp. 15-21, with the indication at each line of the correlated Bekker line.

V^k was written by the Byzantine copyist Gennadios Scholarios (d. ca. 1472); thus, it belongs to the low branches of a textual tradition whose earliest testimonies can be traced back to the 9th century, as is famously the case with manuscript J (branch α).⁵ That nothing prevents a later manuscript from being an important testimony of a given textual tradition is, after Pasquali,⁶ a well-known rule; but that this is indeed the case with V^k has to be proven, and this the A. tries to do at pp. 9-11. Before we turn to this issue, let me follow the A.'s path in presenting the reasons why a "hitherto neglected evidence" of the Greek text of *Lambda* is so important. The point is that V^k contains "approximately

³ Only the manuscripts containing book *Lambda* are taken into account, and they are said to be forty-two (p. 25); should the reader be willing to know something about the total number, or the known dates of the manuscripts of the *Metaphysics* taken as a whole, he should refer to other studies, and in particular to the essay by Dieter Harlfinger quoted in the preceding note.

⁴ At p. 8 n. 32, we are told that this section of the manuscript was examined by Ch.A. Brandis, *Die Aristotelischen Handschriften der Vatikanischen Bibliothek*, Druckerei des König. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1832 (Abhandlungen der König. Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Histor.-philol. Cl. 1831), p. 82.

⁵ The manuscript Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, *Phil. gr.* 100 (J) has been dated to the middle of the 9th century by Jean Irigoin in his foundational study "L'Aristote de Vienne", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 6 (1957), pp. 5-10 not mentioned by the A. Other important studies on this manuscript and on its relationship to the so-called "Collection philosophique" that are lacking in this volume include G. Vuillemin-Diem, "Untersuchungen zu Wilhelm von Moerbekes Metaphysikübersetzung", in A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Studien zur mittelalterlichen Geistesgeschichte und ihren Quellen*, De Gruyter, Berlin - New York 1982 (Miscellanea Medievalia, 15), pp. 102-208, esp. pp. 168-72; Ead., "La traduction de la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote par Guillaume de Moerbeke et son exemplaire grec: *Vind. Phil. gr.* 100 (J)", in J. Wiesner (ed.), *Aristoteles. Werk und Wirkung. Paul Moraux gewidmet, II. Kommentierung, Überlieferung, Nachleben*, De Gruyter, Berlin - New York 1987, pp. 434-86; J. Whittaker, "Arethas and the Collection philosophique", in D. Harlfinger - G. Prato (eds.), *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Atti del II colloquio internazionale Berlino - Wolfenbüttel 17-21 ottobre 1983*, Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria 1991, pp. 513-21; L. Perria, "Scrittura e ornamentazione nei codici della 'collezione filosofica'", *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 28 (1991), pp. 45-111, esp. pp. 98-100.

⁶ G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Le Monnier, Firenze 1952 (reprint Mondadori, Milano 1974, pp. 41-108 (= Chapter IV): "Recentiores, non deteriores. Collazioni umanistiche ed editiones principes".

three quarters” of the second part of book *Lambda* (p. 9). As demonstrated by Dieter Harlfinger,⁷ in this second part one of the basic manuscripts of branch β skips from the latter to branch α .⁸ Hence, determining if V^k belongs to branch β and if it is an independent member of this branch is especially important: should this be the case, then the readings of V^k should be taken into account in the establishment of the text of the *Metaphysics* in a particularly problematic section. That V^k is an independent manuscript is clearly stated in Harlfinger’s *stemma codicum*, and Luna has shown apropos two other manuscripts of the same branch how promising is the collation of the independent manuscripts of branch β for the second part of *Lambda*.⁹

