

EUROPA SACRA

Editorial Board under the auspices of Monash University

Megan Cassidy-Welch (University of Melbourne)

David Garrioch (Monash University)

Peter Howard (Monash University)

F. W. Kent (Monash University)†

Constant J. Mews (Monash University)

M. Michèle Mulchahey (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto)

Adriano Prospero (Scuola Normale di Pisa)

Volume 9

COMMUNITIES OF LEARNING:
NETWORKS AND THE SHAPING OF
INTELLECTUAL IDENTITY IN EUROPE,
1100–1500

edited by

Constant J. Mews and John N. Crossley



BREPOLS

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Communities of learning : networks and the shaping of
intellectual identity in Europe, 1100-1500. -- (Europa
sacra ; v. 9)

1. Europe--Intellectual life. 2. Europe--History--
476-1492. 3. Social networks--Europe--History.

I. Series II. Mews, C. J. III. Crossley, John N.
940.1'7-dc22

ISBN-13: 9782503532332

© 2011, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2010/0095/109

ISBN: 978-2-503-53233-2

Printed in the E.U. on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	
CONSTANT J. MEWS AND JOHN N. CROSSLEY	1
Communities of Learning in Twelfth-Century Toledo	9
CHARLES BURNETT	
Religious Diversity and the Philosophical Translations of Twelfth-Century Toledo	19
ALEXANDER FIDORA	
A Community of Translators: The Latin Medieval Versions of Avicenna's <i>Book of the Cure</i>	37
AMOS BERTOLACCI	
Nature and the Representation of Divine Creation in the Twelfth Century	55
WILLEMEN OTTEN	
Textual Communities of Learning and Friendship Circles in the Twelfth Century: An Examination of John of Salisbury's Correspondence	73
CARY J. NEDERMAN	
Communities of Learning in Law and Theology: The Later Letters of Peter of Blois (1125/30-1212)	85
JASON TALIADOROS	

Communities of Learning and the Dream of Synthesis: The Schools and Colleges of Thirteenth-Century Paris CONSTANT J. MEWS	109
Studying <i>Musica</i> in Thirteenth-Century Paris: The Expectations of Johannes de Grocheio JOHN N. CROSSLEY AND CAROL WILLIAMS	137
The Exchange of Ideas About Music in Paris c. 1270–1304: Guy of Saint-Denis, Johannes de Grocheio, and Peter of Auvergne CATHERINE JEFFREYS	151
Marian Devotion in Thirteenth-Century France and Spain and Interfaces Between Latin and Vernacular Culture EARL JEFFREY RICHARDS	177
The Bond of Aristotelian Language Among Medieval Political Thinkers MARY ELIZABETH SULLIVAN	213
Christine de Pizan: Isolated Individual or Member of a Feminine Community of Learning? KAREN GREEN	229
<i>Reformatrices</i> and Their Books: Religious Women and Reading Networks in Fifteenth-Century Germany JULIE HOTCHIN	251
'Doctrine, When Preached, Is Entirely Civic': The Generation of Public Theology and the Role of the <i>Studia</i> of Florence PETER HOWARD	293
Creating a Union: Ritual and Music at the Council of Florence FRANKIE NOWICKI	315
Notes on Contributors	339
Index	343

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AHDLMA</i>	<i>Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge</i>
BGPhM[T]A	Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie [und Theologie] des Mittelalters
Bibl. Vac.	Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana
BL	British Library
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis (Turnhout: Brepols, 1966–)
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–)
<i>CUP</i>	<i>Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis</i> , ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Châtelain, 4 vols (Paris: Delalain, 1889–97; repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1964)
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina</i> , ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 221 vols (Paris: Garnier, 1844–64)

Conclusion

The dialogue that emerges in Toledo as a result of the translations of philosophical texts may not be as spectacular as the direct confrontations between the representatives of the different religions, for it does not summon our attention so vociferously.

Nonetheless it is a highly significant dialogue, being in fact calm and unhurried, but enduring, as is shown by its continuity in the French and Italian Jewish communities. Rather than inter-religious, it could be called trans-religious, for it is not played out from a supposedly impartial standpoint between the different traditions, that is to say, in a kind of no-man's-land in which the various parties meet. Much more than this, what first takes shape in Toledo in the form of the translation project is an attempt to expand a shared philosophical tradition which might provide a common and continuous medium for dialogue between the faiths, based upon an unconditional commitment to philosophical reason.

A COMMUNITY OF TRANSLATORS: THE LATIN MIEVEAL VERSIONS OF AVICENNA'S *BOOK OF THE CURE*

Amos Bertolacci

Avicenna (d. 1037), the greatest philosopher of Islamic civilization, exerted an enormous impact on subsequent authors through his overarching philosophical and medical output. His philosophical masterpiece, the *Kitāb al-Šifā'* ('Book of the Cure'), is a summa on logic, natural philosophy, mathematics, and metaphysics (with an appendix on practical philosophy), which encompasses twenty-two volumes and aims at replacing Aristotle's corpus of writings. By means of the *Šifā'*, as well as of other works of his, Avicenna's thought rapidly spread in the entire Arab-Islamic world, as the critical attitude, but also the profound debt, of the theologian al-Gazālī (d. 1111) in the East, and the philosopher and jurist Averroes (d. 1198) in the West, witness. Outside the boundaries of the Muslim empire, it deeply influenced Christian thinkers writing in Latin, as well as Jewish scholars writing either in Hebrew or Arabic.

The reception of Avicenna's philosophy in the Latin Middle Ages is probably the best known chapter of his *fortuna*. This field of investigation still presents, however, many lacunae and controversial points. The precise mode of this reception, for instance, has been much debated and different historiographical labels involving the name of Avicenna ('Avicennizing Augustinism'; 'Latin Avicennism'; 'Avicennizing Aristotelianism'; 'Avicennizing Boethianism') have been proposed in the last hundred years to characterize philosophical authors and currents. This proliferation of labels, which in itself suggests a still immature stage of research, can be also regarded more positively as a sign of the multiplicity of modes and areas of the Latin reception of Avicenna. Thus, it is not surprising that Avicenna's thought has influenced, besides philosophy, other fields of Latin culture, such as literature, and society in general, as its traces in papal documents witness. Equally unsurprising is the fact that it surpassed the temporal limits of

the Middle Ages. By means of the edition of the Latin translation of the main parts of Avicenna's *Šifā*, accomplished in the Augustinian convent of San Giovanni in Verdara in Padua, and published in Venice in 1508, Avicenna's philosophy reached modern authors such as Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz.

