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Reconstructing Ishāq ibn Hunayn’s Arabic Translation of Aristotle’s De Anima

Alexander Treiger

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

Ishāq ibn Hunayn’s Arabic Translation of Aristotle’s De Anima: Testimonia and Textual Evidence

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

الكلام على كتاب النفس وهو ثلاث مقالات نقله حنين إلى السريانيّ تامًا، ونقله إسحق إلا شيئاً سيراً. ثمّ نقله إسحق نقلاً ثانياً جوًود فيه. وشرح تامصطيح هذا الكتاب بأسره: أمّا المقالة الأولى ففي مقالتين، والثانية في مقالتين، والثالثة في الثلاث مقالات. [...] قال إسحق: نقلت هذا الكتاب إلى العربيّ من نسخة رديئة، فلمّا كان بعد ثلاثين سنة وجدت نسخة في نهاية الجودة، فقابلت بها النقل الأوّل، وهو شرح تامصطيح.

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

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

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

Ibn al-Nadim’s report ties the history of the Syriac and Arabic translations of the *De Anima* to two famous ninth-century translators: Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 873) and his son Ishāq ibn Hunayn (d. ca. 910-911). Hunayn is credited with an integral Syriac translation of the *De Anima*, while Ishāq is apparently credited with two Arabic translations of the same work (one incomplete, the other complete and revised) and with an Arabic translation of Themistius’ (d. ca. 387-388) Commentary on the *De Anima*. While there is an extant Arabic translation of the *De Anima*, and this translation is indeed attributed to Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn, it is most certainly not by him (its language indicates that it is older). This version will therefore be referenced below as “Pseudo-Ishāq”.

Ishāq’s authentic Arabic translation(s) of the *De Anima* appear to be lost (as is, regrettably, Ḥunayn’s Syriac version).

We do have, however, a Hebrew version of the *De Anima* by Zeraḥyah ben Yishāq ben Shealtiel Ḥen (d. after 1291) and a Latin version of the *De Anima* by Michael Scot (fl. ca. 1217-1240), which is preserved in the lemmata of Averroes’ *Long Commentary* on the *De Anima*. As Alfred Ivry has shown, the Hebrew and the Latin versions (both translated from Arabic) represent more or less the same Arabic text, which is different from *Pseudo-Ishāq’s* old translation. Averroes’ *Middle Commentary* on the *De Anima* and (the first part of) Avicenna’s *Marginal Notes on the... of this passage as well as parallels in Ibn al-Qīṭī (d. 1248) and Ḥāǧǧī Ḵalīfa (d. 1658) see H. Gätje, *Studien zur Überlieferung der aristotelischen Psychologie im Islam*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg 1971, pp. 20ff.; F.E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus: The Oriental Translations and Commentaries on the Aristotelian Corpus*, Brill, Leiden 1968, pp. 40-3.


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

عَلَى هَاهُنا نقل إسحَاق بن حنين، ومن هاهنا نقل آخر بإصلاحات كثيرة للمفسر.

**T2:** Up to this point, the version of the commented text (nusḥat al-faṣṣ) was that of Ishāq ibn Hunayn’s translation; from here onwards, it is another translation, with multiple corrections by the commentator [i.e., Avicenna].

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

A somewhat similar note is preserved, at exactly the same point of Aristotle’s text, in the manuscripts of the Hebrew version of the De Anima:

השלמה מה שיתפויק יצחק בן חיון מהאמור מיחסיק אדיכי יסיב בן יצחק בן האושרי לא עלונים.

**T3:** Supplement to what Ishāq ibn Hunayn translated from this treatise, [taken] from Abū ’Īsā ibn Ishāq’s translation from Syriac into Arabic.

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

---


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


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

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

17 P. 127.325-326 Bos (cf. Bos’ English translation of this note on p. 9). This note can be tentatively retranslated into Arabic as follows: نُشِمَةً القَلْبُ كَانَ (إِنَّ) إِنَّهَا نَقْلُ إِسْحَاقَ بْنِ حَنِينَ، وَإِنَّهَا نَقْلُ أَخَرَ بِإِصْلاحاتٍ كَثِيرةٍ للمفسر.