But in the A.’s view this is not the only reason why this manuscript is so important. In his account of its importance the Arabic translation of the *Metaphysics* comes to the fore, in a way however that is not clear to me. The A. says: “One should not forget in this context that the second part of *Lambda* is more poorly transmitted than the first and that it abounds in textual problems; the Florentine manuscript *Laurentianus* 87, 12 ceases to represent a valuable and insufficiently known stream of the tradition in the posterior part of the book, and the Arabic version of Abū Bishr Mattā, which is mainly based on the lost commentary of Alexander of Aphrodisias, breaks off at 1072b15, a few lines before Gennadios Scholarios starts copying out the portions of the text we are concerned with” (p. 9). Taken at its face value, this statement implies that the only Arabic translation of *Book Lambda* available is the one made by Abū Bišr Mattā, and that it ceases to be so after *Lambda* 7, 1072 b 15. But this is far from being the case: first, as far as we know for the moment there is no such thing as an Arabic translation of *Metaphysics Lambda* made by Abū Bišr Mattā which was based upon Alexander’s commentary:¹⁰ what we know (from the *K. al-Fihrist* by Ibn al-Nadīm)¹¹ is that Abū Bišr Mattā authored the translation of Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda*,¹² whose lemmata are in

⁷ Harlfinger, “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik”, quoted above, n. 2.

⁸ The demonstration provided by Harlfinger, “Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Metaphysik”, that starting from Λ 7 the manuscript Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 87, 12 skips from branch β to branch α counts (obviously) as one of the main points of the reconstruction presented in this volume; however, at p. 51 the A. speaks of the “supposed change of allegiance” of this manuscript (my emphasis), something that I do not understand.

⁹ See above, n. 2. The following remarks by Luna, “Observations sur le texte des livres M-N”, p. 583, are worth quoting in full: “L’analyse que l’on vient de présenter confirme, nous semble-t-il, la conclusion à laquelle est parvenu Dieter Harlfinger: à partir de Λ 7, ce sont les mss. Ambros. F 113 sup. (M) et Taur. B. VII. 23 (C), et non plus A^b , qui représentent la branche β de la tradition de la *Métaphysique*. Ils permettent, en effet, d’améliorer le texte des éditions courantes pour les livres M-N dans une quarantaine d’endroits, tantôt par des leçons inconnues des éditeurs, tantôt en confirmant des leçons de la tradition indirecte ou des conjectures de savants. Ils permettent aussi, d’une part, d’éliminer du texte un certain nombre de leçons isolées de A^b qui ne jouissent plus d’aucune autorité, et, d’autre part, de prendre en considération une dizaine de leçons de E [that is, one of the basic manuscripts of the *Metaphysics*, belonging to branch α : see above, n. 2] qui, jusque ici isolées, sont maintenant confirmées par MC. C’est donc à juste titre que Dieter Harlfinger clôt son article en rappelant ce qui, à partir de la *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* de Giorgio Pasquali, est devenu un principe incontestable de la critique textuelle: *Recentiores, non deteriores*”.

¹⁰ The same uncertainty reappears at pp. 72-3, where the A. says apropos Abū Bišr Mattā that “This version is related to the lemmata of Alexander’s commentary, but is not based exclusively on them, since it repeatedly shows striking similarities with the translation of Ustāth”. The implication is that Abū Bišr Mattā translated *Lambda* having at his disposal Alexander’s commentary and the translation by Ustāth (on which see below, n. 20; on this translator, n. 21); but the sources say that Abū Bišr Mattā’s translated Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* (see below, n. 18), and not *Lambda* itself, consulting Alexander’s lemmata.

¹¹ See below, n. 18.