The present chapter focuses on the starting-point of the Latin reception of Avicenna, namely on the Latin translation of the *Šifā*, the only philosophical work by Avicenna translated into Latin during the Middle Ages. Under the transliterated title *Asshiphe*, interpreted as *Sufficiencia*, its translation took place during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and was the result of the efforts of distinct scholars.¹ Schematically, two phases of the translation activity can be distinguished. The first (c. 1150–1250) was generated by translators active in, or

¹ For an overview of the Latin translations of Avicenna, see Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, 'Notes sur les traductions médiévales d'Avicenne', *Archives d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 19 (1952), 337–58; also d'Alverny, 'Avicenna Latinus', *Archives d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 28 (1961), 284–88; and papers reprinted in *Avicenne en Occident* (Paris: Vrin, 1993); Harald Kishlat, *Studien zur Verbreitung von Übersetzungen arabischer philosophischer Werke in Westeuropa 1150–1400: Das Zeugnis der Bibliotheken* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2000), pp. 33–41. On the Arabic-Latin translation movement in general, see d'Alverny, 'Translations and Translators', in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 421–62; Hans Daiber, 'Lateinische Übersetzungen arabischer Texte zur Philosophie und ihre Bedeutung für die Scholastik des Mittelalters: Stand und Aufgaben der Forschung', in *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale: Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIV^e siècle*, ed. by J. Hamesse and M. Fattori (Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut d'Études Médiévales de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1990), pp. 203–50; Charles Burnett, 'The Translating Activity in Medieval Spain', in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, ed. by Salma Khadra Jayyusi and Manuela Marin (Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 1036–58; Charles Burnett, 'Arabic into Latin: The Reception of Arabic Philosophy into Western Europe', in *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, ed. by Peter Adamson and Richard C. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 370–404; Cristina D'Ancona, 'La trasmissione della filosofia araba dalla Spagna musulmana alle università del XIII secolo', in *Storia della Filosofia nell'Islam Medievale*, ed. by Cristina D'Ancona, 2 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 2005), II, 783–843; Dimitri Gutas, 'What Was There in Arabic for the Latins to Receive? Remarks on the Modalities of the Twelfth-Century Translation Movement in Spain', in *Wissen über Grenzen: Arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter*, ed. by Andreas Speer (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), pp. 4–21; Dag N. Hasse, 'The Social Conditions of the Arabic-(Hebrew-)Latin Translation Movement in Medieval Spain and in the Renaissance', in *Wissen über Grenzen*, ed. by Speer, pp. 68–86; Charles Burnett, 'Arabic Philosophical Works Translated into Latin', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by Robert Pasnau (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 814–22; Charles Burnett, 'Translation and Transmission of Greek and Islamic Science to Latin Christendom', in *The Cambridge History of Science, Volume II: Science in the Middle Ages*, ed. by D. C. Lindberg and M. H. Shank (forthcoming).

related to, the city of Toledo. The second (c. 1250–1300) occurred in Burgos. The Spanish environment is not the only common feature of these two phases. Both focused on logic and natural philosophy/metaphysics (no section of the mathematical part of the *Šifā* was ever translated). Both were characterized by the cooperation of Jewish and Latin scholars under the patronage of Christian ecclesiastic authorities. The main difference is given by the diffusion of the translations: whereas the versions accomplished during the first phase had a wide circulation, the ones composed during the second phase had a much more limited dissemination.

In what follows, I shall first provide a detailed account of the translations and translators involved in the aforementioned two phases, then summarize in a table and discuss the data previously expounded. After outlining the main features of the translators' consideration of Avicenna's work, I shall conclude by emphasizing two crucial — and, in my opinion, not sufficiently stressed — aspects of the first phase of translations, casting light on the intercultural and interreligious nature of the team of translators to whom we owe the *Avicenna Latinus*.

The First Phase of Translations

A scholar named 'Avendeuth Israelita', in all likelihood the Jewish philosopher Abraham Ibn Daūd (d. c. 1180), and Dominicus Gundisalvi or Gundissalinus (d. after 1181) accomplished the translation of the doctrinal core of the *Šifā* in the second half of the twelfth century in Toledo.² As we learn from the forewords to the translations, Avendeuth translated the Preface — namely the Introduction of Avicenna's secretary and biographer al-Ġūzġānī and the Prologue of Avicenna³ —

² The reasons for identifying Avendeuth with Abraham Ibn Daūd advanced by M.T. d'Alverny (see d'Alverny, 'Notes', pp. 341–44; d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', in *Homenaje a Millas-Vallcrosa*, I (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1954), pp. 35–37) — namely the resemblance of the names, the simultaneous presence of Ibn Daūd and Gundissalinus in Toledo, Ibn Daūd's debt towards Avicenna's philosophy, the affinity of Avendeuth's Preface to the translation of Avicenna's *De anima* with the themes of Ibn Daūd's *Book of the Exalted Faith* (*Kitāb al-'Aqida al-rafi'a*), and the influence of this latter on Gundissalinus's own *De anima* — have been corroborated by recent studies (see in this volume the chapters by Burnett and Fidora).

³ The date of composition (around 1150) suggested by d'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 349, can be determined more precisely as 1152–66 on the basis of the identification of the addressee of the foreword with the archbishop, John of Toledo (see the previous footnote, and Kishlat, *Studien*, p. 34). At p. 341, d'Alverny contends that this translation was accomplished by Avendeuth with

and, together with Gundissalinus, the sixth section of natural philosophy (*Nafs, Liber de anima*).⁴ Many manuscripts preserving the translation of Chapter I, 12

the assistance of a Latin scholar 'fort malhabile'; the flaws in Latin style might rather depend on the fact that Avendeuth translated the Preface alone (see below, n. 4, and the evidence provided by Text 1). The Latin text is fully preserved in two manuscripts (Bruges, Bibliothèque de la ville 510; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 4428; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, descr. M.-T. d'Alverny, S. Van Riet, P. Jodogne (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 124, 99), and summarized in MS Cordoba, Arch. Bibl. Cap. 52. The transcription of the entire Preface according to the Bruges manuscripts is available in Alexander Birkenmajer, 'Avicennas Vorrede zum "Liber Sufficientiae" und Roger Bacon', *Revue Néoscholastique de Philosophie*, 36 (1934), 308–320; also in Birkenmajer, *Études d'Histoire des Sciences et de la Philosophie au Moyen Âge* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im Ossolinskich, 1970), pp. 89–101; the transcription of the translator's foreword according to the Vatican manuscript can be found, together with a French translation, in d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', p. 32. The critical edition of the Latin translation of the Preface (Introduction and Prologue, this latter constituting the first chapter of the first section on logic), as well as of all the first section of logic, is in preparation by Françoise Hudry and Miriam Sebti.

