

Studia graeco-arabica

Studies dedicated to Rüdiger Arnzen on His Sixtieth Birthday

Edited by Yury Arzhanov

10

2020

Editorial Board

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

Staff

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

Submissions

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

Peer Review Criteria

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

Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 10 (2020), claims and customer service: redazione@pacineditore.it

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

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

ISSN 2281-2687

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

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

Editor in Chief: Cristina D'Ancona (cristina.dancona@unipi.it)

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

Italian Scientific Journals Ranking: A (ANVUR, Classe A)

Indexing and Abstracting: ERIH PLUS (SCH ESF); Index Islamicus (Brill Bibliographies); Scopus (Elsevier)

© Copyright 2020 by Pacini Editore Srl



Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Pisa

IGP Industrie Grafiche Pacini

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

Cover

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

The Distinctio sermonis super librum auditus naturalis
Attributed to Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī
in Gerard of Cremona's Latin Translation

Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

Sicut lucerna relucens in abscondito non est ponenda neque sub modio,
sed supra candelabrum locanda, sic nec splendida facta bonorum,
velut sub pigra taciturnitate sepulta, sunt reticenda, sed auribus modernorum presentanda,
cum virtutis ianuam sequentibus aperiant et antiquorum exempla
quasi vite ymaginem oculis presentium digna commemoratione insinuent.
Vita of Gerard of Cremona (incipit, p. 275.1-5 ed. Ch. Burnett).¹

Abstract

The aim of this article is to present and put into context a short and undervalued treatise attributed to al-Fārābī in the Arabic-Latin translation by Gerard of Cremona: the *Distinctio sermonis super librum auditus naturalis*. The treatise is an overview of the content of books IV to VIII of Aristotle's *Physics*, even though an internal reference to *Physics* III suggests that the text could have been more complete than as it appears in the Latin translation. The Polish historian of philosophy and science Alexander Birkenmajer presents his *editio princeps* in 1935. In the present article a revised edition is offered on the basis of two more manuscripts and, in addition, the references to Aristotle's *Physics* and an English translation are included. Finally, the attribution of this text to al-Fārābī is discussed in relationship to the ancient lists of his works, and in relationship to his writings devoted to the order of the contents in Aristotle's *Physics* – in particular the *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūṭālīs)*.

In 1935, the Polish historian of Philosophy and Science, Alexander Birkenmajer, published the critical edition of a newly discovered translation by Gerard of Cremona, that of a treatise attributed to al-Fārābī and dealing with Aristotle's *Physics*. It was published in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*.²

I would like to thank my colleague and friend Andrea Robiglio for the valuable help he gave me in studying the Latin manuscripts in which the *Distinctio* has been preserved. My warmest thanks go especially to Concetta Luna for revising my edition of the Latin text. This revision saved me from a number of errors; for those which remain I am alone responsible.

¹ I cannot find better words to thank Rüdiger Arnzen for his studies and his helpful support than the *incipit* of the *Vita*: "Just as a lit candle should not be put in a secret place or under a bushel, but must be raised up on a candlestick, so the glowing deeds of good men should not be left unspoken of, as if buried under silence and neglect, but should be presented to the ears of people of today [*moderni*], since they open the door of virtue to coming afterwards, and the example of the ancients, worthily commemorated, as it were instill an ideal image of life into the eyes of those now living" (ed. and trans. by Ch. Burnett, "The Coherence of the Arabic-Latin Translation Programme in Toledo in the Twelfth Century", *Science in Context* 14.1-2 [2001], pp. 249-88, in part. p. 254 and 275).

² A. Birkenmajer, "Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona", in *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters. Studien und Texte Martin Grabmann zur Vollendung des 60. Lebensjahres von Freunden und Schülern*

The title of this work is featured in the well-known *Commemoratio librorum*, namely the list of Gerard's translations compiled by his *socii* that is attested in manuscript Roma, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. Lat.* 2392, fols. 97v-98r (14th cent.).³ In this list, the treatise attributed to al-Fārābī features as n° 40 under the title *Distinctio Alfarabi super librum Aristotelis de naturali auditu*. The title⁴ *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* appears in the MS Assisi, Fondo antico presso la Biblioteca del Sacro Convento 663 (*olim* Biblioteca comunale, 663), fol. 92vb6-9.

The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is not a commentary; it is rather an overview of the content of books IV to VIII of Aristotle's *Physics*, even if an internal reference to the contents of *Physics* III suggests that the original text may have been more extensive than the Latin translation that is available to us. Birkenmajer suggested a parallel with another work by al-Fārābī, the *Fī Aḡrād mā ba'd al-ṭabī'a* (*The Aims of the Metaphysics*).⁵

In this paper I revise Birkenmajer's *editio princeps* of the Latin text on the basis of two additional manuscripts, namely the MSS: Sevilla, Biblioteca Colombina, 5.6.14 (S), and München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 9559 (M). I give the references to Aristotle's *Physics*, and an English translation. Finally, I discuss the attribution of this text to al-Fārābī in relationship to the ancient lists of his

gewidmet, hrsg. von A. Lang, – J. Lechner – M. Schmaus, Verlag Aschendorff, Münster i.W. 1935 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, III.1), pp. 472-81. Reprinted in *Études d'histoire des sciences et de la philosophie du moyen âge*, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław 1970 (Studia Copernicana, I), pp. 22-32.

³ This manuscript was published in its integral form – which includes also a brief biography of Gerard and a poetic praise dedicated to him in seven verses – by Baldassarre Boncompagni Ludovisi (1821-1894), “Della vita e delle opere di Gherardo cremonese, traduttore del secolo duodecimo, e di Gherardo da Sabbionetta astronomo del secolo decimoterzo. Notizie raccolte da Baldassarre Boncompagni”, *Atti dell'Accademia Pontificia de' Nuovi Lincei* 4 (1851), pp. 387-91. The document was published again by Ferdinand Wüstenfeld in 1877 [cf. F. Wüstenfeld, “Die Übersetzungen arabischer Werke in das Lateinische seit dem XI. Jahrhundert”, *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 22 (1877), pp. 58-77] and by Karl Sudhoff in 1914 [cf. K. Sudhoff, “Die Kurze Vita und das Verzeichnis der Arbeiten Gerhards von Cremona, von seinen Schülern und Studiengenossen kurz nach dem Tode des Meisters (1187) zu Toledo verabfasst”, *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 8 (1914), pp. 73-82]. In the seventies, Michel McVaugh published a partial English translation of this document in M. Mc Vaugh, “The Translation of Greek and Arabic Science into Latin. 7. A List of Translations made from Arabic into Latin in the Twelfth Century-Gerard of Cremona (ca. 1114-1187)”, in E. Grant (ed.), *A Source Book in Medieval Science*, Harvard U.P., Cambridge (Mass.) 1974, pp. 35-8.

⁴ The title is omitted in mss. Cologny, Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cod. Bodmer 10, fol. 249r29; Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, II 482, fol. 133rb46; München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, *Clm.* 9559, fol 14v1. In ms Sevilla, Biblioteca Colombina, 5.6.14, fol. 1r23 we find the following title written by a different hand in red: *Incipit Tractatus Alexandri de motu*.

⁵ Al-Fārābī, *Fī Aḡrād al-ḥakīm fī kull maqāla min al-kitāb al-mawsūm bi-l-Hurūf*, in *Alfārābī's Philosophische Abhandlungen aus Londoner, Leidener und Berliner Handschriften*, ed. F. Dieterici, Brill, Leiden 1890 (reprint in Publications of the Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science, ed. F. Sezgin, vol. XII, Frankfurt am Main 1999), pp. 34-8; al-Fārābī, *Maqāla fī aḡrād mā ba'd al-ṭabī'a*, in *Rasā'il al-Fārābī*, Dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-ūmāniyya (anonymous edition), Hyderabad 1345/1926, pp. 3-8. Cf. F. Dieterici, *Alfarabi's philosophische Abhandlungen aus dem Arabischen übersetzt*, Brill, Leiden 1892 (reprint in *Publications of the Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science*, ed. F. Sezgin, vol. XIII, Frankfurt am Main 1999), pp. 54-60, pp. 213-14; Th.-A. Druart, “Le traité d'al-Fārābī sur les buts de la Métaphysique d'Aristote”, *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 24 (1982), pp. 38-43; R. Ramón Guerrero, “Al-Fārābī y la Metafísica de Aristóteles”, *La Ciudad de Dios* 196 (1983), pp. 211-40, in part. pp. 225-40; D. Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition, Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works*, Brill, Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1988 (Islamic Philosophy Theology and Science, 4), pp. 237-42; G. Endress, “The Defence of Reason: the Plea for Philosophy in the Religious Community”, *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Arabisch-Islamischen Wissenschaften* 6 (1990), pp. 1-49, in part. p. 19; R. Arnzen, “Ibn Rušd on the Structure of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*”, *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 21 (2010), pp. 375-410.

works, and in relationship to his writings devoted to the order of the contents in Aristotle's *Physics* – in particular the *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūṭālīs)*.

I. The Manuscript Tradition: Some Facts

The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is extant in five manuscripts.⁶ The basic information on the manuscript tradition includes the following:

(A) MS Assisi, Fondo antico presso la Biblioteca del Sacro Convento 663 (*olim* Biblioteca comunale, 663) – ff. 1-77 (XIV cent.), 78-120 (XIII cent.), 122-145 (XIII cent.), et 146-186 (XIII cent.); 186ff., two columns. The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is found at fols. 92vb-93vb.