¹² The A. correctly says that Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* is lost in Greek, but omits to explain here that what is extant and edited in Greek is the commentary by the pseudo-Alexander, in fact Michael of Ephesus, as advanced already

part quoted by Averroes.¹³ More importantly, the impression that after 1072 b 15 there is no Arabic version extant should immediately be rectified: the translation of the second part of *Book Lambda* is extant, and edited. It can easily be read and checked against the Greek; the A. is well aware of this fact, since in the apparatus of his own edition the readings of the Arabic are recorded, and the various Arabic versions are endowed each with its own siglum; the A. also sums up the main information about the Arabic versions of *Lambda* elsewhere in the volume (p. 72). Thus, we are left with the possibility that what the A. wanted to say at p. 9 is that since Alexander's commentary is lost in Greek, and since its Arabic version extends only until 1072 b 15, the testimony of V^k is particularly important because it fills a gap in our knowledge of the text of *Lambda*, a gap that would have been filled by the lemmata as quoted by Alexander, if only we had access to them through the mediation of the Arabic, as is the case with previous sections of *Lambda*.

Be that as it may, it seems to me that a plain presentation of what kind of textual evidence one can get from the Arabic versions of the *Metaphysics* would have been helpful to the reader, and I deem it necessary to sum up here the main data, before presenting the way in which the A. deals with V^k and its stemmatic position. In what follows, the Greek text and its Arabic translation are presented according to the "sections", so to say, that are created by the lemmata quoted by Averroes. This because the Arabic version of the *Metaphysics* has come down to us through Averroes' Great Commentary, that is preserved in only one manuscript housed in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, *or.* 2074 (and, for a little number of folios, in another manuscript of the same library, *Or.* 2075). A series of fortunate circumstances makes the Arabic *Metaphysics* available, and in more than one translation: first, Averroes himself had recourse to various versions;¹⁴ second, the copyist of the Leiden manuscript was lucky enough to have more than one translation at his disposal, and accurate enough to copy in the margins the version which was alternative to that quoted by Averroes in the lemmata; third, all these stratified materials (only a part of which I have mentioned here) found between the 30's and the 50's of the past century the erudition, restless care and intelligent reading of the Jesuit priest Maurice Bouyges, who edited them in the $\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha$ ἐξ ἀλει represented by the volumes V-VII of the series "Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum", published in Beirut.¹⁵

Thus, that there is an Arabic text corresponding to the Greek after 1272 b 15 is a fact. Another point that is worth mentioning is that Abū Bišr Mattā's version of Alexander's genuine commentary¹⁶

by K. Praechter in his review of *Michaelis Ephesii In libros De Partibus animalium, De Animalium motione, De Animalium incessu* ed. M. Hayduck, *CAG* XXIII 2, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 168 (1906), pp. 861-907, and as demonstrated by C. Luna, *Trois études sur la tradition des commentaires anciens à la Métaphysique d'Aristote*, Brill, Leiden 2001 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 88), esp. pp. 1-71. The distinction between Alexander's genuine commentary on *Lambda* (indirectly and partially attested by Averroes) and the Greek pseudo-Alexander is mentioned later on by the A., e.g. at p. 117; once again, it is regrettable that Luna, *Trois études*, is not taken into account.

¹³ See below, n. 18.

¹⁴ Averroès, *Tafsir Ma ba'd at-tabi'at* ("Grand commentaire" de la *Métaphysique*), Texte arabe inédit établi par M. Bouyges, S.J., Imprimerie Catholique, Beyrouth 1938-1952 (*Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum. Série arabe, V-VII*); repr. Dar el-Machreq Éditeurs, Beyrouth 1990³. On the various Arabic translations quoted by Averroes cf. Vol. V, 1, *Notice*, pp. CXVII-CXXXIII; the results of Bouyges' analyses, summarized in the pages of the *Notice* just mentioned, became the standard in the scholarship and are available in the form of a useful chart in one of the studies included in the A's bibliography: A. Bertolacci, *The Reception of Aristotle's Metaphysics in Avicenna's Kitāb al-Šifā'. A Milestone of Western Metaphysical Thought*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2006 (*Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies*, 63), p. 14.

¹⁵ See the preceding note. Thanks to a license agreement with the Publisher Dar el-Machreq, this work is available online at <http://www.greekintoarabic.eu/index.php?id=106>.