⁴ The critical edition of the *De anima* is available in Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus, IV–V*, ed. by S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1968); *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus, I–II–III*, ed. by S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1972). In her pioneering and ground-breaking studies, M.-T. d'Alverny appears to have unduly generalized the case of the *De anima*, portraying Avendeuth and Gundissalinus as always translating from Arabic into Latin with the help of another scholar; see her remarks on the translation of the Preface, above, n. 3, the similar remarks about the translations of *Madhjal* I, 12, *Burbān* II, 7, and *Ilābiyyāt* below, nn. 5, 7, 10, and, more in general d'Alverny, 'Les Traductions à deux interprètes, d'arabe en langue vernaculaire et de langue vernaculaire en latine', in *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, ed. by G. Contamine (Paris: CNRS, 1989), pp. 193–206. These translators, however, might have known both Latin and Arabic well enough to accomplish their translations on their own, as other coeval translators (such as Hugo of Santalla) actually did; see Burnett, 'Some Comments on the Translating of Works from Arabic into Latin in the Mid-Twelfth Century', in *Orientalische Kultur und europäische Mittelalter*, ed. by A. Zimmermann, I. Crämer-Ruegenberg, and G. Vuillemin-Diem (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985), pp. 161–71 (p. 168). Another questionable aspect of d'Alverny's account is her interpretation of the adverb *vulgariter* in *nobis* [...] *singula verba vulgariter proferente* in the foreword to the *De anima* ('I [...] read out the single words as they are spoken by the people', see below, Text 2) as referring to the vernacular Romance language spoken in Spain at the time ('moi disant chaque mot en langue vulgaire': d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', p. 34). She bases her claim on the presence of mistranslations, such as the rendering of the Arabic *šay*, 'thing', as *causa*, and of 'illa', 'cause' as *res*, supposedly due to the fact that both Arabic terms had the same corresponding term (*cosa*) in the vernacular. The perplexities in this regard raised by S. Van Riet in Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus, I–II–III*, p. 98*, are corroborated by Burnett, 'Some Comments', p. 166, who interprets the phrase *vulgariter proferente* as referring to Avendeuth's reading of the text in the

of the first section of logic (*Madhjal*, corresponding to Porphyry's *Isagoge*) ascribe it to Avendeuth.⁵ The translation of the rest of this section (Chapters I, 2–11, 13–14; II, 1–4), accomplished very likely in the same Toledan context, has been transmitted without any indication of the name of a translator.⁶

Besides Avicenna's *Nafs* (together with Avendeuth), Gundissalinus translated probably also — alone or in cooperation with someone else — Chapter II, 7 of the section of logic corresponding to the *Posterior Analytics* (*Burbān*), which he incorporated in his *De divisione philosophiae*.⁷ He is probably the translator also of the *Ilābiyyāt* (*Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina*).⁸ Since Spanish

Arabic of the Toledan Muslims and Mozarabs: Gundissalinus probably knew the spoken Arabic of his fellow citizens, but not the written Arabic of philosophical texts, which very often lacked diacritical marks. The alleged impact of the vernacular on the translation of *Nafs* is convincingly discarded by Dag N. Hasse, *Avicenna's 'De anima' in the Latin West: The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul, 1160–1300* (London: Warburg Institute, 2000), p. 7 and n. 16. For the same point about the *Ilābiyyāt*, see below, n. 8.

⁵ See the manuscripts mentioned by d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', p. 28, and Amos Bertolacci, 'Albert The Great and The Preface of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Šifā'*', in *Avicenna and his Heritage*, ed. by J. Janssens and D. De Smet (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), pp. 131–52, Section 1, Text 2. d'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 350, regards this translation as accomplished by Avendeuth shortly after the translation of the Preface, with the help of an unknown Latinist.

⁶ D'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 350, regards this translation as probably accomplished in Toledo in the second half of the twelfth century. On terminological grounds, she excludes that Gundissalinus might have taken part in it (cf. d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', pp. 38–39). Its critical edition is in preparation (see above, n. 3). The Latin text is available in *Avicennae peripatetici philosophi ac medicorum facile primi opera in lucem redacta [...]* (Venice: mandata ac sumptibus heredum nobilis viri domini Octaviani Scoti, 1508; repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1961), fols 2–12'.

⁷ See Gundissalinus, *De divisione philosophiae*, ed. by L. Baur (Münster: Aschendorff, 1903), pp. 124–33. D'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 345, ascribes this translation to Gundissalinus and, tentatively, to the 'magister Iohannes' recorded in the manuscript tradition as the translator, together with Gundissalinus, of al-Gazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa* and Ibn Gabirol's *Fons Vitae*; she does not provide indications on the date of composition.

⁸ Critical edition in Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–IV*, ed. by S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1977); Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, V–X*, ed. by S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1980); Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–X*, Lexiques par S. Van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1983). Of the 25 manuscripts of the *Philosophia prima*, the *explicit*s of four (not three as stated in Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina, I–IV*, p. 123*) ascribe the translation to 'Dominicus Gundissalui archidiaconus Tholeti' (Paris, BnF, lat. 6443; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica

Romance vernacular appears to have played no significant role in this translation,⁹

Vaticana, lat. 4428; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, pp. 30, 100), or 'Gundisalvus archidiaconus Toleti' (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 217; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, p. 143), or 'Gundisalvus archidiaconus Toleti' (Kues, Hospitalbibliothek. 205; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, p. 192). Three of these manuscripts (Paris, Vatican City, Kues) present the so-called revised text, one (Oxford) the so-called ancient text contaminated with the revised (see Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina*, I-IV, p. 131*, n. 32; cf. p. 123*, n. 2; Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina*, I-X, Lexiques, pp. 83*-84*, 86*). Another manuscript containing the ancient text (Venice, Biblioteca S. Marco, lat. 2665; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, p. 112) ascribes the translation to 'M. G. Cre. (Magistro Gerardo Cremonensi)'. Four other manuscripts of the ancient recension state generically that the book was translated in Toledo ('Toleti translatus', Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 3473; Paris, BnF, lat. 16097; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, pp. 27, 42; 'Toleti translatus est', Paris, BnF, lat. 15114, Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.I.4; see Avicenna Latinus, *Codices*, pp. 38, 187). Since the *Philosophia prima* does not appear in the list of Gerard's translations compiled by his disciples (see R. Lemay, 'Gerard of Cremona', in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, ed. by C. G. Gillespie, 15, Supplement I (New York: Scribner, 1981), pp. 173-92), whereas it is amply used by Gundissalinus in his own works, the latter has more credentials to be its translator. The evidence provided by the aforementioned manuscripts contradicts the contention of Adeline Rucquoi, 'Gundisalvus ou Dominicus Gundisalvi?', *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 41 (1999), 85-106 (p. 96), according to whom 'l'auteur des oeuvres philosophiques originales est toujours appelé Gundisalvus, tandis que le traducteur est invariablement désigné comme Dominicus': two manuscripts (Oxford and Kues) designate the translator of the *Philosophia prima* as 'Gundisalvus' or 'Gundisalvinus' (at p. 94, n. 31, Rucquoi misreports the *explicit* of the former manuscript and does not take into account the latter). Rucquoi's thesis is convincingly rejected by A. Fidora-M. J. Soto Bruna, "'Gundisalvus ou Dominicus Gundisalvi?': Algunas observaciones sobre un reciente artículo de Adeline Rucquoi', *Estudios eclesidásticos*, 76 (2001), 467-73.