Cf. C. Cenci O.F.M., *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacrum conventum Assisiensem*, Casa Editrice Franciscana, Assisi 1981, vol. I, pp. 158-9, n. 162; see also Lacombe-Birkenmajer-Dulong-Franceschini-Minio Paluello (eds.), *Aristoteles latinus. Codices*, II, pp. 878-80, n. ° 1267 (brief description under *Assisiensis Bibl. Communalis* 663). S.D. Wingate noticed the presence of the treatise *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* attributed to al-Fārābī in this MS, in 1931 (cf. S.D. Wingate, *The Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus: With special reference to the biological works*, The Courier Press, London 1931, p. 123). An incomplete description of the MS is found in G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, IV, L. Bordandini, Forlì 1894, p. 129, who did not mention the *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis*.

(C) Cologne, Fondation Martin Bodmer, *Cod. Bodmer* 10 (*olim* Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1341) – XIII century; 251ff.. This MS was probably intended for didactic use, perhaps of a student of the Art Faculty in Leipzig, as can be inferred from a list of lectures from 1439 that was included in the Codex (cf. Pellegrin, *Manuscrits latins de la Bodmeriana*, quoted below, pp. 25-6). It was housed in the Leipzig University Library at least since the early 15th century; it got lost during the Second World War, and was acquired by Martin Bodmer in the summer of 1958. The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is found at fols. 249r-250v.

Cf. E. Pellegrin, *Manuscrits latins de la Bodmeriana*, Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cologne-Genève 1982, pp. 25-33 (URL: <<https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/it/description/fmb/cb-0010/>> last consulted 2020-10-09); G. Lacombe – A. Birkenmajer – M. Dulong – E. Franceschini – L. Minio Paluello, *Aristoteles latinus. Codices*, La Libreria dello Stato, Roma 1939, I, pp. 698-9, n. ° 966 (Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi): brief description under *Lipsiensis Bibl. Univ.* 1341. See also Birkenmajer, “Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona” (above, n. 2), p. 474.

⁶ Birkenmajer, “Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona” (above, n. 1), p. 475, noticed that a copy of the “*Distinctio Albumazar super librum eudem*” (*Physicorum*) was in the library of the Sorbonne in the middle of the 15th century (Birkenmajer refers to L. Delisle, *Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Imprimerie Impériale, Paris 1881, vol. III, p. 77); he searched in vain for the manuscript in the present collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Moreover, Birkenmajer noticed that in the manuscript British Library, *Royal* 12. C. XV there is no “*Tractatus Alpharabii de tempore translatus a magistro G. Cremonensi Tholeti*”, as the colophon reports (fol. 149).

(G) Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, II 482. Dated: XIII century; ff. 242, two columns. The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is found at fols. 133rb-134ra.

Cf. H. Zotter, *Handschriften der UB-Graz*, URL <<http://sosa2.uni-graz.at/sosa/katalog/katalogisate/482.html>; https://manuscripta.at/hs_detail.php?ID=23536> (consulted on December 07, 2020). See also L. Thorndike – P. Kibre, *A Catalogue of incipits of Medieval Scientific Writings in Latin*, The Medieval Academy of America, London 1963, p. 1074; M.-T. D’Alverny, “Avicenna Latinus, Codices Austriaci”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 33 (1966), pp. 305-27, in part. p. 312 n°11. The MS was discovered by Birkenmajer himself in 1920: cf. Birkenmajer, “Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona” (above n. 1), p. 473.

(S) Sevilla, Biblioteca Colombina, 5.6.14 – XIII century; ff. 164. The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is found at fols. 1r - 2r.

Cf. J.F. Sáez Guillém, *Catálogo de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Colombina de Sevilla. Elaboración de índices P. Jiménez De Cisneros Vencelá*, Cabildo de la S.M. Y.P.I. Catedral de Sevilla, institución Colombina, Sevilla 2002, pp. 325-7; see also M.-T. D’Alverny, “Avicenna Latinus, Codices Ispanici”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age* 33 (1968), pp. 301-5, in part. p. 303.

(M) München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 9559 – XV century; ff. 150. The *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* is found at fols. 14v-15r.

Cf. Thorndike-Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Medieval Scientific Writings in Latin*, p. 1074. See also *Avicenna Latinus. Codices*. Descripsit M.-T. D’Alverny, addenda collegerunt S. Van Riet et P. Jodogne, Académie Royale de Belgique – Peeters – Brill, Louvain-la-Neuve – Leiden 1994, p. 393, and M. Grabmann, *Neue aufgefundenen Werke des Siger von Brabant und Boetius von Dacien*, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 1924 (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Philologische und Historische Klasse 1924, 2).

(Birkenmajer) *Editio princeps* – see the bibliographical references quoted above, n. 2.

II. A Revised Edition

Birkenmajer’s *editio princeps* has the merit – also thanks to S.D. Wingate’s PhD dissertation published in 1931⁷ – to have definitively identified the text and to have provided its critical edition, which made the *Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alpharabi super librum auditus naturalis* available to the scholars. Birkenmajer in his work does not devote any observation to the ecdotic principles he uses.

The *editio princeps* was published by Birkenmajer on the basis of manuscripts A, C and G. He did not take into account S and M. The former (S) was known to Birkenmajer, who however did not use it;⁸ the latter (M) was unknown to Birkenmajer. In spite of the fact that (M) is a later manuscript of the XV century, it preserves a text certainly superior to that of the other manuscripts in one case, at p. 278.1-2 below.

⁷ S.D. Wingate, *The Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus: With Special Reference to the Biological works*, The Courier Press, London 1931.

⁸ Birkenmajer, “Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona” (above, n. 2), p. 475; and below § 11.

The edition that I present here uses the two further witnesses of the text mentioned above, M and S and, as in the work of Birkenmajer, presents all the different readings recorded in the five manuscripts which I consider in the apparatus. The text of Birkenmajer's *editio princeps* has been modified in the following passages: p. 276.12; p. 278.1-2; p. 280.18; 284.12 below.

III. Codicum conspectus

A – Assisi, Fondo antico presso la Biblioteca del Sacro Convento 663, fols. 92vb - 93vb

C – Cologne, Fondation Martin Bodmer, Cod. Bodmer 10, fols. 249r - 250v

G – Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, II 482, foll. 133rb - 134ra

S – Sevilla, Biblioteca Colombina, 5. 6. 14, fols. 1r - 2r

M – München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 9559, fols. 14v - 15r

Birkenmajer – *editio princeps* Birkenmajer (1935)

Incipit distincio sermonis Abunazar Alfarabi super librum auditus naturalis, in quo rememoratur intencionis Aristotilis in unoquoque tractatu qui est in eo.

Eius uerba:

5 Postquam narrauit Aristotiles in tractatibus quatuor libri de auditu naturali res existentes communicantes in omnibus corporibus naturalibus, et sunt materia et forma (que due sunt intra rem) et agens et finis (que due sunt cause extra rem), et dixit motum et diffiniuit ipsum et que sequuntur motum et sumuntur in diffinitione eius, sicut infinitum et locus et inane et tempus (nam non inuenitur naturale uacuum ab istis rebus, et sunt materia et forma, et agens et paciens, et locus et tempus et motus et infinitum. Quies uero est inuenta in corporibus naturalibus motis secundum
10 rectitudinem; in rememoracione autem inanis loquitur Aristotiles propterea, quod putatur de eo, quia existit et negat ipsum existere penitus. Infinitum uero fecit nos inuenire Aristotiles in omni corpore et non corpore, secundum quod diffiniuit et exposuit ipsum), dixit in tractatu quinto esse motus et mutacionis.

15 Et non iterauit motum in hoc tractatu, nisi quia narrauit rememoracionem intencionis sue in quinto de esse eius planius, quam dixit ipsum in eis, que precesserunt. Intencio namque eius in eis, que precesserunt, fuit, ut diffiniret motum et faceret scire quia existit; in hoc autem tractatu exposuit ipsum expositione manifesta et exposuit ea, que continuantur cum motu et ei sunt comparia.

20 Et incepit dicere mutacionem naturalem et innaturalem, et dixit, quod motus essentialis est in mouente solo absque moto et absque tempore et loco, et illud ex quo mouetur et ad quod mouetur. Et dimisit dicere motum accidentalem et dixit, quod motus per se est ex rebus contrariis ad res contrarias. Cum ergo sit illud ita, tunc motus non est nisi in qualitate (et est alteracio) et in quantitate (et est augmentum et diminucio) et in ubi (et est localis mutacio).

25 Generacionem autem et corrupcionem negat esse motum, immo nominat eas in quibusdam locis mutacionem. Eius namque posicio fuit quod motum mouetur ex aliquo ad aliquid et ex contrario ad contrarium suum; sed non est generacio et corrupcio ex aliquo ad aliquid. Quod si aliquis dixerit, quod materia mouetur per generacionem et corrupcionem ex aliquo ad aliquid, scilicet ex priuacione ad formam, dicitur quod priuacio non est aliquid ad quod motus fiat, sicut et eidem motus ex nigredine ad albedinem aut ex sanitate ad egritudinem. Mutacio igitur generacionis est ex non esse ad esse et ex esse ad non esse.

10-11 in rememoracione—existit Arist., *Phys* IV 6, 213a12-14 || 11 et—penitus *Phys* IV 8, 216b20-21 || 20-21 Et dimisit—ad res contrarias *Phys* V 1, 224a26-29 || 21-22 motus non est—mutacio *Phys* V 1, 225b7-9 || 23 immo nominat—mutacionem *Phys* V 1, 224b8-9 || 28-29 Mutacio—non esse *Phys* V 1, 224b35-225a20.