¹⁶ The text that Averroes quotes as being the commentary by Alexander on *Lambda* is not that which is edited to-

– which included the lemmata, as we learn from Averroes’ quotations – possibly extended even after 1272 b 15, as has been suggested with good arguments.¹⁷

From the beginning of book *Lambda* (1069 a 18) to approximately the middle of Chapter 7 (1072 b 16) the lemmata commented upon by Averroes come from Abū Bišr Mattā’s translation of Alexander’s commentary.¹⁸ For the subsequent passages, Averroes had recourse to another version,¹⁹ that from which he took most of the lemmata that feature in his commentary on the *Metaphysics*: the earliest translation of this work, made for al-Kindī²⁰ by a scholar named Uṣṭāṭ (Eustathios)²¹ whose translation technique has been studied by Gerhard Endress²² and Manfred Ullmann.²³ From 1073 a 14 onwards, and until the end of *Lambda*, either Averroes continued to make use of Uṣṭāṭ’s

gether with the genuine Alexander (books A-Δ) by H. Bonitz in 1847 (and by Hayduck in 1891, *CAG* I), but another text, that has a very good chance of being Alexander’s. The demonstration has been provided by J. Freudenthal, *Die durch Averroes erhaltene Fragmente Alexanders zur Metaphysik des Aristoteles* untersucht und übersetzt von J.F., mit Beiträgen zur Erläuterung des arabischen Textes von S. Fränkel, Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1885 (Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin von Jahre 1884), esp. pp. 6-7 and 10-52. This work is acknowledged by the A., p. 71 n. 3.

¹⁷ The point is discussed by M. Geoffroy, “Remarques sur la traduction Uṣṭāṭ du *Livre Lambda* de la *Métaphysique*, chapitre 6”, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 70 (2003), pp. 417-36; for more details, see below, n. 25. Unfortunately, the A. does not take into account this study, that deals not only with Uṣṭāṭ’s translation (on which see below, n. 20-21) but also with Abū Bišr Mattā’s translation of Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda*.

¹⁸ That Alexander’s commentary on *Lambda* was translated by Abū Bišr Mattā (hence from Syriac, not from Greek) is stated in the *K. al-Fibrīst*, p. 251.28 Flügel = p. 312.14-15 Tağaddud; that Averroes made use of this translation is an inference, but a very plausible one: it is based on the fact that he announces in two passages (p. 1537.12-14 and p. 1545.12-13 Bouyges) his intention to check against “another translation” (*tarğama uḫrā* or *al-tarğama al-ṭaniyya*) what he has at his disposal in Alexander’s commentary; he also explicitly mentions Aristotle’s lemmata as contained in the commentary by Alexander: *kalām Aristū fi šarḥ al-Iskandar* (p. 1545.12 Bouyges).

¹⁹ Cf. Bouyges, *Notice*, in Averroès, *Tafsīr Ma ba’d at-tabī’at*, V, 1, *Notice*, p. CXXVII: “Plusieurs fragments d’une traduction de la *Métaphysique* ont été inscrits (...) dans les marges de l’exemplaire (...) de Leyde. L’anonyme auquel nous les devons était plus documenté que nous. La présence de ces extraits et, mieux encore, leur régularité méthodique, nous procure donc une sorte de témoignage (...). L’auteur de ces extraits possédait une traduction arabe de la *Métaphysique* d’Aristote et la comparait avec le *Textus* d’Averroès. Quand il n’y avait pas identité, il copiait, dans les marges, les lignes correspondantes de son exemplaire de la *Métaphysique*; quand il y avait identité, il s’en abstenait. Cette traduction (...) était celle de Aṣṭāt. Il en résulte (...) que la traduction commentée par Averroès était, en général, celle de Aṣṭāt, c’est-à-dire celle qui, dans le *Fibrīst*, apparaît comme principale”. On the information provided by the *K. al-Fibrīst* see the following note.