⁹ About the *Philosophia prima*, d'Alverny ('Notes', p. 344) points to 'Emploi de *causa* pour *res*. Les termes arabes correspondants n'ont aucune analogie: 'illa et shay. Souvenons-nous que dans les langues romanes du Midi, l'une et l'autre se prononcent: cosa'. In the *Philosophia prima*, *šay'* ('thing') is translated as *causa*, instead of *res*, in two cases (see Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina*, I-X, Lexiques, p. 65b). In the former (p. 99, 62), the rendering of *wuğūd šay'ayni* ('existence of the things', *Ilāhiyyāt*, II, 4, p. 86, 3) as *esse duarum causarum* can be either the effect of a mispointing (*wuğūd sababayni*, whose unpointed skeleton or *rasm* is identical to *wuğūd šay'ayni*), or it can be due to an interpretation by the translator (Avicenna is speaking of the existence of two things that bring something else to perfection, that is, of the causes of this latter's perfection). Mispointing can also explain the cases in which *šay'iyya* ('thingness') is rendered as *inquantum est causa*, *causalitas*, or *similitudo* (see Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive Scientia divina*, I-X, Lexiques, pp. 65b-66a; Robert Wisnovsky, 'Notes on Avicenna's Concept of Thingness [šay'iyya]', *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy*, 10 (2000), 203-06; in n. 44, Wisnovsky reports other cases of mistranslations due to mispointing). The second case (p. 394, 84) is difficult to explain in terms of mispointing, since *al-ašya'* ('the things', *Ilāhiyyāt* VIII, 3, p. 341, 3), rendered as *causae*, has a *rasm* partly different from the Arabic

it is uncertain whether or not this latter was accomplished by two translators, one translating from Arabic into vernacular, and the other (supposedly Gundissalinus) from vernacular into Latin.¹⁰ The anonymous translation of a portion of the first section on natural philosophy, corresponding to the *Physics* (*Samā'*, I-III, 1), can be included among the translations accomplished in Toledo in the third quarter of the twelfth century.¹¹

Another translator active in Toledo in the second half of the twelfth century was Alfred of Sareshel, who died in England at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Alfred translated and commented upon two chapters of the fifth section of natural philosophy (*Ma'ādin wa-ātār 'ulwiyya*, on metals and meteorology, corresponding to books A-Γ of Aristotle's *Meteorology*), namely Chapters I, 1 and I, 5. The joint translation of these two chapters, split into three parts, circulated under the general title of *De mineralibus*.¹² Continuing the translation program

term for 'causes' (*al-asbāb*). *Causae*, however, instead of *res*, might have been suggested to the translator ('bonitas est [...] propter quam ceterae causae quaeruntur') by the context of Avicenna's argument, which is a discussion of the finiteness of final causes, and by the doctrine of the essential priority of the final cause over the other causes in *Ilāhiyyāt*, VI, 5. Also at p. 32, 12-13, the rendering of *li-'illa mā* ('on account of a certain cause', *Ilāhiyyāt*, I, 5, p. 29, 16) as *per aliquid aliud* ('on account of something else'), instead of *per causam aliquam*, can be regarded as an interpretative translation in which the causal force of *per* make the mention of *causa* superfluous.

¹⁰ According to d'Alverny ('Notes', pp. 344, 358), the co-translator of the *Philosophia prima* might have been 'magister Johannes' (see above, n. 7). M. Alonso Alonso ('Traducciones del arcediano Domingo Gundisalvo', *Al-Andalus*, 12 (1947), 295-338) thought that Gundissalinus knew Arabic well enough, albeit imperfectly, and translated the *Ilāhiyyāt* on his own, as some inaccuracies in the Latin version of this latter would attest.

¹¹ See d'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 344; Avicenna Latinus, *Liber primus naturalium: Tractatus primus de causis et principiis naturalium*, ed. by S. van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1992), p. 53*. The Latin text of the first two treatises of this section has been critically edited in Avicenna Latinus, *Liber primus naturalium: Tractatus primus*, and Avicenna Latinus, *Liber primus naturalium: Tractatus secundus de motu et de consimilibus*, ed. by S. van Riet, J. Janssens, and A. Allard (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 2006). The Latin text of Treatises I-III, 1, under the title of *Sufficientia*, is available in *Avicennae peripatetici philosophi*, fols 13-36*.

¹² The Latin text is available in *Avicennae De congelatione et conglutinatione lapidum* being Sections of the *Kitāb Al-Shifā'*. The Latin and Arabic texts ed. by E. J. Holmyard and D. C. Mandeville (Paris: Geuthner, 1927), and R. French, 'Teaching Meteorology in Thirteenth-Century Oxford: The Arabic Paraphrase', *Physis*, 36 (1999), 99-129. According to d'Alverny ('Notes', p. 346), the translation was accomplished in Toledo. Kishlat, *Studien*, p. 38, regards either the end of the twelfth century or the beginning of the thirteenth as probable date of composition of the translation; J. M. Mandosio and C. Di Martino, 'La "Météorologie" d'Avicenne' (*Kitāb al-Šifā'* V) et sa diffusion dans le monde latin', in *Wissen über Grenzen*, p.

of Gerard of Cremona (d. 1187), Alfred added to Gerard's Latin translation of Aristotle's *Meteorology* (Books A–Γ, from Arabic), Henricus Aristippus's translation of Book Δ (from Greek), and these chapters by Avicenna.¹³ The Latin translation of Chapter II, 6 of the same section (*De Diluviis in Thimaem Platonis*) does not contain any indication about the translator.¹⁴

Finally, it cannot be excluded that Michael Scot (d. between 1234 and 1236) began, or at least envisaged, the translation of the eighth section of the *Šifā*² on zoology (*Hayawān, Liber de animalibus*)¹⁵ when he was in Toledo (until 1220), although the dedication to the emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen would suggest that this translation was finished at the imperial court of Palermo after 1220, the probable date in which Michael entered to the service of the emperor.¹⁶

411, locate it before 1200.

¹³ C. Burnett, *The Introduction of Arabic Learning into England* (London: British Library, 1997), pp. 71–72, shows convincingly that Alfred's translation of Avicenna's chapters was part of a program, inherited from Gerard of Cremona, aimed at implementing the classification of philosophy provided by al-Fārābī in the *Ihṣā' al-'ulūm* (*Survey of the sciences*), in which mineralogy had a precise role.

¹⁴ The Latin text of the MS Sevilla, Colombine Library, 5.6.14 (end of the thirteenth century) is edited in M. Alonso Alonso, 'Homenaje a Avicenna en su milenario: Las traducciones de Juan González de Burgos y Salomón', *Al-Andalus*, 14 (1949), 291–319 (see Mandosio-Di Martino, 'La "Météorologie" d'Avicenne', p. 420 and n. 82). For the different opinions about the translator (Gunsalvi-Salomon; Alfred of Sareshel) and the date of the translation, see Kishlat, *Studien*, p. 38, n. 145.