1 Abunazar] Abimazar A || 1-3 Incipit – uerba rubr. A] Incipit tractatus Alexandri de motu *al. m. rubr. S om. GCM* || 4 auditu] libri *add. et del. A* || 5 et² *s.l. al. m. S* || 6 agens] efficiens A | due] etiam *add. GMS (mg. al. m. S)* | que due sunt et cause extra rem *mg. al. m. S* | diffiniuit] diffinit A || 7 motum et] ipsum A | et tempus] *post G* || 8 naturale] ex illis *add. et del. A* | istis] illis A || 10 rememoracione] remonicionem *S^{ac} (al. m. corr.)* | inanis] motus A maius *GM^{mg} magis M* | quod *om. A* || 11 existit] existat S | penitus] in tempore (?) *add. S^{ac} | inuenire] lac. C* | fecit nos inuenire Aristotiles] nos fecit Aristotiles inuenire M || 12 non *s.l. M* | et non corpore *om. S* | diffiniuit] diffinit M | exposuit] exponit *CGMS Birkenmajer* || 13 esse] rememoracionem *add. M* || 14 motum in hoc tractatu] in hoc tractatu motum *S^{ac}* || 15 eius *s.l. al. m. S* | planius] plenius uel *praem. A* | exposuit] exponit A || 17 expositione] expone *CM* | exposuit] exponit *AM* | continuantur] continentur A continentur *praem. et del. M* | comparia] compedita A || 18 Et] non *add. A* | incepit] incipit A | innaturalem] non naturalem A | motus] naturalis *add. et del. G* | essentialis est *inv. M* || 19 loco] locum *CMS* | ex *om. S* || 20 dicere] dividere M | rebus contrariis *inv. A* || 21 sit illud *inv. M* | illud] istud A | motus *om. S* | et²] est *add. A om. M* || 22 et³ *om. M* || 23 autem et] n *add. et del. G om. A* | nominat eas *inv. A* | quibusdam] quibus G || 24 mutacionem] mutaciones A | namque] quidem A | ex] de S || 25 ad¹] in A | ad²] in A || 25-26 quod si aliquis – aliquid *om. A* || 26 materia] natura G || 27 ex *om. G* | ad¹] in A | dicitur] dicitur A | motus] nutus *GS^{ac}* || 28 et eidem] est *AM* et aliquid S | nigredine ad albedinem] albedine in nigredinem A | ad²] in A || 29 et ex] et corruptio ex A non *add. et del. C* | ad²] in A.

The beginning of the chapter in the discourse by Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī on the *Book of the Physics*, where Aristotle's aim in each treatise present in this book is recalled.

His words are:

Then, in the fourth treatise of the *Book of the Physics*, Aristotle speaks about the existing realities which are common to all the natural bodies, and they are matter and form – both of which are inside the thing – and agent and end – both of which are causes outside the thing. And he talks about motion, he defines it and that which follows motion and is implied in its definition, as the infinite, place, void, and time – in fact, a natural void is not found arising from these things, and they are matter and form, agent and patient, place and time, motion and infinite. Rest is found, indeed, in the natural bodies which move in straight line. Therefore, in recalling (the notion of) void, Aristotle recounts what he thinks about it, whether it exists, and he denies that it exists in any way. Aristotle makes us know that the infinite is in every corporeal and incorporeal thing according to what he has defined and presented; he tells in the fifth treatise what is the being of motion and change.

He does not treat again motion in this treatise, if not in recalling his aim in the fifth treatise to clarify it more if compared with the explanation given it in the previous chapters. In fact, his aim in the previous chapters was to define motion and to let people know why it exists; in this treatise, instead, he presents it with a clear explanation and clarifies the things which follow motion and are like it.

He starts to say that change is either natural or unnatural; he says that the essential motion is in what moves by itself alone, apart from (any other) motion, time and place, and it is that (motion) from which the thing moves and to which the thing moves. He dismisses accidental motion and he says that the motion by itself is from contrary things to contrary things. Therefore, if this is the case, the motion is in quality – and this is alteration – and in quantity – and this is increase and decrease – and in space – and this is local change.

He does not accept that generation and corruption are motion, even if he labels them change here and there. His position is that the thing moved is moved from something to something else and from a contrary to its contrary; now, generation and corruption are not from something to something else. Therefore, if one says that matter is moved because of generation and corruption from something to something else, namely from privation to form, he replies that privation is not something to which belongs motion, as in the case of the motion from blackness to whiteness or from health to disease. In fact, the change of generation (and corruption) is from not being to being and from being to not being.

Et ego quidem non uolo per sermonem meum quod aliquid mutetur ex non esse, scilicet ex priuacione penitus non existente, sed uolo, quia actu est non existens, potencia uero est existens.

Deinde dixit quod in predicamento in quo inuenitur contrarietas, in illo eodem inuenitur motus, quoniam posuit quod motus est ex contrario ad contrarium. Dixit ergo, quod est in qualitate et
5 quantitate et ubi, et remouit ab omnibus predicamentis, ut sit in eis motus essentialis per se, et fecit quibusdam eorum necessarium esse motum per accidens, proprie predicamento 'pati'. Et dixit: "Non est sermo noster in accidente". Deinde dixit quod quiescens quando mouetur, non est possibile, ut moueatur ad motum mouentem ipsum quem suscipit, nisi per viam accidentis.

Deinde loquitur in rebus existentibus in motibus, et sunt consecucio et assebea (et intencio assebea
10 est occursus) et simul et continuum et quod inter et singulariter. Et diffinit unumquodque eorum. Deinde loquitur de motu uno secundum quot modos dicatur. Dixit ergo, quod dicitur de motu in genere et motu in specie et motu per numerum. Et exponit esse motus per numerum et diffinit ipsum. Et dicit motus diuersos. Deinde dicit oppositiones motuum et oppositiones quietum et qui eorum quibus opponantur et exponit illud.

15 Intencio igitur eius de istis est exponere esse mutacionis et motus et eorum, que continuantur cum motu et que eis sunt compara, et dicit quod sunt continua.

In tractatu autem sexto est eius intencio ut faciat nos scire quod omne continuum diuiditur in infinitum. Et ipse quidem iam dixerat quiddam de illo in fine tractatus tercii. Intencio namque eius fuit in illo tractatu ut faceret nos scire quod infinitum non est in corporibus sensibilibus neque in
20 rebus intellectis; et succedit illi dicendo quia inuenitur in diuisione et particione continui. Et exponit in tractatu sexto spacium et corpus et tempus et ad summum quod est continuum per se semper in infinitum. Et incepit et dixit quod omne continuum impossibile est ut sit compositum ex eis que non diuiduntur. Et dixit post illud quod motus et quod tempus et quod spacium diuisibilia. Et dixit quod si tempus est diuisibile, tunc magnitudo diuiditur, et quod secundum quod est
25 magnitudo de diuisionibus et longitudine infinite, est tempus, et quod secundum illud secundum quod est tempus, de illo est magnitudo. Et intencio illius est quod si magnitudo est infinita, tunc prolongatur tempus infinite; et si est diuisio continui infinite, tunc diuisio temporis est infinita; et si magnitudo et continuitas sunt finite, tunc est tempus finitum.

3-5 Deinde—per se *Phys* V 1, 225a34-225b14; V 2, 226a23-26 || 6-7 Non est—accidente *Phys* V 2, 226a22-23 || 9-10 Deinde loquitur—eorum *Phys* V 3, 226b18-21; 226b34-227b2 || 11 Deinde—dicatur *Phys* V 4, 227b3-4 || 11-12 Dixit ergo—numerum *Phys* V 4, 227b4-22 || 13-14 Deinde dicit—illud *Phys* V 5, 229a7-8 || 22-23 Et incepit—diuiduntur *Phys* VI 1, 231a24 || 23 et dixit—diuisibilia *Phys* VII 231b18-20 || 24-28 Et dixit—finitum *Phys* VI 2, 233a10-18, 32-34.

1 non uolo] nolo AM | quod aliquid mutetur] *om.* ACGS | scilicet] quia *corr.* Birkenmajer || 2 existente] ente A | uolo] nolo M | actu *corr. ex* actum G | est non *inv.* M non *s.l.* C est *s.l.* G | est *om.* AM || 3 dixit] dicit A | 4 quoniam] quia A | 4-5 qualitate et quantitate] quantitate qualitate A quantitate et qualitate CS | remouit] remouet A | motus] uel (?) *add. et del.* A | essentialis *om.* CM || 7 Quod] et S || 8 quem] qui A || 9 in¹] de G | intencio] et *add.* G | assebea¹⁻²] assabea GS | et intencio assabea *mg. al. m.* S || 10 occursus] concursus S | diffinit] diffinit M || 9-11 in rebus existentibus – Deinde loquitur *om.* A | Dixit] Dicit G | dicitur *om.* M | de motu *om.* M || 12 diffinit] diffiniuit M || 13 qui] que M || 14 illud *om.* A || 15 eius *om.* CM | que] qui A || 16 cum motu] per motum uel *praem.* A | que] eque A | eis] ei M | dicit] dixit A || 17 autem] eius *add.* A | nos] non A | diuiditur] diuisibile uel diuiditur (uel diuiditur *s.l.*) A || 18 quidem] qui C | quiddam] quedam A quidam S^c (*mg. corr. al. m.*) | tractatus tercii *inv.* A || 19 neque] nec M | in *s.l.* S || 20 quia] quoniam A, quod GM et *s.l.* *add.* G | et *om.* G | particione] participacione GS || 22 in *om.* G || 23 diuiduntur] componuntur et *praem.* A | Quod tempus et quod spacium] tempus et spacium A, spacium et tempus G | diuisibilia] sunt *praem.* A || 24 dixit] dicit A | diuiditur *corr. ex* diuiditur (*sic*) C | quod *om.* G | secundum] illud secundum *add.* M || 25 infinite] et infinite M | secundum] *om.* S || 26 quod si] secundum quod A | magnitudo] infinita *add.* G | tunc *om.* S || 27 continui] u *praem. et del.* C *om.* M | infinite] infinita M || 27-28 Diuisio temporis – sunt finite tunc *om.* G || 28 et continuitas *corr. ex* continuitatis A | est tempus *inv.* M | finitum *corr. ex* infinitum G.