²⁰ Ibn al-Nadīm, *K. al-Fibrīst*, p. 251.27-28 Flügel = p. 312.14 Tağaddud. Uṣṭāṭ’s translation was widespread: not only it reached the West of the Muslim world, as shown by the fact that it was available to Averroes, but it was also widespread in the East, as shown by the fact that in his paraphrase of book *Lambda* Avicenna made use mainly of it (not without consulting other sources, especially Themistius’ paraphrase): for more details on this point, see Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā), *Commentaire sur le livre Lambda de la Métaphysique d’Aristote (chapitres 6-10)*, Édition critique, traduction et notes par M. Geoffroy, J. Janssens et M. Sebti, Vrin, Paris 2014 (*Études Musulmanes*, 43), pp. 23-25 (reviewed by C. Martini Bonadeo below in this volume, pp. 395-8).

²¹ G. Endress, “The Circle of al-Kindī. Early Arabic Translations from the Greek and the Rise of Islamic Philosophy”, in G. Endress - R. Kruk (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism. Studies on the Transmission of Greek Philosophy and Sciences dedicated to H. J. Drossaart Lulofs on his ninetieth birthday*, CNWS Research, Leiden 1997, pp. 43-76; on Uṣṭāṭ, see in part. p. 52 n. 21; cf. also J. Nasrallah, “L’Église melchite en Iraq, Perse et dans l’Asie centrale”, *Proche Orient chrétien* 38 (1976), pp. 319-53, and M. Ullmann, *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung, Teil 2: Überlieferung, Textkritik, Grammatik*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2012, pp. 16-19.

²² G. Endress, *Proclus Arabus. Zwanzig Abschnitte aus der Institutio Theologica in arabischer Übersetzung*, Imprimerie Catholique, Wiesbaden-Beirut 1973.

²³ Ullmann, *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung*, quoted above n. 21.

translation, as maintained by Bouyges,²⁴ or, as advanced by Marc Geoffroy, he went back to Abū Bišr Mattā's version of Alexander's commentary.²⁵

In Averroes' commentary the lemmata of the *Metaphysics* are interwoven with his own exegeses. The two formulaic expressions that mark the alternance between Aristotle's text and Averroes' commentary are *qāla Aristātālīs* ("Aristotle said" = Textus = T.) and *tafsīr* ("Commentary" = Commentum = C.). Here I will limit myself to quoting the first lemma after the switch from Abū Bišr Mattā's lemmata to Uṣṭāṭ's. The chart below is intended to allow the reader to realize how literal the Arabic rendering is. Then, another chart will follow in which, without quoting the lemmata in extenso, I will give the correspondences between the Greek and Arabic passages from *Lambda* 7, 1072 b 30 to the end of the chapter (1073 a 13).

