

# 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.

Edition der lateinischen Übersetzung von Avicennas *Logica*, einen Vergleich mit dem arabischen Text, begleitet von einem Kommentar und einer Übersetzung ins Französische.

Den Leser tief in die lateinische Logik-Tradition hinein führt Julie Brumberg-Chaumont mit ihrem Beitrag über Alberts des Grossen Einteilung der Logik: "Les divisions de la logique selon Albert le Grand" (pp. 335-416). Die Autorin berücksichtigt dafür die von Thomas von Aquin angewendete Einteilung, um einen Vergleich der Konzepte anstellen zu können. Herausstechend dabei ist zweifellos der grosse Kenntnisreichtum Alberts des Grossen, der es ihm erlaubte, aus mehreren Quellen zu schöpfen und seine Konzept an verschiedenen Modellen zu prüfen. *Forma partis* und *forma totius* sind die mit dem Universalienproblem eng verbundenen Begriffe, denen David Piché nachgeht: "La notion de *forma totius*" (pp. 417-66). Das Problem hat seinen Ursprung im Buch Z der *Metaphysik*. Der Beitrag wirft weiteres Licht auf das Problem der Universalien bei Albert dem Grossen, Grosseteste, Bonaventura, Thomas von Aquin und anderen mittelalterlichen Autoren, ebenso wie bei Avicenna und Averroes. Um das Erbe Alberts des Grossen ab dem 13. Jh., was die Debatte um den Gegenstand der Logik betrifft, kreist der Beitrag von Aurélien Robert: "Le débat sur le sujet de la logique" (pp. 467-512). Er betont die Wichtigkeit von Alberts Interpretation der Logik als Teil der Philosophie und als deren Instrument, die jedoch in der Rezeption des 14. Jh. nicht mehr in ihrer ganzen Bedeutung wahrgenommen wurde.

An die Quellen- und die Sekundärliteratur-Bibliographien (pp. 515-51) schließen sich ein nicht sehr reicher analytischer *Index* (p. 555-9) an, sowie Handschriften- und Namenindices (pp. 561-75).

Der Band ist sehr reich an Materialien und Anregungen. Angesichts der Komplexität des Themas, das 2000 Jahre, fünf Kulturräume mit ihren verschiedenen Sprachen und Kulturen, sowie verschiedene Disziplinen der theoretischen Philosophie umfasst, wäre es denkbar gewesen, den Beiträgen noch einen die Traditionen zusammenführenden Überblick beizufügen.

CF

*A Companion to the Latin Medieval Commentaries on Aristotle's Metaphysics*, ed. by F. Amerini and G. Galluzzo, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2014 (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, 43), pp. 695

When in 1978 Francesco Del Punta started teaching Medieval Philosophy at the State University of Pisa, coming from Cornell University, it was quite uncommon in Europe to give such classes with the text itself of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* accompanying Thomas' *Expositio*, and it was also uncommon on both sides of the ocean to have recourse to the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, whose reading did not benefit at that time from the help provided by the English translations to be initiated some ten years later by R. Sorabji. It was surely not the case that medievalists did ignore that Aristotle's *Metaphysics* fuelled the Latin philosophy of the universities, especially in the 13<sup>th</sup> century: a glance at Grabmann's *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* or at Gilson's *La philosophie au Moyen Age* is enough to show that the contrary is true. But the idea that first hand acquaintance both with Aristotle's *ipsissima verba* and with the late antique exegetical tradition was mandatory for the student who wanted to get his or her degree in medieval philosophy was admittedly quite a novel one.

This volume is comprised of fourteen essays, nine of which authored by scholars who were pupils of Francesco Del Punta – in itself a telling outcome of the decisive impact of his teaching and vision about medieval philosophy as part and parcel of an uninterrupted story rooted in ancient and late antique thought. That such is the background of this volume is acknowledged in the *Introduction* by F. Amerini and G. Galluzzo as follows: "A special mention is due to Francesco Del Punta for the decisive role he played over the last three decades or so in establishing the view that medieval commentaries on Aristotle cannot be left out when it comes to reconstructing the historical and philosophical development of Latin Western culture. Without his support and inspiration, this volume would have been simply unthinkable. We are also very grateful to him for having organized at the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa a number of seminars and meetings on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, which allowed us to benefit from the thoughts of many important Aristotelian and medieval scholars" (p. 18).