¹⁵ The Latin text is available in *Avicennae peripatetici philosophi*, fols 29–64. A. M. I. van Oppenraay is preparing its critical edition. She notices that Michael's translation is an abbreviation of Avicenna's original text, and possibly depends on a summary of Avicenna's work; see A. M. I. van Oppenraay, 'Michael Scot's Latin Translation of Avicenna's Treatise on Animals: Some Preliminary Remarks on the Future Edition', in *Tradition et traduction: Les textes philosophiques et scientifiques grecs au Moyen Âge latin: Hommage à Fernand Bossier*, ed. by R. Beyers and others (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), pp. 107–20.

¹⁶ R. A. Gauthier, 'Notes sur les débuts (1225–1240) du premier 'averroïsme'', *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 66 (1982), 331–34, argues that Michael entered the service of Emperor Frederick in 1220 (rather than 1227, as was supposed by R. De Vaux, 'La Première entrée d'Averroès chez les Latins', *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 22 (1933), 193–245, and unanimously accepted afterwards). About the date of Michael's translation of Avicenna's *De animalibus* scholars disagree: Charles Burnett, 'Michael Scot and the Transmission of Scientific Culture from Toledo to Bologna via the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen', *Micrologus*, 2 (1994), 101–26, tends to locate it, together with the other translations by Michael, in Toledo before 1220 (p. 110), thinking that the dedication to the emperor might have been added later by Michael himself (p. 117); Gauthier, 'Notes', p. 333, dates the translation

The Second Phase of Translations

The second phase of the Latin translation of the *Šifā*² regarded the section of logic corresponding to the *Rhetoric*, some fragments of which were inserted by Hermann the German (d. 1272) in his translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (started during the regency of John, archbishop of Burgos in 1240–46, and accomplished in 1256);¹⁷ and the part on natural philosophy, whose sections not yet available to Latin readers were translated by a team involving two otherwise unknown scholars, named 'Magister Johannes Gunsalvi' of Burgos and 'Salomon' (in all likelihood a Jew) in the only manuscript preserving their translation, under the sponsorship of Gonzalo Garcia Gudiel, archbishop of Burgos (1275–80).¹⁸ Johannes and Salomon translated Chapters III, 1–10 of the first section,¹⁹ and the second (*De caelo et mundo*),²⁰ third (*De generatione et corruptione*),²¹ fourth (*De actionibus et passionibus qualitatum primarum*),²² and fifth sections (*Libri*

immediately after 1220; according to van Oppenraay, 'Michael Scot's Latin Translation', p. 107, n. 2, on the other hand, it was probably accomplished between 1227 and 1230. In Toledo Michael translated from Arabic the Aristotelian counterpart of Avicenna's *De animalibus*, namely Aristotle's *Historia, De partibus* and *De generatione animalium* under the common title *De animalibus*.

¹⁷ See M. Aouad, 'La Rhétorique: Tradition syriaque et arabe', in *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques*, ed. by R. Goulet, 1 (Paris: CNRS, 1989), pp. 460, 468, and the further references that he provides; cf. Aouad, 'Introduction générale, commentaire et tables', in Averroès (Ibn Rušd), *Commentaire Moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote*, ed. and trans. by M. Aouad, 2 vols (Paris: Vrin, 2002), 1, 9.

¹⁸ See Avicenna Latinus, *Liber tertius naturalium de generatione et corruptione*, ed. by S. van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1987), pp. 67*–68*.

¹⁹ Chapters 11–14 of Treatise III and the entire Treatise IV were not translated.

²⁰ The transcription of the Latin text of this section is available in M. Renaud, 'Le "De celo et mundo" d'Avicenne', *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale*, 15 (1973), 92–130. The *De caelo et mundo* in *Avicennae peripatetici philosophi*, fols 37–42, is not the Latin translation of this section, but a pseudo-Avicennian writing (see Pseudo-Avicenna Latinus, *Liber celi et mundi*, ed. by O. Gutman (Leiden: Brill, 2003)), as it is the *De intelligentiis*, fols 64'–67" (also known as the *Liber de causis primis et secundis*); see 'Le "Liber de causis primis et secundis et de fluxu qui consequitur eas"', in R. de Vaux, *Notes et textes sur l'averroïsme latin aux confins des XII^e–XIII^e siècles* (Paris: Vrin, 1934), pp. 83–140.

²¹ See Avicenna Latinus, *Liber tertius naturalium*.

²² See Avicenna Latinus, *Liber quartus naturalium de actionibus et passionibus qualitatum primarum*, ed. by S. van Riet (Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters; Leiden: Brill, 1989). This section corresponds mainly to *Meteorologica* Δ, with additions from Books A, 3 and B, 1–3 (see A.

meteororum)²³ in their entirety. They possibly also translated the seventh section (*De vegetabilibus*), a translation, however, that is only attested.²⁴

An Overview

The data discussed so far about place, date, and authors of the translations are ordered in Table 1 according to the part of the *Šifā* to which they correspond.²⁵ The last column on the right provides additional information on the manuscript diffusion of the translations.²⁶ Thus the first entry indicates that al-Ġūzġānī's

Hasnawi, 'Avicenne et le livre IV des *Météorologiques* d'Aristote', in *Aristoteles Chemicus: Il IV libro dei 'Meteorologica' nella tradizione antica e medievale*, ed. by C. Viano (Sankt Augustin: Academia, 2002), pp. 133–43).

²³ See Mandosio-Di Martino, 'La "Météorologie" d'Avicenne', pp. 409–10.

²⁴ The translation of these five sections is preserved in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urbiniana lat. 186 (see Avicenna Latinus, Codices, pp. 86–88). At least one other manuscript, which also contains the seventh section on botany, must have reached Paris around the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century, since in 1338 the catalogue of the Sorbonne Library records the Latin translation of all eight sections of Avicenna's natural philosophy (see d'Alverny, 'Notes', pp. 348, 356–57; Avicenna Latinus, *Liber tertius naturalium*, p. 65* and n. 3). Johannes appears to have had the main role in the translation of these sections, since he is mentioned not only in the *explicit* of the translation of the first section, together with Salomon, but also, alone, in the *incipit* of the second. The resemblance of the Latin translation of Sections 1–2 with that of Sections 3–5 attests that all sections were translated by the same *équipe*. On the method of translation of Johannes and Salomon, see Avicenna Latinus, *Liber tertius naturalium*, pp. 68*–69*. Wisnovsky, 'Notes', p. 205, n. 47, notices mistranslations of *šay* as *causa*, which — if not explained otherwise — might imply the use of a Romance language as an intermediary between Arabic and Latin.