<i>Lambda</i> 7, 1072 b 16-30	Bouyges, pp. 1613.6-1615.2
<p>ἐπει καὶ ἡδονὴ ἢ ἐνέργεια τούτου (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐργηγορσις αἰσθησις νόησις ἡδιστον, ἐλπίδες δὲ καὶ μνήμαι διὰ ταῦτα). ἡ δὲ νόησις ἢ καθ' αὐτὴν τοῦ καθ' αὐτὸ ἀρίστου, καὶ ἡ μάλιστα τοῦ μάλιστα. αὐτὸν δὲ νοεῖ ὁ νοῦς κατὰ μετὰληψιν τοῦ νοητοῦ· νοητὸς γὰρ γίγνεται θιγγάνων καὶ νοῶν, ὥστε ταῦτὸν νοῦς καὶ νοητόν. τὸ γὰρ δεκτικὸν τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας νοῦς, ἐνεργεῖ δὲ ἔχων, ὥστ' ἐκείνου μᾶλλον τοῦτο ὁ δοκεῖ ὁ νοῦς θεῖον ἔχειν, καὶ ἡ θεωρία τὸ ἡδιστον καὶ ἀριστον. εἰ οὖν οὕτως εὖ ἔχει, ὡς ἡμεῖς ποτέ, ὁ θεὸς αἰεὶ, θαυμαστόν· εἰ δὲ μᾶλλον, ἔτι θαυμασιώτερον. ἔχει δὲ ὧδε. καὶ ζωὴ δὲ γε ὑπάρχει· ἡ γὰρ νοῦ ἐνέργεια ζωὴ, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἡ ἐνέργεια· ἐνέργεια δὲ ἡ καθ' αὐτὴν ἐκείνου ζωὴ ἀρίστη καὶ αἰδῖος. φαμέν δὴ τὸν θεὸν εἶναι ζῶον αἰδῖον ἀριστον. ὥστε ζωὴ καὶ αἰὼν συνεχῆς καὶ αἰδῖος ὑπάρχει τῷ θεῷ· τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ θεός.</p>	<p>فإن اللذة فعل لذلك أيضا ولهذه العلة اليقظة والحس والفهم لذيد أما الرجاء والذكر فلمكان هذه وأما الفهم الذي بذاته فللذي هو أفضل بذاته والذي هو أكثر فللذي هو أكثر والذي يفهم ذاته هو العقل باكتساب المعقول فإنه يصير معقولا حين يلامس ويفهم فاذا العقل والمعقول شئ واحد لأن قابل المعقول والجوهر هو عقل وإنما يفعل^{a)} إذ له فإذا يظن أن العقل ذلك الالاهي أكثر من هذا أيضا والرأي أيضا شيء لذيد جدا وفاضل فإن كان الاله أبدا كحالنا في وقت ما فذلك عجيب وإن كان أكثر فأكثر عجبا فله كذلك وهو حياة لأن فعل العقل الحياة وذلك هو الفعل والعقل الذي بذاته وله حياة فاضلة ومؤبدة فنقول إن الاله حي أزلي في غاية الفضيلة فإذا هو حياة وهو متصل أزلي وهذا هو الاله .</p> <p>^{a)} ms. يعقل : Bouyges in app. يفعل</p>

²⁴ Bouyges, *Notice*, in Averroès, *Tafsir Ma bā d at-tabī at*, V, 1, p. CXXXI.

²⁵ M. Geoffroy, "Remarques sur la traduction Uṣṭāṭ", quoted above n. 17, p. 421: "Sans aucun doute, jusqu'au Textus 38 (1072b16), la version commentée est Abū Bišr. Pour la suite immédiate du texte, Averroès est retourné à Uṣṭāṭ. Mais comme l'a noté P. Thillet, la suite du commentaire porte des traces de la connaissance par Averroès du commentaire d'Alexandre au-delà de cette limite, même si plus aucune citation littéraire d'Alexandre ne peut être relevée. Mais ce qui est vrai pour le commentaire d'Alexandre l'est aussi pour les Textus provenant de ce commentaire et traduits par Abū Bišr. L'analyse stylistique que nous avons entreprise tend à montrer que, contrairement à l'opinion de Bouyges, qui considérait que 'Les Textus 39 et suivants sont pris par Averroès à la traduction Aṣṭāt', l'on pouvait penser qu'au moins les Textus 43, 44 et 45 (= 1073a22-b22), vraisemblablement aussi le T 46 (= 1073b22-32), proviennent de la même version que les Textus antérieurs à 39, c'est-à-dire celle d'Abū Bišr dans la traduction du commentaire d'Alexandre. Au niveau terminologique, l'une des indications les plus évidentes en est l'usage du terme *sarmadī* pour αἰδῖος ('éternel'), qui est habituel chez Abū Bišr mais n'est jamais utilisé par Uṣṭāṭ". It is useful to quote also the synthesis made by Geoffroy, *ibid.*, p. 423: "On peut donc vraisemblablement conclure que non seulement Averroès connaissait le commentaire d'Alexandre pour le texte d'Aristote jusqu'à 1074 a 31, mais qu'il a continué d'utiliser comme texte de base pour son commentaire les Textus contenus dans Alexandre et traduits par Abū Bišr, jusqu'à l'endroit où s'interrompait sa copie du *Commentaire* d'Alexandre, avec seulement une exception pour les Textus 39 à 41".