However, I do not intend to say that something is changed from not being, i.e. from a privation which is radically non-existent, rather I mean that it is non-existent in act, but it is potentially existent.

Then, he says that what is in a category in which contrariety occurs, in that (thing) motion occurs, because he had stated (before) that motion is from a contrary to a contrary. So he means that this occurs in quality, quantity, and place; on the other hand, in all the (other) categories it is not the case that there is an essential motion by itself, even if he maintains that for some of them accidental motion is necessary, in particular for the category of 'to be affected'. And he says: "Our discourse is not about the accident". Then, he claims that that which is in rest, when it is moved, cannot be moved by the same moving motion which it (i.e. which was in rest) receives, if not by accident.

Then, he speaks about the things featuring kinds of motion which are the 'consecutive', the 'together' (and the meaning of 'together' is encounter), the 'in contact', the 'continuous', 'what is intermediate', and 'what is separate'; and he defines each of them. Then, he explains in how many ways motion is said to be 'one'; and he expounds the doctrine about motion according to genus, according to species, and according to number. He explains what it is motion according to number and he defines it. He mentions the different motions. Then, he describes the oppositions of the kinds of motion and the oppositions of the kinds of rest, and their respective oppositions, and he explains that.

His intention in these (chapters) is to explain the being of change, of motion, and of those (things) which follow motion and are like it, and he says (that they are so) because they are continuous.

In the sixth treatise his intention is to let us know that every continuous is divisible infinitely. He himself has already said something about this at the end of the third treatise. In fact, his intention in that treatise was to let us know that the infinite is neither in the sensible bodies nor in the intelligible things, and he concluded by saying that the infinite exists in the division and partition of the continuous. In the sixth treatise he discusses space, body, time and accounts for the fact that the continuous is always in and of itself infinite. He starts to say that it is impossible for everything which is continuous to be composed of things which are not divisible. And, after that, he says that motion, time, and space are divisible. He continues to say that if time is divisible, then magnitude can be divided and (he concludes) that time (is divisible) according to that with which magnitude is infinitely divisible and great, and (vice versa) magnitude (is divisible) according to that with which time (is infinitely divisible and great). His intention is (to state) that if magnitude is infinite then time also goes on infinitely; if the division of the continuous is infinite, then the division of time is also infinite; if magnitude and continuity are finite, then time is also finite.

Et loquitur iterum in hoc quod instans unum et idem est tempori preterito et futuro, et quod non mouetur aliquid in instanti neque quiescit in eo, et quod principium mutacionis est instans, et quod principium motus, in quantum est hoc principium, est pars motus, cui non est principium. Et similiter dicit quod omnis continui principium est pars eius, cui non est principium, quoniam ipsum est existens in tempore et diuiditur diuisionibus temporis, eius uero principium non diuiditur, quoniam non est in tempore, immo in instanti. Et dixit quod omne mutabile, et est illud quod semper mutatur, ante aliquam horarum suarum in sempiternitate sua, qua mutatur, iam mutatur; et quod illud quod iam mutatur, ante aliquam horarum suarum in mutacione sua iam semper mutatur; et quod causa in illo est aggregatio diuisionum in infinitum.

10 Deinde dixit quod illud quod non partitur non occurrit ei quod non partitur.

Et dixit, quod corpus finitum non abscedit spacium finitum in tempore infinito, et quod secundum illud secundum quod est spacium, de illo est tempus, et quod secundum illud secundum quod est tempus, est spacium; scilicet si est hoc finitum, tunc hoc est finitum, et si hoc est infinitum, tunc hoc est infinitum, et quod unum eorum in illo est ligatum cum altero. Et similiter eciam spacium et 15 similiter corpus et similiter motus secundum illud secundum quod est tempus, est unumquodque eorum; et secundum quod est unumquodque eorum, est aliud.

Et loquitur in hoc quod stans est motum, quando incipit esse in uia stacionis, et quod stat in tempore, et in deceptionibus uel sophismatibus Zenonis, et in destructione sua, qua destruit motum, et in hoc, quod illud quod non partitur, non mouetur per se, et in hoc, quod non erit sempiterna, 20 nisi mutacionem sequatur mutacio alia (dicit ergo quod est sempiterna genere), et in hoc, quod motus circularis est sempiternus specie et non sempiternus individuo.

In tractatu autem septimo est eius intencio ut faciat nos scire, quod omne motum non mouetur nisi ab aliquo, et quia non est inter mouens et motum medium penitus. Et facit apparere istas res per rememoracionem earum. Dicit ergo in primis quod motum aut mouetur a re, que est extra ipsum, 25 aut mouetur a se ipso; et quia si propter illud motum est motum, tunc illud non erit in infinitum, immo est ei finis, et est motum per se. Deinde, omne motum per se, cuius principium est motum extrinsecus, tunc non est inter mouens ipsum et inter ipsum medium omnino; et uult per illud quia non est inter motum postremum et motum primum medium penitus.

1 Et loquitur–futuro *Phys* VI 2-3, 233b33-234a20 || 1-2 et quod–in eo *Phys* VI 3, 234a24-25, 31-34 || 6-9 Et dixit–infinitum *Phys* VI 6, 237a17-b9 || 10 Deinde–partitur *Phys* VI 6, 237b7-8 || 11–16 Et dixit–aliud *Phys* VI.7 || 17-18 Et loquitur–in tempore *Phys* VI 8 238b24-29 || 19-21 et in hoc²–individuo *Phys* VI 10 || 25-26 et quia–et est motum per se *Phys* VII 1, 241b34-36 || 26-28 Deinde–penitus *Phys* VII 2, 244a5-6; 245a16-b2.

1 iterum] uerum G || 2 non *mg.* S | non mouetur aliquid] aliquid non mouetur A | est] et A || 3 hoc] huic A | est] et A | pars] principium *praem. et del.* M | motus] uel eius *s.l.* *add.* A | cui *om.* C | non *s.l.* A || 4 eius *om.* M | 4-5 quoniam ipsum] id est continuum quoniam ipsum A quoniam continuum ipsum GS (“*minime dubitandum quin hoc uerbum continuum ex glossa interlineari in textum receptum sit*” sic Birkenmajer) || 6 in] est *praem.* A, *om.* G | mutabile] mutabile (sic) G *om.* M | et *om.* C | est] eciam A || 7 ante] antequam G | sua *om.* C | mutatur] mutatur uel narratur *add.* A || 7-8 et quod illud – mutatur *om.* A || 8 illud quod *om.* C | iam²] non M || 9 in illo] illa A | diuisionum] diffinicionum G || 10 non *om.* C | partitur] patitur GS^{ac} | occurrit] accidit A | quod non – ei quod *om.* M | partitur] patitur GS^{ac} || 11 dixit] dicit A | abscedit] accipit A | infinito] finito GS | Secundum *s.l.* A || 12 illud¹] id G | secundum¹ *om.* A | illud²] id G | secundum² *om.* A | spacium de illo – secundum quod est *om.* C || 13 scilicet *om.* A | hoc] hic GS | finitum] infinitum M | hoc¹] hic G | hoc²] hic G || 14 eorum] eo et C | eorum in illo] illorum A | altero] alio AM | et² *om.* GS || 15 corpus] extra A | secundum² *om.* C | est] et AG || 16 et *om.* GS | secundum] illud secundum *add.* M *om.* C | est¹ *om.* A || 18 uel] et ABirkenmajer *deest* C | uel sophismatibus *om.* C || 19 quod² *om.* C | partitur] patitur S^{ac} (*corr. al. m.*) | erit] est A || 20 mutacio alia *inv.* C | est *om.* A | sempiterna] est *add. et del.* M || 22 autem] eius *add.* C | eius *om.* A | nos] non A || 23 mouens et motum] motum et mouens CMS || 24 earum] eorum G | motum] res mota A | ipsum] ipsam A || 25 se] re *praem. et del.* A | ipso] ipsa A | illud] erit A | in *om.* M || 26 ei] ibi A *om.* M | finis *iter. et corr.* G | est motum] motus A mouetur C || 26-27 motum extrinsecus *inv.* G | illud] illo S | quia] quod AG || 28 medium *om.* C.

He repeats again here that the instant is one and the same for the past and the future, and that nothing is moved in the instant nor is it at rest in the instant, and that the principle of change is the instant and that the principle of motion, in so far as it is such a principle, is a part of motion which has no principle. And similarly, he says that in every continuous the principle is that part of it which has no principle, because (the continuous) itself exists in time and it is divided according to the divisions of time, while its principle is not divided because is not in time, but in the instant. He affirms that every changeable – i.e. that which always changes – is already changing before any of its moments in its eternity in which it changes; and (he states) that which is already changing before any of its moments in his changing, is changing all along; and (he says) that the cause for it is the connection of the infinite divisions.

Then, he says that to what is non-divided (into parts), does not occur (as contiguous) what is non-divided (into parts).

He adds that a finite body does not cross a finite space in an infinite time and that time follows the nature of space, and space follows the nature of time; so if the first is finite, the second is also finite, and if the first is infinite, the second is also infinite, and in this respect each of the two is linked to the other. Space, body and motion also operate in the same way: each of them follows the nature of time, and according to what is each of them, it is also the other.