²⁵ In the left column, the number between brackets indicates the position of the parts of the *Šifā* taken into account within the four main sections of the work (logic, natural philosophy, mathematics, metaphysics). The expressions between brackets are the traditional Latin titles of these parts, or the titles adopted in the critical editions. In the fourth column, the square brackets include the source of the translator's identification.

²⁶ Information on manuscripts is taken from the prolegomena of the critical editions of the series *Avicenna Latinus*, complemented with M.-T. d'Alverny, 'La Tradition manuscrite de l'Avicenne latin', in *Mélanges Taha Hussein* (Cairo: n. pub., 1962), pp. 67–78; A. Chemin, 'La Traduction latine médiévale de l'*Isagoge* d'Avicenne: notes pour une édition critique', in *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle*, 4 vols (Athens: Publications of the Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1981–83), II, 304–07; C. B. Schmitt and D. Knox, *Pseudo-Aristoteles Latinus: A Guide to Latin Works Falsely Attributed to Aristotle before 1500* (London: Warburg Institute, 1985), p. 44; van Oppenraay, 'Michael Scot's Latin Translation'; Kishlat, *Studien*;

Introduction and Avicenna's Prologue (which is *Madhal* I, 1) are not known to correspond to any other work. These were translated in Toledo between 1152 and 1166 by Avendeuth, as is evident from the foreword. There are three known manuscripts of this translation.

Of the three main parts of the *Šifā* translated into Latin (logic, natural philosophy, and metaphysics), translations were primarily concerned with natural philosophy and metaphysics (*philosophia realis*), and only to a lesser degree logic (*philosophia rationalis*). Natural philosophy and metaphysics were almost entirely translated into Latin, whereas translations of only one entire section of logic, and of some excerpts of other two sections, are extant.²⁷ The manuscripts also document a wider diffusion of natural philosophy and metaphysics than of logic: the *Logica* of Avicenna, with 13 manuscripts, is much less attested than the *De anima* (50 manuscripts), the *De mineralibus* (36), the *De animalibus* (33), the *Philosophia prima* (25), and the *Liber primus naturalium*, I–III, 1 (22).²⁸ The greater interest in, and diffusion of, Avicenna's natural philosophy and metaphysics than of logic in Latin does not reflect the importance that Avicenna himself ascribes to these disciplines (logic is, by and large, the most extensive part of the *Šifā*). Rather, it mirrors the scientific needs of the Latin users of the translations, who were much more attracted by a new and comprehensive worldview (such as the one proposed by Avicenna), than by a logical theory that, despite its originality, was less novel in the Latin world.

Mandosio-Di Martino, 'La "Météorologie" d'Avicenne'.

²⁷ On account of the quotations of Avicenna in Albertus Magnus's commentaries, M. Grignaschi, 'Les Traductions latines des ouvrages de la logique arabe et l'abrégé d'Alfarabi', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 39 (1972), 41–107, contends that some integral Latin translations of the second, third and fifth section of the logic of the *Šifā* (corresponding, respectively, to the *Categories*, *De Interpretatione*, and *Posterior Analytics*), subsequently lost, must have existed. Grignaschi's contention has to be tested taking into account the possibility of some intermediate source connecting Avicenna and Albertus, *in primis* the Latin translations of al-Ġazālī's works.

²⁸ The scarce manuscript diffusion regards also the Latin translation of the Preface, probably because of the connection of this latter with the part on logic. Among Latin scholars, only Roger Bacon and, possibly, Albertus Magnus knew it (see Bertolacci, 'Albert The Great and The Preface').

Table 1

Part of the <i>Sifā'</i>	Corresponds to	Place and date of translation	Translator(s)	Manuscripts
<i>Preface</i>				
al-Ġūzġānī's Introduction and Avicenna's Prologue (= <i>Madḥal</i> I, 1)		Toledo, 1152-66	Avendeuth (foreword)	3
<i>Logic</i>				
(1) <i>Madḥal</i>	Porphyry's <i>Isagoge</i>			13
I, 2-11, 13-14; II, 1-4 (<i>Logica</i>)		Toledo, c. 1150-1200		3
I, 12 (<i>De universalibus</i>)		Toledo, c. 1150-75	Avendeuth (mss)	5 (1 is a summary)
entire work				5 (1 summarizes I, 2-11; II, 1-4)
(5) <i>Barhān Posterior Analytics</i>				
II, 7 (<i>De convenientia et differentia scientiarum</i>)		Toledo, c. 1150-75	Gundissalinus (the translation is extant in <i>De divisione philosophiae</i>)	5 (= mss of Gundissalinus's <i>De divisione philosophiae</i>)
(8) <i>Ḥiṭāba fragments Rhetoric</i>				
		Burgos, between 1240-46 and 1256	Hermann the German (fragments extant in his translation of the <i>Rhetoric</i>)	2
Part of the <i>Sifā'</i>				
Corresponds to				
Place and date of translation				
Translator(s)				
Manuscripts				
<i>Natural Philosophy</i>				
(1) <i>Samā' (Liber primus naturalium)</i>	<i>Physics</i>			
I-III, 1		Toledo, c. 1150-75		22 (two recensions: 12 and 10 mss)
III, 1-10		Burgos, 1274-80	Johannes Gunsalvi and Salomon (mss)	1
(2) <i>Samā' wa-'Ālam (De Caelo)</i>	<i>De caelo</i>	Burgos, 1274-80	Johannes Gunsalvi (mss) and Salomon	1
(3) <i>Kawn wa-Fasād (De generatione et corruptione)</i>	<i>De generatione et corruptione</i>	Burgos [?], 1274-80 [?]	Johannes Gunsalvi and Salomon [?]	1
(4) <i>Af'āl wa-Ḥay' ālāt (De actionibus et passionibus qualitatium primarum)</i>	<i>Meteorologica</i> Δ; A, 3; B, 1-3	Burgos [?], 1274-80 [?]	Johannes Gunsalvi and Salomon [?]	1
(5) <i>Ma'ādin wa-Ātār 'ulwyya</i>	<i>Meteorologica</i> A-I			