The translation by Uṣṭāṭ, of which this is just a specimen, is of obvious importance from the viewpoint of the Greek text of the *Metaphysics*: it was made for al-Kindī (d. after 860),²⁶ which means that the Greek manuscript at Uṣṭāṭ's disposal was either coeval with the earliest extant Greek manuscript, J,²⁷ or earlier than it. It is true that the value for the Greek text of this indirect testimony which, on a chronological basis, seems to be of great importance heavily depends upon how accurate and skilful the translator was; but if one decides to take into account the indirect testimony represented by the Arabic version, it is primarily to this early version that one has to turn. Indeed, it counts as the best candidate for a check in the case of passages dagged in the direct tradition, while Abū Biṣr Mattā's translation of Alexander's commentary on *Lambda* comes necessarily second, for the following reasons: first, this translation is available only in part and of second hand, namely through Averroes; second, it was made out of a Syriac version (Abū Biṣr Mattā had no Greek). On the contrary, Uṣṭāṭ's translation extends for the most part of the entire *Metaphysics*, and was made from Greek on the basis of a manuscript that, although predictably not connected with the textual tradition of the Greek *Metaphysics* – since in all likelihood it ended its life in Baghdad – was chronologically parallel to the earliest extant Greek manuscript, J. Also in consideration of this, the following chart lists the lemmata of the second part of *Book Lambda* that surely belong to Uṣṭāṭ's translation.

<i>Lambda</i> 7, 1072 b 30 - 1073 a 3 ὅσοι δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν (...) ἐξ οὗ τὸ σπέρμα.	Bouyges, p. 1624.7-12 فأما جميع الذي يظنون (...) الذي منه الزرع
<i>Lambda</i> 7, 1073 a 3 - 13 ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἔστιν οὐσία (...) τὸν τρόπον.	Bouyges, pp. 1625.11-1626.4 فأما أن جوهر (...) على هذه الحال

It is time to go back to manuscript V^k. The proof that it belongs to branch β is pursued by the A. not by presenting the cases in which V^k communes in error with the other manuscripts of the same branch, but the other way round: the passages mentioned at pp. 10-11, that are meant to prove “the affiliation of the passages mentioned above [i.e. the part of *Lambda* transcribed by Gennadios Scholarios] to the β family” (p. 10), are all of them cases in which V^k communes with A^b (as for the passages in which it still belongs to branch β), as well as with M and C (branch β)²⁸ in what the A. himself declares to be the sound reading. It is on this ground that the A. claims that “a strong affinity” of V^k “with this group is indisputable”; but the fact that V^k communes in the sound reading attested by branch β means only that it does not belong to branch α. The proof that it belongs to branch β can be provided only by cases apt to prove that it communes in error with it. That V^k is an independent manuscript is argued on the basis of the fact that “many peculiar errors

²⁶ See above, n. 20.

²⁷ See above, n. 2.

²⁸ When, in the section devoted to the “Affiliations of the hitherto known codices”, the “Relationship between the independent codices of the β family” is discussed, the A. affirms once again that C and M “have hitherto remained uncollated and neglected by editors” (p. 32), what – once again – is true only if *Lambda* alone is taken into account: as mentioned above, n. 9, the results of the collation of M and C for books M-N have been published by Luna in 2005. That the A. thinks that these manuscripts have been neglected tout court is shown by n. 59, p. 52, where he claims apropos M that “For some reason the relevant evidence, presented at the Sixth Symposium Aristotelicum, has not been discussed *at all* in the recent literature” (my emphasis).