In this (treatise) he explains that what is at rest is moved when it starts to be at rest, and it is in time; (he presents) Zeno's deceptions or sophistries and the refutation of his arguments against motion; in this (treatise he addresses) that which is non-divisible in parts, which cannot be moved by itself; in this (treatise he considers) that which cannot eternal, if not in the sense that a change is followed by a change – and he explains what is eternal according to the genus; finally, in this (treatise he speaks about) the fact that the circular motion is eternal according to the species, but not according to the individual.

In the seventh treatise his intention is to let us know that everything which is moved is moved only by something else, and that there is no intermediate between the mover and the thing moved. And he clarifies these things by recalling them. First of all, he explains that a thing which is moved is moved either by something which is outside it, or by itself; and (he says) that if it is for the first reason that what is moved has been moved, then this cannot go on infinitely, but there is an end for it and it is that which is moved by itself. Then, (he continues that) in the case of everything which is moved by itself and whose principle is an external motion, there is no intermediate between it and its mover. And he means that there is no intermediate between the last thing moved and the first thing moved.

Deinde dicit, secundum quot modos fit motio corporis per corpus, et ostendit ex eo, quia non est medium inter mouens et motum. Deinde ostendit, quia non est medium inter alterans et alteratum, neque medium inter augmentans et augmentatum.

Deinde loquitur de alteracione et in quibus rebus est et in quibus qualitatibus est.

5 Deinde loquitur de motibus et qui applicant quibus et qui non applicant, et qui equantur et qui non equantur; et qualiter est proporcionalitas uirtutum mouencium ad res, que mouentur ab eis, et ad motus factos ab eis.

10 In tractatu autem octauo dixit in primis mundum totum sicut conueniens est, ut fiat inquisicio naturalis de omni re. Et est conueniens, si motus existens est, ut hic sit motus assiduus sempiternus, qui non cessauit neque cessabit, quoniam causa huius motus est non corpus, et quod ipsa non permutatur nec mutatur nec alteratur. Propter illud ergo non est possibile, ut causatum eius mutetur, et quia cum inueniatur motum in quibusdam horis, tunc non est possibile ut non sit in omnibus horis motum motu qui est actu. Et uult per illud motum, quod est causatum cause prime, que non est corpus, quoniam loquitur in mundo toto et causa eius, que est non corpus. Fit ergo 15 conueniens illi cause, ut sit causatum eius motum semper.

Et fit necessarium post illud ut non sit causa moti quod uides intercise moueri et quiescere, illa eadem causa que est causa rei mote semper, scilicet causa huius motus intercisi non est illius motus sempiterni. Et dixit quod iste motus intercisi (et est generacio et corruptio) sequitur se ad inuicem semper. Et dicit quod causa in illo et in mutacione eius est mutacio motus sempiterni 20 per depressionem et eleuacionem Solis in latitudine ipsius.

Et dixit quia si mouens est motum, tunc non est illud in infinitum, immo incipit illud motum esse motum ex se ipso et per se ipsum, cui non est motor alius, qui ipsum moueat, immo motus eius esse ex se ipso. Et dixit quod istud motum quod est motum ex se ipso, non est nisi quia aliquid eius mouet aliquid eius, quoniam non est possibile ut totum moueat se ipsum et ipsum idem totum 25 moueatur, quoniam mouet et mouetur et calefacit et calefit et docet et docetur et creat et creatur ex contrarietate et opposicione. Quod si possibile esset ut in essencia rei esset opposicio, simul esset essencia eius (uerbi gracia) nigra et alba, et calida et frigida simul. Ergo pars eius mouet et pars eius mouetur.

1-2 Deinde–motum *Phys* VII 2, 243b15-244a14 || 2-3 Deinde–alteratum *Phys* VII 2, 244b3-245a11 || 3 neque medium–augmentatum *Phys* VII 2, 245a11-16 || 4 Deinde–qualitatibus est *Phys* VII 3 || 5-7 Deinde–ab eis *Phys* VII 4-5 || 8-10 In tractatu–cessabit *Phys* VIII 1 || 23-28 Et dixit–mouetur *Phys* VIII 5, 257b2-15.

1 quot] quod G | ostendit ex eo] ex eo ostendit G | quia] quod AG || 2 quia] quod A | est²] ei *add.* M || 3 augmentans] augmentum A || 4 rebus est *inv.* A | est² *om.* C 5 Deinde] Et *praem.* A | applicant¹] applicantur A applicauit S^{ac} | applicant²] applicantur A | qui *om.* A || 6 et qui non equantur *om.* C || 7 et ad motus factos ad eis *om.* M | factos ab eis *iter.* C || 9 hic sit *corr. ex* sit hic G || 10 neque] nec CMS | huius] huiusmodi M || 11 non¹] nec A | nec¹] neque G || 12 motum] motus C | motum] motus C | est *mg. al. m.* S || 13 motu] quam *add.* S *om.* M | qui est actu] quo et motum A | illud] per *add. et del.* G | causatum] et uult per illud motum causatum quod est *add.* A || 14 quoniam] quia A | est non *inv.* MS^{ac} | quoniam – corpus *om.* C | ergo *om.* M || 16 fit] sit AM | intercise] interscise AM | quiescere] quod eidem G || 17 intercisi] interscisi A || 18 intercisi] interscisi A | et *om.* A | sequitur] sequuntur A || 19 ad *om.* A | in² *om.* AC || 20 Solis – Et dixit Birkenmajer] solis in latitudine ipsius A Et dixit in latitudine illius CGSM || 21 quia] quod AS | in *om.* M | illud *s.l. al. m.* G || 22 se² *om.* S || 22-23 et per se ipsum – ex se ipso *om.* M | dixit] dicit A | istud] illud AMS | motum ex se ipso] ex se ipso motum A || 24 idem] illud S || 25 quoniam] quando M | creat] crea *add. et del.* M | creat et creatur] causat et causatur A || 26 ex] et A || 27 essencia eius post gracia *transp.* A | nigra et alba] alba et nigra A | et *om.* C | simul] sunt G || 28 eius *om.* A.

Then he states the many ways in which the motion of a body in a body occurs, and from this he shows that there is no intermediate between the mover and the thing moved, and that there is no intermediate between the altering body and the altered body, nor between the augmenting body and the augmented body.

Then, he indicates, in which things and qualities alteration occurs.

Then, he speaks about motions: which motions belong and do not belong to which things, which motions are and are not equivalent, and how the moving powers correspond to the things which are moved by them and to the motions they impart.

In the eighth treatise, first of all he considers all the world as it is appropriate for a natural investigation of everything. Granted that motion exists, there must be an eternal continuous motion which did not cease and will not cease, because the cause of this motion is not a body, and it does not change, mutate, or alter. Therefore, because of this, it is not possible that what is caused by it changes. For, when we find something which is moved at any time, it is not possible that in the whole time does not exist something moved with a motion which is in act. This motion means for him that which is caused by a first cause, which is not a body, for he is speaking about the whole world and its cause, which is not a body. It is proper to this cause that that which is caused by it is always in motion.

Therefore, the cause of motion for that which – as you can see – intermittently moves and stands still must not be the same cause as the cause of the thing which moves always: namely, the cause of this intermittent motion is not that of the eternal motion. He says that this intermittent motion, i.e. the generation and corruption, is indeed continuous, but the cause of it and of its change is the change of the eternal motion due to the depression and elevation of the Sun in its latitude.

He says that if the mover is moved, then this does not happen infinitely. In fact, that motion starts to be moved from itself and by itself without any other mover which moves it: hence its motion is from itself. He further states that this moved thing, which is a thing moved by itself, occurs only because a part of it moves another part of it, for it is impossible that all of it moves itself and all of it is moved, because it moves and it is moved, it warms and is warmed, it teaches and is taught, it creates and is created out of contradiction and opposition. (He claims) that if it were possible that in the essence of the thing there was an opposition, at the same time its essence (for example) would be black and white, or hot and cold. Therefore, a part of it moves and a part of it is moved.

Deinde ostendit post illud quod possibile est has duas partes motas esse simul; tunc si una illarum est mota ab altera, alterius motus a quo erit? Nam si motus eius est ab altera, tunc ipsa non est mota per se, quoniam motum per se est illud cui non est aliquid extra ipsum mouens ipsum. Et si est motus eius ex se ipsa, necesse est in ipsa ut ipsa eadem non sit mota et mouens, sicut ostensum est.

5 Remanet ergo ut ipsa sit mota, non mouens. Et exposuit illud et declarauit ipsum.

Et dixit post illud quod iste res que non mouentur et sunt cum rebus quarum summa est mota per se, non potest esse ut sint cause generacioni et corrupcioni, si generacio et corruptio sunt sempiternae et ille res sunt mortales, non sempiterni esse, et mortales non sunt causa sempiternis. Et quod rebus que non mouentur, cause sunt non sempiternae etiam. Et est necessarium ut mouens
10 illud quod mouetur circulariter, sit non corpus; quoniam si esset corpus, esset finitum et esset uirtus eius uirtus finita (manifestum est enim quia impossibile est corpus finitum esse in quo sit uirtus infinita); et cum uirtus illa sit finita, non est motum ab ea sempiternum.

Explicit.

1-5 Deinde–ipsum *Phys* VIII 4-5 || 9-12 Et est necessarium–sempiternum *Phys* VIII 10.

1 has *om.* C | motas esse *inv.* A | illarum] earum CMS || 2 est mota *inv.* G | alterius] alius G | alterius motus – ab altera *om.* C | ab altera] alterius motus a quo erit *add. et per va-cat del.* G || 3 motum] illud *add. et del.* A | est *s.l. al. m.* S | aliquid *corr. ex* ipsum A || 4 eius] est A | necesse est in ipsa *om.* A || 5 ergo *om.* M | illud] ipsum M || 6 iste] ille G | res *om.* M || 7 mota per se] per se mota M | sint *om.* C | generacioni] generacio A || 8 mortales] res *praem.* A | causa] cause G || 9 est *om.* A || 11 quia] quod A | finitum] infinitum G || 12 ea] eo CBirkenmajer || 13 Explicit] finitus est sermo M *om.* CGS.