Part of the <i>Šifā'</i>	Corresponds to	Place and date of translation	Translator(s)	Manuscripts
1, 1; 1, 5 (<i>De mineralibus</i>); 1, 1 (<i>De congelatione et conglutinatione lapidum</i>)/ <i>Liber de congelatis, De causa montium</i>); 1, 5 (<i>De quatuor speciebus corporum mineralium</i>)		Toledo [?], end of twelfth–beginning of thirteenth century	Alfred of Sareshel (mss)	36 (+ 112 mss; all mss of the <i>translatio vetus</i> and some mss of Moerbeke's translation of Aristotle's <i>Meteorologica</i>)
II, 6 (<i>De diluviis in Thimacum Platonis</i>)		Before 1250–54		11
Overall translation (<i>Libri meteororum</i>)		Burgos [?], 1274–80 [?]	Johannes Gualsalvi and Salomon [?]	1
(6) <i>Nāfs (De anima)</i>	<i>De anima</i>	Toledo, 1152–66	Avendeth and Gundissalinus (foreword)	50 (two recensions: 31 and 19 mss)
(7) <i>Nabāt</i>	Pseudo-Aristotle, <i>De plantis</i>	Burgos [?], 1274–80 [?]	Johannes Gualsalvi and Salomon [?]	—
(8) <i>Hayawān (De animalibus)</i>		Southern Italy; finished between 1227 and 1234–36	Michael Scot (foreword)	33
<i>Metaphysics</i>				
<i>Ilāhiyyāt (Philosophia prima)</i>	<i>Metaphysics</i>	Toledo	Gundissalinus (mss)	25 (two recensions: 15 and 10 mss) + fragments

The Translators' Consideration of Avicenna's Works

The first translators regarded the *Šifā'* as intimately connected with Aristotle's *corpus*, by being a derivative, or a complement, or an explanation of it. Three significant examples can be adduced. In the Prologue of the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Liber de anima*, Avendeth portrays this work as a book that, in the most complete form (*plenissime*), gathers and replaces what Aristotle says in his *De anima* and *De sensu et sensato* (Avendeth mentions also the pseudo-Aristotelian *De intellectu et intellecto*).²⁹

Likewise, the fact that Alfred of Sareshel prolonged Aristotle's meteorology with the mineralogy contained in Chapters I, 1 and I, 5 of Avicenna's corresponding section reveals an acute perception of the Aristotelian inspiration of the *Šifā'*, especially if he regarded these chapters as written by Avicenna rather than by Aristotle himself.³⁰ Significantly, Alfred commented not only on Aristotle's *Meteorology*, but also on Avicenna's chapters, and described Avicenna as imitator of Aristotle and the second main philosophical authority after Aristotle ('imitator Aristotelis precipuus, immo ipso Aristotele excepto, philosophorum maximus').³¹

Finally, Michael Scot's translation of Avicenna's zoology (a reworking of Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, *De partibus animalium*, and *De generatione*

²⁹ 'Habetis ergo librum [...] ex arabico translatum: in quo quidquid Aristoteles dixit in libro suo de anima et de sensu et sensato et de intellectu et intellecto, ab auctore libri sciatis esse collectum; unde, postquam, volente Deo, hunc habetis, in hoc illos tres plenissime vos habere non dubiteris' (Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus*, I–II–III, p. 4, 21–25). On the Latin translation of the *De intellectu* of Alexander of Aphrodisias, see Burnett, 'Arabic into Latin', p. 392 and n. 11.

³⁰ According to J. K. Otte, 'Alfred of Sareshel's Commentary on Avicenna's *De congelatione et conglutinatione lapidum*', in *Aspectus et affectus: Essays and Editions in Grosseteste and Medieval Intellectual Life in Honor of R. C. Dales*, ed. by G. Freibergs (New York: AMS, 1993), pp. 105–11, Alfred did not know Avicenna's authorship of these two chapters, and translated and commented upon them as if they were by Aristotle, in order to fill the gap left open by Aristotle's promise, at the end of the third book of the *Meteorologica*, of a future treatment of minerals (a treatment actually missing in Aristotle's work). Otte's opinion is convincingly discarded by Mandosio and Di Martino, 'La "Météorologie" d'Avicenne', pp. 413–15, who prove that Alfred knew Avicenna's authorship of the Arabic text that he translated into Latin.

³¹ For Alfred's glosses on Aristotle's *Meteorology* and Avicenna's *De congelatione et conglutinatione lapidum*, see the bibliographical indications in Burnett, 'Arabic into Latin', p. 375 and n. 15. The reported expression occurs in *Alfred of Sareshel's Commentary on the Meteora of Aristotle*, ed. by J. K. Otte (Leiden: Brill 1988), p. 50, lines 18–19.

animalium) followed shortly after his translation, from Arabic, of these three Aristotelian works themselves (as a single unit, with the title *De animalibus*). It is reasonable to suppose that, after having translated Aristotle's zoology, Michael wanted to provide, with the translation of Avicenna, its interpretative tool.³² On account of all this evidence, it is safe to state that the first translators of the *Šifā'* 'intended to provide Western scholars with a commentary on Aristotle's works'.³³

Andalusian Avicennism and Ibn Daūd

Two remarks on the translations of Avicenna accomplished in Toledo during the first phase are appropriate. First, they do not reveal the 'diffidence' or 'distaste' for Avicenna's thought that is proper, in the same period and geographical area, of Averroes.³⁴ On the contrary, they seem to attest a profound esteem for, and an integral endorsement of, Avicenna's thought, especially, as we have seen, of his natural philosophy and metaphysics. In this light, these translations can be taken as another expression of that 'Andalusian Avicennism', whose Arabic side is witnessed, in positive terms, by authors deeply indebted to Avicenna such as Ibn Tufayl and, in negative terms, by the criticisms of the Andalusian followers of Avicenna by Averroes.³⁵

Second, contrary to what is often maintained, Avendeuth, rather than Gundissalinus, appears to have promoted, initiated, and led the enterprise of translating Avicenna into Latin. In other words, Avendeuth is not simply the associate of Gundissalinus in the translations of Avicenna, as the *opinio vulgata* reports; he is rather the organizer, commencer and the main one responsible for the translations, whom Gundissalinus joins.³⁶ It is Avendeuth alone, for example,

³² Similarly, by inserting the translation of fragments of the rhetoric of the *Šifā'* into his Arabic-Latin translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Hermann the German aimed at clarifying the obscurities he encountered in the Arabic translation of Aristotle's work (see d'Alverny, 'Notes', pp. 339, 347).

³³ d'Alverny, 'Translations and Translators', p. 451.

³⁴ See Gutas, 'What was there in Arabic', p. 10.

³⁵ See Amos Bertolacci, 'The "Andalusian Revolt Against Avicennian Metaphysics": Averroes' Criticism of Avicenna in the Long Commentary on the *Metaphysics*', communication held at the XIVth annual symposium of the SIEPM (*Averroès, l'averroïsme, l'antiaverroïsme*), Geneva, 4–6 October 2006.

³⁶ The lack of a clear and univocal identification of Avendeuth has certainly prompted scholars to regard him as less important than the well-known Gundissalinus. The leading role of

who succeeded in convincing the archbishop of Toledo (probably John, 1152–66) to sponsor and financially support the translation of the entire work, by presenting to him the Latin translation of the overall account of the *Šifā'* contained in Avicenna's Preface. In the foreword to the translation of the Preface, addressing the archbishop, he states:

Text 1

Wishing to excite the appetite of your studious soul for the translation of a book by Avicenna, which he called *Asschiphe*, meaning *Sufficientia*, I have undertaken to translate for your sovereignty from Arabic into Latin some chapters on general goals (*quaedam capitula intentionum universalium*) with which he prefaced his treatment of logic at the beginning of this book.³⁷

This same foreword attests also that Avendeuth disposed of several manuscripts of the *Šifā'*, since he contends that 'in most manuscripts' (*in plerisque codicibus*) al-Ġūzġānī's Introduction precedes Avicenna's Prologue.