The first essay by M. Borgo, "Latin Medieval Translations of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*" (pp. 19-57) is a useful survey on the translations into Latin of the *Metaphysics*, both from Greek and from Arabic. Based mainly on that  $\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha \ \acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota$  that is represented by Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem's critical editions of the Graeco-Latin

translations, this study also contains an up-to-date discussion of the issues of the translating style, with special focus on James of Venice and William of Moerbeke. M. Di Giovanni, "The Commentator: Averroes's reading of the *Metaphysics*" (pp. 59-94) outlines the main features of Averroes' commentaries, narrowing his focus on the three works he devoted to the *Metaphysics*: the *Epitome* (whose first draft dated from the sixties of the 12<sup>th</sup> century), the *Middle Commentary* (dated 1174), and the *Long Commentary*, in all likelihood Averroes' last work. Attention is paid also to the Latin translation of the *Long Commentary* that, although anonymous, is almost certainly the work of Michael Scotus (d. ca. 1235). The main doctrinal point dealt with in this essay is that of the subject-matter and unity of the *Metaphysics* according to Averroes. In his "Avicenna's and Averroes' Interpretations and their influence in Albertus Magnus" (pp. 95-135) A. Bertolacci discusses the impact of Avicenna and Averroes on Albert the Great against the background of the latter's intention to *facere Latinis intelligibiles* all the parts of what Albert labels *philosophia realis* (set against the *scientia moralis* in so far as the first is not caused by us, while the second is). In his approach to the *philosophia realis* Albert is guided on important issues by Avicenna's *Metaphysics* and by Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *Metaphysics*, both available to him in Latin translation. Bertolacci describes Albert's reaction to the disagreement expressed by Averroes with respect to Avicenna's metaphysical positions as a threefold line of "Omitting part of the dissent", "Disguising the dissent", and "Eliminating the dissent". S. Donati, "English Commentaries before Scotus. A Case Study: the Discussion on the Unity of Being", (pp. 127-207) brings to the fore a number of commentaries on the *Metaphysics* authored by English scholars between 1240 and the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Starting from Richard Rufus of Cornwall, whose *Scriptum super Metaphysicam* has a good chance of being the earliest Latin commentary on the *Metaphysics*, the works devoted to the *Metaphysics* in the English universities of the 13<sup>th</sup> century include those by Roger Bacon, Adam of Buckfield, Geoffrey of Aspull, Richard of Clive, John Dinsdale, William of Bonkes, and a number of anonymous *Questions*. Against the backdrop of Avicenna and Averroes' diverse accounts of the Aristotelian notion of being, these English authors develop a position that bears the hallmark of Averroes' interpretation in the earliest commentaries, and is more and more acquainted with Avicenna's doctrine "of a single notion of being prior to the notions of the categories and common to them (...), but the present investigation has brought to light no commentators subscribing to such doctrine before Scotus" (p. 206). In his "Aquinas's Commentary on the *Metaphysics*" (pp. 209-54) G. Galluzzo accounts for the sources, distinctive character, and main doctrinal points of Thomas' *Sententia super Metaphysicam*. Written during his second teaching in Paris (1268-1272), this commentary is based on William of Moerbeke's revision of the so-called *Metaphysica media*, to which William added the translation of the previously unknown Book K. Thomas Aquinas' commentary is examined in this study mostly from the viewpoint of the problem of the subject-matter of metaphysics, but also the topic of the ontological structure of the sensible substance receives attention. The ontological composition of individual substances, this time as understood by Giles of Rome, forms the core also of the paper by A.D. Conti, "Giles of Rome's Questions on the *Metaphysics*" (pp. 255-75). Conti deals with Giles' *Quaestiones metaphysicales*, that have come down to us in the *reportatio* of a course given between 1269 and 1272, when Giles was a bachelor in Paris. Giles' most distinctive metaphysical positions, and in particular his idea of essence and being as really distinct from one another *ut res et res*, is already announced in these early *Quaestiones*, even though here "Giles seems to hold a simplified doctrine in relation to the more mature one" (p. 264). The issues of the subject-matter of the *Metaphysics* and of the relationship between being and essence are discussed also by S. Ebbesen, "Five Parisian Sets of *Questions* on the *Metaphysics* from the 1270s to the 1290s" (pp. 277-314). The *Questions* analysed are those by the *Anonymus Lipsiensis*, Siger of Brabant, the *Anonymus Zimmermanni*, Peter of Auvergne, and Radulphus Brito. Ebbesen sheds light on the implications of the issue at stake: "As so often in medieval metaphysics, the framework for the debate is provided by disagreement between Avicenna, according to whom being (i.e., existence) is accidental to an essence, and Averroes, who claims that a thing is (exists) by virtue of its essence (...). From a medieval point of view, one of the strongest arguments in favour of some variant of the Avicennian theory was the need to differentiate created separate substances (intelligences) from the First Separate Substance, i.e., the Creator. (...) Siger, however, will have none of any of the current variants of the Avicennian theory (...). Siger expressly mentions Albert the Great as an adherent of a version of the Avicennian theory and further singles out "some" (alias Thomas Aquinas), who seem to try to ride the fence by holding both that in creatures there is an essence/being composition and that is not an accident of