Then, after that he shows that it is possible that these two parts are moved at the same time: so, if the first of them is moved by the other, what will be the cause of the motion of the second? In fact, if its motion is caused by the first part, then this part is not moved by itself, because the thing moved by itself is exactly that which has nothing outside itself which moves it. And if its motion is by itself, it is necessarily in it, so that it cannot be moved and mover, as it has been shown. Therefore, it is moved and not mover. He explains that and maintains that.

Then, he states that it is impossible that these things which are not moved and which are with the things whose totality is moved by itself are the causes of generation and corruption, if generation and corruption are eternal and these things are mortal, not eternal. Therefore, the mortal things are not the cause of the eternal. In addition, (he says) that the things which are not moved do not have eternal causes either. And it is necessary that that mover which moves circularly is not a body, because if it was a body, it would be finite and its power would be a finite power – it is clear, in fact, that it is impossible that a body endowed with an infinite power is finite; and if that power is finite, then the motion which it produces is not eternal.

The end.

VI. *The Distinctio sermonis Abunazar Alfarabi super librum auditus naturalis: The Question of its Attribution to al-Fārābī*

Since the *Distinctio* exists only in Latin, and is attributed to al-Fārābī in the list of Gerard of Cremona's translations, as well as in one of the manuscripts – Assisi, Fondo antico presso la Biblioteca del Sacro Convento 663 –, the first question to raise is that of its authorship. Unfortunately, almost no works which al-Fārābī devoted to Aristotle's *Physics* are extant, and so the very first place where we can check are the ancient lists of his treatises.

In the list by Ibn al-Muraḥḥim, who was a scholar devoted to philosophy and science and served as a judge in Baghdad between 1146 and 1160, the following works related with Aristotle's *Physics* appear: as n° 27 a *Natural Discourse* (*Kalām lahu ṭabī'ī*), as n° 28 the treatise *On Changing Beings* (*Fī l-Mawḡūdāt al-mutaḡayyira*), and as n° 61 a *Commentary on the Physics* (*Šarḥ al-samā' al-ṭabī'ī*).⁹

None of the above points to the *Distinctio*: n° 27 is a very general title and, after cross-checking with another list, that by Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a (which I will present below), one may suspect that, together with n° 28, this title points to one and the same treatise, i.e. *On Changing Beings*. Steinschneider called attention on the quotations from this lost work which are preserved in Ibn Bāḡḡa, Averroes, and Maimonides — all three born in Muslim Spain.¹⁰ According to them, in this work al-Fārābī elaborated on Aristotle's argument in *Physics* VIII 1 for the eternity of celestial motion and time. The *Distinctio* deals in general with books IV-VIII of the *Physics* and the eternity of celestial motion is clearly stated in it.¹¹ N° 61 in Ibn al-Muraḥḥim's list, the *Commentary on Physics*, does not fit either: even if the term *šarḥ* is taken loosely, the brief outline presented in the *Distinctio* cannot be a full-fledged commentary. One may imagine that it is only a part of it, or also a part of its prologue.¹² Still, the format of the *Distinctio* is quite different from that of the prologue of the commentary on the *De Interpretatione*, where al-Fārābī endorses the typical Alexandrian model and discusses the *κεφάλαια*, the preliminary questions to be dealt with before commenting upon a given work.¹³

⁹ I received this information from Marwan Rashed and my sincere thanks go to him for his valuable help.

¹⁰ Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Al-Fārābī (Alfarabius). Des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Geschichte der griechischen Wissenschaft unter den Arabern, nebst Anhängen Job. Philoponus bei den Arabern; Leben und Testament des Aristoteles von Ptolemaeus, Darstellung der Philosophie Plato's, grösstentheils nach handschriftlichen Quellen*, Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, St. Petersburg 1869 (Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersburg, VII^e série, T. XIII, n° 4), pp. 119-23 [repr. Philo Press, Amsterdam 1966, same pagination]; J. Puig Montada, "Zur Bewegungsdefinition im VIII Buch der *Physik*", in G. Endress – J.A. Aertsen (eds.), *Averroes and the Aristotelian Tradition. Sources, Constitution and Reception of the Philosophy of Ibn Rushd (1126-1198)*. Proceedings of the Fourth Symposium Averroicum (Cologne, 1996), Brill, Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999 (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies, 31), pp. 145-59; M. Rashed, "Al-Fārābī's Lost Treatise *On Changing Beings* and the Possibility of a Demonstration of the Eternity of the World", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 18 (2008), pp. 19-58; D. Janos, *Method, Structure and Development in al-Fārābī's Cosmology*, Brill, Leiden [etc.] 2012 (Islamic Philosophy, Theology and Science. Texts and Studies, 85), p. 38.

¹¹ Cf. above p. 282.8-15 of the Latin text.

¹² Cf. A. Lammer, *The Elements of Avicenna's Physics, Greek Sources and Arabic Innovations*, De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2018, (Scientia Graeco-Arabica, 20), p. 36.

¹³ Cf. W. Kutsch S.J. – S. Marrow S.J., *Alfarabi's Commentary on Aristotle's ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ (De Interpretatione)*, Imprimerie Catholique, Beyrouth 1986, pp. 17.4-23.18. That al-Fārābī was familiar with the eight preliminary questions used by Alexandrian commentators David and Elias, according the teaching of Proclus, is clear from his introductory writings on logic. In particular, in *On the Expressions used in Logic (Kitāb al-Alfāz al-mustā'mala fī l-manṭiq)* al-Fārābī writes: "Now we must expose the things that a teacher must explain at the beginning of each book. You can easily learn these from the commentators' reports. They are: the aim of the work, its usefulness, the division into books and chapters, the relationship, the place,

Furthermore, if the *Distinctio* were only a part of one of the points of the Alexandrian κερφάλαια – i.e. the division into books and chapters – we should imagine an extremely long prologue.

In Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a’s list of the Farabian works, n° 22 is a *Commentary on Aristotle’s Physics in the Form of Glosses* (*Šarḥ kitāb al-samā’ al-ṭabī‘ī li-Aristūṭālīs ‘alā ḡihati al-tā’aliq*).¹⁴ Then, n° 46 is *On Changing Beings known also as the Natural Discourse* (*Kitāb fī l-Mawḡūdāt al-mutaḡayyira al-mawsūm bi-l-kalām al-ṭabī‘ī*).¹⁵ N° 86 is a *Discourse on the Fact that the Motion of the Sphere is Eternal* (*Kalām fī an ḡarakat al-falaki dā‘im*).¹⁶ Finally, n° 103 is a *Book on Physics* (*Kitāb al-samā’ al-ṭabī‘ī*).¹⁷ The first three items are not good candidates for the Arabic antecedent of the *Distinctio*, for the same reasons indicated above. Concerning n° 22, a *Commentary on Aristotle’s Physics in the Form of Glosses*, the *Distinctio* is not a commentary, and it hardly could be a part of it, or of its prologue; n° 46, *On Changing Beings* known also as the *Natural Discourse*, covers only *Physics* VIII, 1; furthermore, n° 86 does not seem to deal with a general theory of motion. N° 103, the *Book on Physics*, might point to a commentary on the *Physics*, or also to the *Distinctio*, but we are in the dark about its content. There is an additional reference, as n° 82, to the work *On Aristotle’s Aims in all his Books* (*Kitāb fī aḡrād Aristūṭālīs fī kulli wāhidin min kutubihī*).¹⁸ The *Distinctio*, in my opinion, might be a part of it, related to the *Physics*: if so, this might account for both the concision of the *Distinctio* and for the fact that the word *intentio*, which translates the Arabic term *ḡarād*, occurs eight times in it. Birkenmajer had already observed a certain analogy between the *Distinctio* and the treatise on *The Aims of the Metaphysics*, a similar text, without going deeper into details.¹⁹

Ibn al-Qiftī, in his list of al-Fārābī’s works, indicates as n° 35 a *Commentary on the Physics* (*Kitāb šarḥ al-samā’*),²⁰ and as n° 53 a *Book on the Fact that the Motion of the Sphere is Eternal* (*Kitāb fī an ḡarakat al-falaki sarmadī*)²¹ but also in this case the remarks on treatises n° 22 and n° 86 in Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a’s list are valid.

Finally, in the list of al-Fārābī’s writings copied by Abū l-‘Abbās Yaḡyā, a grandson of Abū l-Walid ibn Rušd, that is preserved in the manuscript El Escorial, Derembourg 884, foll. 82r-82v, we find as n° 29 the treatise *Changing Beings* (*al-Mawḡūdāt al-mutaḡayyira*); as n° 45 a *Commentary on*

the title, the name of the author and the teaching method used by him” (al-Fārābī, *Kitāb al-alfāz al-musta‘mala fī l-mantiq*, ed. M. Maḡdī, Dār al-Mašriq, Beirut 1968², pp. 94.15-95.8). These words are followed by the explanation of each point. Also in the *Prologue* to his *Commentary on the De Interpretatione* al-Fārābī presents all the points – the σκοπός of the work, the five parts into which it is divided, the meaning of its Arabic title, i.e. *al-‘ibāra*, its usefulness, his position in Aristotle’s *Organon* in relation to the *Categories* and the *Prior Analytics*, and the exegetical method he followed – with the exception of one, that related to the authenticity of the work (‘the author’s name’). The reasons may be different: (i.) it may not have appeared in the Farabian text at all (as in the case of the introduction to his commentary on *Rhetoric*, which has been preserved in Latin translation); (ii.) it may have fallen out for reasons of textual tradition: the last part of the introduction came down to us, in two incomplete versions, one after the other; or (iii.) as Zimmermann argues, this could be the echo of Andronicus’ doubt about the authenticity of the treatise: cf. F.W. Zimmermann, *Al-Fārābī’s Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle’s De Interpretatione*, Oxford U.P., London 1981 (Classical and Medieval Logic. Texts, 3) pp. xciii-xciv.