of M and C are not present in the Vatican manuscript”; thus, says the A., “V^k cannot be regarded as their apograph” (p. 10). It is therefore the A.’s conviction that V^k “can help to reconstruct readings of the lost hyparchetype β; this is especially useful in the section of *Metaph.* Λ where cod. Laur. 87, 12 represents the α family (i.e. 1073 a 1 - 1076 a 4) and where the lections of the hyparchetype β had to be restored until now almost exclusively from M and C” (p. 11). The relationship between V^k, M and C is discussed at n. 41 p. 10 on the basis of five separate errors of “M against V^k” and two of C against V^k. In the section entitled “Relationships between the independent codices of the β family” (pp. 32-39) the point is no longer discussed; particularly puzzling for the reader is the fact that V^k does not feature in the stemma codicum on p. 39, devoted to the section 1073 a 1 - 1076 a 4, i.e. the section where A^b ceases to represent branch β, and where V^k should represent this branch as an independent testimony as M and C.

The core of the volume is represented by the edition of *Lambda*. Fourteen manuscripts are considered as the basic ones, and twenty-nine further manuscripts plus three editions (*editio Aldina*, *editio Erasmi* and Casaubon’s edition) are listed as supplementary testimonies. As I said at the beginning of my review, one has surely to be grateful to the A. for having included in his apparatus also a number of indirect testimonies of the text of *Lambda*, derived from the Greek commentaries both genuine and spurious, from the Arabic translations and commentaries, from the Latin translations from Greek,²⁹ and from the partial Hebrew version of Averroes’ commentary. The fact that the respective value of all these testimonies is not discussed may leave room for some disappointment on the part of the reader, but it would be unfair not to acknowledge that it is incredibly difficult to master such a huge amount of documentation on a text on which every age, in every language, had so many things to say.

From the *Bibliography* some studies are lacking, that would surely have been useful for the purpose of this book.³⁰

Cristina D’Ancona

²⁹ The so-called *Metaphysica nova*, namely the version from Arabic into Latin of the lemmata of Averroes’ *Great Commentary* translated in all likelihood by Michael Scot (d. 1236) is not included. More information on the *metaphysica nova* in the article by G. Vuillemin-Diem, “Les traductions gréco-latines de la *Métaphysique* au moyen âge: le problème de la *Metaphysica Vetus*”, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 49 (1967), pp. 7-57, esp. pp. 22-23 (this study features in the bibliography of this volume).

³⁰ In addition to the study by Irigoien mentioned above, n. 5, to that by Geoffroy, mentioned at n. 17, to those by Luna, mentioned at n. 2 and 12, and to that by Vuillemin-Diem, mentioned at n. 5, other studies on the specific point of the Arabic translation of the *Metaphysics* lacking in the bibliography are J.N. Mattock, “The Early Translations from Greek into Arabic: an Experiment in Comparative Assessment”, in G. Endress - M. Schmeink (eds.), *Symposium Graeco-Arabicum II*, Grüner, Amsterdam 1989, pp. 73-102; C. Martini, “La tradizione araba della *Metafisica* di Aristotele. Libri α-A”, in C. D’Ancona - G. Serra (eds.), *Aristotele e Alessandro di Afrodisia nella tradizione araba*, Il Poligrafo, Padova 2002 (Subsidia mediaevalia patavina, 3), pp. 75-112; P. Thillet, “Remarques sur le Livre *Lambda* de la *Métaphysique*”, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 70 (2003), pp. 361-400; J. Janssens, “Avicenne et sa ‘paraphrase-commentaire’ du Livre *Lambda* (*Kitāb al-insāf*)”, *ibid.*, pp. 401-16. It should also be noticed that the study by G. Endress, “The Circle of al-Kindī” (quoted above, n. 21) is erroneously indicated (p. 202) as having been published in the collective volume *Autori classici in lingue del Vicino e Medio Oriente*, edited in 2001 by G. Fiaccadori and G. Pugliese Carratelli.