Likewise, in the foreword to the translation of Avicenna's *De anima*, which he accomplished together with Gundissalinus, Avendeuth portrays himself, in front of the archbishop John (this time addressed by his name), as the man responsible for the translation:

Text 2

Therefore, I attended (*curavi*) to carrying your command into effect, Sir, of translating the book of the philosopher Avicenna on the soul, so that by your provision and by my labour (*meo labore*) the Latins will have firm knowledge of something hitherto unknown [...] Here then you have this book, translated from the Arabic: I led [the translation] (*nobis praecipiente*) and read out the single words as they are spoken by the people; and the archdeacon Dominicus turned the single [words] into Latin.³⁸

Avendeuth in the translations is signalled by M. Alonso Alonso, 'Traducciones del árabe al latín por Juan Hispano (Ibn Dāwūd)', *Al-Andalus*, 18 (1952), 129 (who identifies him with John of Spain); d'Alverny, 'Notes', p. 341; d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', p. 38, and, more recently, A. Fidora, 'Zum Verhältnis von Metaphysik und Theologie bei Dominicus Gundissalinus', in *Metaphysics in the Twelfth Century: On the Relationship among Philosophy, Science and Theology*, ed. by M. Lutz-Bachmann, A. Fidora, and A. Niederberger (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 67–84, and in the present volume the chapters of Fidora and Burnett.

³⁷ Birkenmajer, 'Avicennas Vorrede', p. 314, 1–7; English translation in Hasse, 'Avicenna's *De anima*', p. 4, slightly modified. The expression *quaedam capitula intentionum universalium* refers to the Prologue of the *Šifā'* (= *Madḥal*, 1, 1), where Avicenna clarifies the goal of this work (see Hasse, 'Avicenna's *De anima*', p. 4 and n. 9).

³⁸ Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de anima seu sextus de naturalibus*, 1–11–11, pp. 3–4; English translation in Hasse, 'Avicenna's *De anima*', pp. 5–6, modified.

Thus, without excluding Gundissalinus's paramount importance in the larger context of the overall Arabic-into-Latin translation movement that took place in Spain,³⁹ Avendeuth, rather than Gundissalinus, deserves to be regarded as the motive force of the program as far as the translations of Avicenna are concerned.

The leading role of Avendeuth in the first phase of translation of Avicenna is significant in many respects. First, it corroborates the identity of Avendeuth and Abraham Ibn Daūd. The main source of this latter's philosophy is Avicenna, so that his philosophical production can be regarded as 'the first attempt to systematically introduce the Aristotelianism of [...] Ibn Sina [...] into Jewish philosophy'.⁴⁰ The familiarity of Avendeuth with Avicenna's thought, and his attempt to introduce Avicennian Aristotelianism into Latin philosophy by means of the aforementioned translations, represent the mirror image of this picture.⁴¹ Second, it is in accordance with the signs of doctrinal dependence of Gundissalinus on Ibn Daūd that scholarship has detected.⁴² Third, it attests that the Andalusian Avicennism crossed cultural and religious boundaries, and was common to Arabic-Islamic, Latin-Christian and Hebrew-Jewish circles.

Thus, although a Christian scholar writing in Latin (Gundissalinus) can be regarded as the main one responsible for the diffusion of the newly accomplished Latin translations of Avicenna, by means of his original works incorporating or depending on these versions, a Jewish scholar writing in Hebrew (Ibn Daūd) — in cooperation with a Christian cleric and ecclesiastic authority — has to be credited with formulating the project of, and giving the first decisive impulse to, the enterprise of transposing Avicenna's philosophy into Latin.

³⁹ See, on this point, Burnett, 'The Translating Activity', pp. 1044–45.

⁴⁰ R. Fontaine, 'Abraham Ibn Daud', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/abraham-daud/>); rev. 10 November 2010), Sections 3, 4, 2.

⁴¹ 'spricht aus dem Übersetzungsprojekt des Avendauth der gleiche Geist wie aus Abraham Ibn Daūds Werken', 'Abraham Ibn Daūd legt ein [...] Programm [von Rationalisierung] für die jüdische Welt [...] vor, und er und Gundissalinus versuchen nun mit den Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen ins Lateinische diesen Weg auch für das Christentum zu gehen'; Fidora, 'Zum Verhältnis', pp. 22, 24.

⁴² For the impact of Ibn Daūd's *Book of the Exalted Faith* on Gundissalinus's *De processionem mundi* and *De anima*, see M. Alonso Alonso, 'Las fuentes literarias de Domingo Gundisalvo: El *De processionem mundi* de Gundisalvo y el *K. al-'aqida al-rafi'a* de Ibrahim Ibn David', *Al-Andalus*, 11 (1946), 159–73; d'Alverny, 'Notes', pp. 341–44; d'Alverny, 'Avendauth?', pp. 35–37; Gundissalinus, *The Procession of the World (De processionem mundi)*, trans. by J. A. Laumakis (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2002); Fidora, 'Zum Verhältnis', pp. 19, 22.

NATURE AND THE REPRESENTATION OF DIVINE CREATION IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

Willemien Otten

In the context of the study of twelfth-century cultural and religious diversity, which we usually attribute to its renaissance-quality resulting from its rapid urbanization and the concomitant revitalization of its schools and masters, Nature is a theme that may not immediately come to mind. And yet, as the present chapter argues, it is a theme that is of crucial importance if we want to evaluate the full breadth of the intellectual complexity of the period. This chapter will therefore concentrate on the idea of Nature and its effects on learning communities as an important feature of twelfth-century intellectual culture, an idea which has so far not received the attention that it deserves. As 'the theatre of God's glory', as Jean Calvin would term the natural order many centuries later,¹ Nature or creation provides a fitting background for discussions about religious orthodoxy and heresy, even if such discussions were fought out, for example, with more drama and emotions over other issues perhaps, as in the paradigmatic debate between Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter Abelard on salvation through Christ.² While in the latter there might have been fireworks, at least from Abelard's side, in the former, there were subtle and more nuanced, technical shifts of cosmological emphasis, whose consequences were not any less radical. We have a trace of one such shift, when in his *Dragmaticon philosophiae* William of Conches leaves out the metaphorical interpretation of the creation of Eve which was found

¹ See Susan E. Schreiner, *The Theater of His Glory: Nature and the Natural Order in the Thought of John Calvin* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1991).

² See Michael T. Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 288–325. On the Council of Sens, see Constant J. Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard, and the Fear of Social Upheaval', *Speculum*, 77 (2002), 342–82.