the essence. This, Siger declares, is an unintelligible doctrine” (pp. 287-8). The starting point of the paper by F. Amerini, “Alexander of Alessandria’s Commentary on the *Metaphysics*” (pp. 315-58) is the fact that Alexander of Alessandria, a little-known Franciscan theologian of the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, is the main source of the admittedly better known Commentary on the *Metaphysics* by Paulus Venetus. An overview of Alexander’s metaphysical ideas is presented, that explores once again the issues of the subject-matter of metaphysics, that of the nature of being, and that of the relationship between being and essence, with special emphasis on the nature of the individual substance. This commentary is described as “an original organization of the *Metaphysics* content, characterized by a close reading of Averroes’s *Great Commentary* and by an attempt to harmonize, when possible, Averroes’s interpretation with Aquinas’s” (p. 367). Scotus’ *Quaestiones super Aristotelis Metaphysicam* are the focus of the chapter by G. Pini, “The Questions on the *Metaphysics* by John Duns Scotus: a Vindication of Pure Intellect” (pp. 358-84). According to Pini, “there is a common thread running through Scotus’s *Questions*. From among the many topics addressed, there seems to be one that particularly concerned Scotus, namely, the very nature of metaphysics and the possibility of carrying out an inquiry into the structure of reality in a situation as cognitively impaired, as the one Scotus thought we currently experience. In other words, one of Scotus’s dominant preoccupations in his *Questions* was with issues of what is now called ‘metametaphysics’, i.e. questions concerning our inquiry into the structure of reality rather than the structure of reality itself” (p. 361). R. Lambertini, “Jandun’s Question-Commentary on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*” (pp. 385-411), discusses the idea of philosophy, the relationship between logic and metaphysics, and the position about the topic of divine omnipotence presented in this little-known commentary on the *Metaphysics* by the *princeps averroistarum*. In his chapter “Three Franciscan Metaphysicians, after Scotus: Antonius Andreae, Francis of Marchia, and Nicholas Bonet” (pp. 413-93) W.O. Duba provides a survey of the 14<sup>th</sup> century metaphysical doctrines: “While their conception of the science of metaphysics neatly tracks a progressive split between ontology and theology, what they said about being – that is, their ontology – differed greatly. Antonius Andreae remained a strict Scotist; Francis of Marchia criticized Scotus and even his own previous thought, developing Scotus’ doctrine, at least in his discussion of truth, towards a more conceptualist understanding; Nicolas Bonet takes a syncretist approach and, combining Scotus’s thought with that of his opponents such as Peter Auriol, interpreted dialectically to arrive at an extreme realist position” (p. 413). F.J. Kok, “John Buridan’s Commentary on the *Metaphysics*” (pp. 495-549) deals with Buridan’s *Quaestiones in duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis*. The running commentary, *Expositio in duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis* (known to us through a *reportatio*) was far less known and less influential than the *Quaestiones*; F.J. Kok discusses their influence on Marsilius of Inghen, and devotes most of his essay to Buridan’s concept of metaphysics, its subject-matter and relationship with theology. Being and essence, and the issue of the individual substance feature also in this study. Another contribution by A.D. Conti in this volume is devoted to “Paul of Venice’s Commentary on the *Metaphysics*” (pp. 551-74). As Conti puts it, “[F]or about 150 years Paul was erroneously, but unanimously, believed to be an Ockhamist in logic and metaphysics and an Averroist in psychology and epistemology. But here, in the Commentary on the *Metaphysics*, it is possible to find not only clearly displayed and expounded his own form of realism but also, paradoxically, his most keen criticisms to Averroistic position on psychology and epistemology” (p. 554). In the last essay of the volume, “Fifteenth-Century Parisian Commentaries on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*” (pp. 575-629) P.J.J.-M. Bakker presents a survey of the forty-two commentaries on the *Metaphysics* written between 1400 and 1500. Their formal characteristics, geographical provenance, and contents are described before Bakker narrows his focus on the Parisian group of the six commentaries by Georgius Bruxellensis, Johannes Hennon, Johannes le Damoisiau, Johannes Versoris, Nicolaus de Orbellis, and Petrus Tartareti. The influence of Antonius Andreae on some of these commentaries is proven by textual comparisons. The *Bibliography* (pp. 631-64), the list of manuscripts and the Index of names (including some topics and titles) concludes the volume.

As stated in the introduction, “The general goal of the volume is to convey the sense of the variety of perspectives from which Aristotle’s text has been approached and investigated across the mature Middle Ages” (p. 4), and this goal has been achieved. The only regret is that of not seeing the volume, or at least the contributions of his pupils, dedicated to the memory of Francesco Del Punta, who passed away on 3 December 2013.

CDA