¹⁴ *A literary history of medicine. The ‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā’ of Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a*, ed. and trans. by E. Savage-Smith – S. Swain – G.J. Van Gelder – I. Sánchez – N.P. Joosse – A. Watson – B. Inksetter – F. Hilloowala, Brill, Leiden 2020, n. 15.1.5, vol. 2.2, p. 1159.10. Cf. Steinschneider’s numeration in *Al-Fārābī (Alpharabius). Des arabischen Philosophen Leben und Schriften*, pp. 214-20.

¹⁵ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *Kitāb ‘Uyūn*, p. 608.29 Riḡā = p. 1161.7 Savage-Smith *et alii*.

¹⁶ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *Kitāb ‘Uyūn*, p. 609.15-16 Riḡā = p. 1163.14 Savage-Smith *et alii*.

¹⁷ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *Kitāb ‘Uyūn*, p. 609.25-26 Riḡā = p. 1164.15 Savage-Smith *et alii*.

¹⁸ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a, *Kitāb ‘Uyūn*, p. 609.17-18 Riḡā = p. 1163.9 Savage-Smith *et alii*.

¹⁹ Birkenmajer, “Eine wiedergefundene Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona” (above n. 2), p. 474, n. 9

²⁰ Ibn al-Qiftī, *Tārīḡ al-ḡukamā’*, ed. J. Lippert, Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig 1903, p. 279.21.

²¹ Ibn al-Qiftī, *Tārīḡ al-ḡukamā’*, p. 280.6 Lippert.

the *Physics* (*Šarḥ kitāb al-samā' al-ṭabī'ī*); as n° 67 a *Discourse on the Motion of the All* (*Kalām fi ḥarakat al-kull*) which Steinschneider proposed to identify with the *Discourse on the fact that the Motion of the Sphere is Eternal* (*Kalām fi an ḥarakat al-falak dā'im*), i.e. n° 86 in Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a; and as n° 15 *Aristotle's Aims in all his Books* (*Agrāḍ Aristū fi kulli wāḥidin min kutubihī*) of which the *Distinctio* might be a part.²²

To better understand the nature of this work, it is useful also to examine al-Fārābī's ideas about the content of Aristotle's *Physics*. The *Catalogue of the Sciences* (*Iḥṣā' al-'ulūm*),²³ which is extant in Arabic and also in the Latin version by Gerard of Cremona,²⁴ is not of great help from this point of view. The first part of the fourth chapter is devoted to natural science (*'ilm al-ṭabī'ī*) and its parts. Al-Fārābī begins with a general presentation in which he distinguishes the natural from the artificial bodies and their accidents, explains the things by which, in which and for which these bodies exist, and finally recalls the doctrine of matter and form. Al-Fārābī devotes to Aristotle's *Physics* – according to him, the first part of natural science – only one sentence.²⁵

Another work which is of some interest for the present inquiry is the *Risāla fi-mā yanbagī an yuqaddama qabla tā'allumi l-falsafa* (*What Must Precede the Study of Philosophy*).²⁵ In this short treatise al-Fārābī introduces the nine introductory questions that must be dealt with before tackling the study of philosophy, on the model of the *κεφάλαια* canonized by late antique

²² The list is reproduced in Steinschneider, *Al-Farabi* (above, n. 10), pp. 214-20; the titles have been checked on the manuscript.

²³ Cf. al-Fārābī, *Iḥṣā' al-'Ulūm*, ed. 'U. Amīn, Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī, al-Qāhira 1949². This edition is based on the following manuscripts: Cairo, Dār al-kutub 264 (now Princeton, Garrett Collection, *Yahuda* 308); Nağaf, 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Nağafī's private collection, n. 7; İstanbul, Köprülü Kütüphanesi, *Mehmet* 1604, foll. 1v-40v; Madrid, El Escorial, *Derenbourg* 646, foll. 27-45. In addition, the editor has integrated the Arabic readings on the second chapter on Logic, as reported in Ibn Tūmlūs' *Introduction to the Art of Logic* (*Mudḥal li-ṣinā'at al-mantiq*) and those reported by Ibn Abī Uṣaybī'a in the *Sources of Information on the Classes of Physicians* (*Kitāb 'Uyūn al-anbā' fi ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*).

²⁴ Cf. Al-Fārābī, *Über die Wissenschaften. De Scientiis. Nach der lateinischen Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona*, Mit Einleitung und kommentierenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben und übersetzt von F. Schupp, F. Meiner Verlag, Hamburg 2005, pp. 1-135. Schupp used for his edition the following manuscripts: Paris, BnF, *Lat.* 9335, foll. 143v-151v; Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, *Lat.* 482, foll. 222v-229r; Brügge, Stadtbibliothek, *Lat.* 486, foll. 94r-100v.

²⁵ This sentence reads as follows in Gerard of Cremona's Latin translation: "Et dividitur scientia naturalis in octo partes magnas. Quarum prima est inquisitio de eo in quo communicant corpora naturalia omnia, simplicia eorum et composita ex principiis et accidentibus consequentibus illa principia. Et hoc totum est in auditu naturali". Cf. al-Fārābī, *Über die Wissenschaften. De Scientiis. Nach der lateinischen Übersetzung Gerhards von Cremona*, p. 100.6-10 Schupp. The last sentence "Et hoc totum est in auditu naturali" is present only in the Latin translation: cf. the Arabic text in al-Fārābī, *Iḥṣā' al-'Ulūm*, p. 72.13-15 Amīn. The *Physics* coincides with the inquiry on what all the natural bodies have in common, whether they are simple or composite, on their principles and their accidents. There is an analogy of little importance – because in itself very obvious – with our *Distinctio*: it consists in the idea expressed at the beginning of the illustration of book IV of Aristotle's *Physics* regarding the four causes common to all the natural bodies: "Postquam narravit Aristotiles in tractatibus quatuor libri *De auditu naturali* res existentes communicantes in omnibus corporibus naturalibus, et sunt materia et forma (que due sunt intra rem) et agens et finis (que due sunt cause extra rem)".

²⁶ Al-Fārābī, *Risāla fi-mā yanbagī an yuqaddama qabla tā'allumi l-falsafa*, in F. Dieterici, *Alfārābī's Philosophische Abhandlungen aus Londoner, Leidener und Berliner Handschriften*, Brill, Leiden 1890 (reprint in Publications of the Institute for the History of Arabic-Islamic Science, ed. F. Sezgin, XII, Frankfurt am Main 1999), pp. 49-55. Cf. R. Ramón Guerrero, "Una introducción de al-Fārābī a la filosofía", *Al-Qantara* V/1 (1984), pp. 2-10.

Neoplatonic commentators.²⁷ Al-Fārābī presents the following questions: what is the number of philosophical schools (i.); what is the aim of Aristotle in each of his books (ii.); from which science the study of philosophy should begin (iii.); for what purpose philosophy is studied (iv.); what path must follow those who study philosophy (v.); what kind of language Aristotle uses in each of his treatises (vi.); why is Aristotle obscure in his treatises (vii.); in what condition must be the man who approaches philosophy (viii.); what is necessary for those who want to study Aristotle's works (ix.).

Concerning question (ii.), al-Fārābī distinguishes among the books on natural things those which analyze what is common to all natural beings and those which inquire what is proper to each one. The *Physics*, called here *Sam' al-Kiyān* – from the Syriac *Šem'ā kyānāyā* which is the literal translation of the Greek title Φυσικῆ ἀκρόασις – is the treatise on what is common to all the natural things. Al-Fārābī writes:

The book which studies what is common to all the natural (beings) is his book entitled *Sam' al-Kiyān*. He (Aristotle) teaches in this place the knowledge of the principles that all the things have, the knowledge of the things which are considered to be principles and the knowledge of the things inherent to those principles and of the things which are considered to be inherent. Concerning the principles, they are matter (*al-unṣur*), form (*al-šūra*) and what resembles the principles, and does not really exist, but almost so. Concerning the things inherent to the principles, they are time and place. Concerning what resembles the inherent things, they are the void and the infinite.²⁸

In this short passage as in the description of the fourth treatise of *Physics* presented in the *Distinctio*,²⁹ al-Fārābī recalls the very general fact that in this work Aristotle speaks about the existing realities which are common to all the natural bodies, which are matter and form. But the analogy between the two texts – the *Risāla fi-mā yanbaġī an yuqaddama qabla tā'allumi l-falsafa* and the *Distinctio* – stops here. In the passage above, indeed, he mentions time and place as things inherent to the principles, and void and the infinite as things that resemble the inherent things, while in the *Distinctio*³⁰ he introduces time, place, the infinite and void, as things which are implied in the definition of motion and he specifies that Aristotle denies that void exists in any way.

Another work which is of more interest for the present inquiry is the *Philosophy of Aristotle* (*Falsafat Aristūṭālīs*). Since both texts – the *Distinctio* and the *Philosophy of Aristotle* – present a summary of the contents and the scope of Aristotle's *Physics*, the comparison of the two works might prove useful.

According to al-Fārābī, Aristotle first highlighted the shortcomings of the ancient philosophers who denied difference, multiplicity, and change; then he moved to indicate the issues addressed in natural science: the bodily substances, i.e. the natural beings. Then again, he clarified his epistemology in the *Physics*, with a clear-cut distinction between dialectics and science. Aristotle, according to al-Fārābī, starts his inquiry using some very general fundamentals (*uṣūl*) about natural beings, whose truth will become evident by means of demonstrations. The first fundamental regards the principles of the bodily substances, which are four: the material, the form, the agent and the end. Then, after having analyzed the concepts of nature and extension, Aristotle focuses on motion:

²⁷ See above n. 134; cf. J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text*, Brill, Leiden 1994 (Philosophia Antiqua, 61).

²⁸ Al-Fārābī, *Risāla fi-mā yanbaġī an yuqaddama qabla tā'allumi l-falsafa*, p. 51.1-7 Dieterici.

²⁹ Cf. above, p. 276.4-6.

³⁰ Cf. above, p. 276.6-11.

Then he investigated what motion is, and its being and whatness. Since motion has a whatness that signifies its definition, and has species; since it is from a thing and to a thing, and at a distance and in time; since it is an attribute in a bodily substance; since it exist from a mover – he had to investigate every one of these and its essential consequences: to summarize what it is, how it is, and to make its essential consequences known. And since each of these things entails many consequences for motion, since motion entails consequences for each of these, and since motion entails consequences for the moving bodies, he began to investigate what consequence each of these entails for motion and what consequence motion entails for each of them. Therefore, he investigated what place is. He summed up the concomitants of place that adhere to its whatness.³¹

According to al-Fārābī, Aristotle investigates the definition of motion, its species, and essential consequences (*lawāḥiq*), place and time. This passage is reminiscent of the report on *Physics* IV of the *Distinctio*: “et dixit motum et diffiniuit ipsum et que sequuntur motum et sumuntur in diffinitione eius, sicut infinitum et locus et inane et tempus (nam non inuenitur naturale uacuum ab istis rebus), et sunt materia et forma, et agens et paciens, et locus et tempus et motus et infinitum”.³² Aristotle, according to the *Distinctio*, discussed motion, its definition, and its consequences as the infinite, place, void, and time, as well as the items affected by motion: matter and form, agent and patient, place and time, motion, and the infinite.

The *Distinctio* states the following about Aristotle’s notion of void: “in rememoracione autem inanis loquitur Aristotiles propterea, quod putatur de eo, quia existit et negat ipsum existere penitus”.³³ Aristotle denies radically the existence of void. In the *Philosophy of Aristotle* al-Fārābī similarly writes that void simply does not exist:

He (Aristotle) investigated whether or not for motion to exist the moving thing requires void. He explained that void is not required by the moving thing or for the existence of motion; and in general, that no void at all is required for the existence of a natural thing, be it a substance or an attribute. Then he explained generally that the void cannot in any way exist.³⁴

And again, in the *Philosophy of Aristotle* al-Fārābī states that Aristotle established axioms regarding bodies which follow from their motion or from the principles which move them:

It follows that the moving bodies present before us are moved by other bodies that are together and in contact with them, and the latter in turn by others together and in contact with them; the bodies that move each other are contiguous in their positions or in contact, succeeding each other; and this succession is infinite in number.³⁵

³¹ Al-Fārābī, *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūtālīs wa-aḡzā’ falsafati-hi wa-marātib aḡzā’i-hā wa-l-mawḍī’ alladī min-hu ibtada’a wa-ilayhī intahā)*, ed. M. Mahdi, Dār maḡallat Šī’r, Beirut 1961 (Committee on research in Arabic philosophy, 1), p. 95.2-12; English translation in Alfarabi, *Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*, ed. M. Mahdi, Cornell U.P., Ithaca (NY) 1969, p. 101.

³² Cf. above, p. 276.6-9.

³³ Cf. above, p. 276.10-11.

³⁴ Al-Fārābī, *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūtālīs)*, p. 95.15-20 Mahdi; English translation by Mahdi in Alfarabi, *Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*, p. 101.

³⁵ Al-Fārābī, *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūtālīs)*, p. 96.10-13 Mahdi; English translation by Mahdi in Alfarabi, *Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*, p. 102.

In the *Distinctio*, the reciprocal positions of the moving bodies are highlighted as follows: “Deinde loquitur in rebus existentibus in motibus, et sunt consecutio et assebea (et intencio assebea est occurus) et simul et continuum et quod inter et singulariter. Et diffinuit unumquodque eorum”.³⁶

Another point of contact between the two texts occurs at the very end of both, regarding the First Mover and the cause of motion in circle. In the *Philosophy of Aristotle*, al-Fārābī writes:

It became obvious to him (i.e. Aristotle) that that which gives circular motion to the bodies at the limits is a certain being that cannot be a nature or a natural thing, or a body or in a body, or even in a material at all.³⁷

In the *Distinctio*, we are told that according to Aristotle the mover which moves in a circular motion is necessarily not a body: if it were a body, it would be finite and its power would be finite; however, a finite power cannot produce eternal motion: “Et est necessarium, ut mouens illud, quod mouetur circulariter, sit non corpus; quoniam si esset corpus, esset finitum et esset uirtus eius uirtus finita (manifestum est enim, quia impossibile est corpus finitum esse, in quo sit uirtus infinita); et cum uirtus illa sit finita, non est motum ab ea sempiternum”.³⁸

The analysis above elicits the following conclusions: the text of the *Distinctio super librum Aristotelis de naturali auditu* does not match any extant Arabic work by al-Fārābī on Aristotle’s *Physics* with absolute evidence. However, similarities in lexicon and doctrine with passages of an extant Farabian text have been detected. The way in which al-Fārābī presents Aristotle’s theory of motion in the *Philosophy of Aristotle* shows some points of contact with the *Distinctio*. This suggests that it can indeed be attributed to al-Fārābī. A possible lost antecedent could be n° 103 in the list of Ibn Abī Uṣaybī’a, i.e. the *Book on the Physics* (*Kitāb al-samā’ al-ṭabī’ī*), but, as already remarked, we are in the dark about its contents. The best candidate is in my opinion the treatise *On Aristotle’s Aims in all his Books* (*Kitāb fī aḡrād Aristūṭālīs fī kulli wāḡidin min kutubihī*), n° 82 in Ibn Abī Uṣaybī’a’s list – corresponding to n° 15 in that by Abū l-‘Abbās Yaḡyā, a relative of Abū l-Walid ibn Ruṣd. The *Distinctio* might be the part related to *Physics* and this might account for both the format and the concision of the *Distinctio*. An additional indication is the repeated

³⁶ Cf. above, p. 278.9-10.

³⁷ Al-Fārābī, *Philosophy of Aristotle (Falsafat Aristūṭālīs)*, p. 97.9-12 Mahdi; English translation by Mahdi in Alfarabi, *Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle*, p. 103.

³⁸ Cf. above, p. 284.9-12. On the Aristotelian tenet that the power of a body, which by definition is limited, cannot be infinite (*Phys.* VIII 10, 266 b 25-26), its use in Philoponus and through him its influence in the following Peripatetics and in particular in the Arabic-speaking world cf. Sh. Pines, “An Arabic Summary of a Lost Work of John Philoponus”, *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972), pp. 320-52; C. Steel, “*Omnis corporis potentia est finita*. L’interprétation d’un principe aristotélicien: de Proclus à S. Thomas”, in J.P. Beckmann – L. Honnefelder – G. Schrimpf – G. Wieland (eds.), *Philosophie im Mittelalter. Entwicklungslinien und Paradigmen*, F. Meiner Verlag, Hamburg 1986, pp. 213-24. The doctrine is clearly stated in Thomas Aquinas: Sancti Thomae Aquinatis (...) *Opera Omnia (...) Tomus Tertius. Commentaria in libros Aristotelis De Caelo et mundo, De Generatione et corruptione et Meteorologicorum ...* cura et studio fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum, Romae ... De propaganda 1886, *Lib. I lectio* 6, 3, p. 23: “Sciendum est autem circa primum, quod quidam posuerunt corpus caeli esse generabile et corruptibile secundum suam naturam, sicut Ioannes Grammaticus, qui dictus est Philoponus. Et ad suam intentionem adstruendam, primo utitur auctoritate Platonis, qui posuit caelum esse genitum et totum mundum. Secundo inducit talem rationem. Omnis uirtus corporis est finita, ut probatur in VII *Physic.*; sed uirtus finita non potest se extendere ad durationem infinitam (unde per uirtutem finitam non potest aliquid moveri tempore infinito, ut ibidem probatur): ergo corpus caeleste non habet uirtutem ut sit infinitum tempore”. Furthermore cf. C. D’Ancona, “Philoponus, or ‘Yaḡyā al-naḡwī’. An Overview”, *Studia graeco-arabica* 9 (2019), pp. 203-42, in part. pp. 228-30.

presence of the term *intentio*. If the *Distinctio* is, as it is probable, a Farabian work on Aristotle's *Physics* with a special focus on the theory of motion, it should be taken into account in any future examination of al-Fārābī's natural philosophy. In fact, it could be a useful complement in the reconstruction of al-Fārābī's natural thought which is often based only on indirect sources reporting portions of works otherwise lost, like *On Changing Beings*.

It is true that in this short text the purpose of al-Fārābī is to present Aristotle's doctrine, but his own views surface here and there.³⁹ More research on this is needed, and I hope I will be able to do it in the near future.

³⁹ Cf. above, p. 278.1-2.



Finito di stampare anno 2020
presso le Industrie Grafiche della Pacini Editore S.r.l.
Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Pisa
Tel. 050 313011 • Fax 050 3130300
www.pacineditore.it