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


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

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

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

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

---

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

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

20 Frank, “Some Fragments” (above, n. 5), p. 233. Frank himself, however, understood the text of the Fihrist in a hardly more plausible way, namely: “after 30 years I found another recension which was truly excellent in all respects; I compared this with the first translation and found it to be the ‘commentary’ of Themistius” (ibid., my emphasis). As Frank’s discussion makes clear, the pronoun “it” in the phrase “[I] found it to be the ‘commentary’ of Themistius” refers to the second manuscript (or, as he has it, “recension”). Frank then goes on to argue that “the translator [i.e., Ishāq], according to the quotation, mentions how he came to notice that it [i.e., the excellent recension] was the work of Themistius rather than that of Aristotle, almost as if the manuscript which he had gave no indication of the author” (Frank, “Some Fragments” (above, n. 5), p. 234). Frank’s interpretation is both implausible and incorrect. It is implausible because Ishāq would need no “comparison” to recognize that the second manuscript contained something else than Aristotle’s text – it would be sufficient for him to have a glance at the first sentence of the text to realize that what he had in front of him was a Peripatetic commentary on Aristotle rather than an original composition by Aristotle himself (Themistius’ commentary begins as follows: “In this treatise we must try to follow Aristotle on everything that can be systematically understood about the soul”). It is incorrect because Frank does not take into account the technical meaning of the verb qābala: in this context it clearly means “to correct” one manuscript (in this case: a translation) on the basis of another. Cf. similar use of this term in Ḥunayn’s Risāla, §3 – G. Bergsträsser (ed. and trans.), Hunain ibn Ishāq über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen, F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1925, p. 5.5-6 (German translation, p. 4); J.C. Lamoreaux (ed. and trans.), Hunayn ibn Ishāq on His Galen Translations. With an Appendix by G. Kessel, Brigham Young U.P., Provo, UT 2016, p. 11; F. Rosenthal, The Classical Heritage in Islam, trans. from German by E. Marmorstein and J. Marmorstein, University of California Press, Berkeley 1975, p. 20.
Anima itself; the phrase “and this is the commentary of Themistius” is simply an explanation added (by Ibn al-Nadīm?) to clarify this. It is very likely that these words of Isḥāq have their origin in a colophon of his (second) Arabic version of Themistius’ commentary, a manuscript of which Ibn al-Nadīm may well have examined. The disadvantage of this interpretation is that it fails to explain how, according to T1c, Isḥāq managed to produce his “second, complete and revised” translation of the De Anima.

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

The Hebrew note (T3) is somewhat ambiguous as well. Two questions arise. First, does the text mean that the ending of the Hebrew version (after 431 a 14) (as well as the parallel section of the Latin translation) reflect the Syro-Arabic version of Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq or does it mean that they are based on Ishāq’s translation made from Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq’s Syriac version? Second, do we have a proof (independent of T3) that the second part of the text (after 431 a 14) is not supplied from Ishāq’s second and complete (presumably Graeco-Arabic) translation? The answer to the first question largely depends on Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq’s identity. If Moritz Steinschneider is correct in his suggestion, adopted by the majority of scholars, that Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq is Yahyā ibn ʿAdī’s pupil Abū ʿAlī ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq Ibn Zurʿa (d. 1008), then the second interpretation of the Hebrew note is ruled out on chronological grounds. The first interpretation, on the other hand, seems very plausible indeed: it stands to reason that Ibn Zurʿa had at his disposal Ishāq’s first and incomplete translation of the De Anima and completed it working from an unknown (possibly Hunayn’s) Syriac version.

21 The only extant manuscript of the Arabic version of Themistius’ Commentary on the De Anima (Ishāq’s second version, according to T4) breaks off near the end of the book, and so this colophon, if it existed, is irreparably lost.
23 A textual comparison of the Hebrew version with the Latin reveals that after 431 a 14 both versions reflect more or less the same Arabic text – see synoptic edition of Passage 8 in Appendix III below.
24 This is the interpretation shared by Frank (“Some Fragments” [above, n. 5], p. 235, n. 1), Peters (Aristoteles Arabus [above, n. 3], pp. 41-2), and Ivry (“The Arabic Text” [above n. 9], p. 62, n. 16).
25 Steinschneider (Die hebräischen Übersetzungen [above, n. 17], p. 146) understands this passage as meaning that the second part (after 431 a 14) contains Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq’s Arabic rendering of Ishāq’s (Syriac) supplement ( bezier) to the (according to Steinschneider, incomplete) Syriac version by Hunayn (rendered by the same Abū ʿĪsā ibn Isḥāq into Arabic for the first part of the text). This interpretation seems to me to be very far-fetched. It is nevertheless upheld by Bos (Bos, Aristotle’s “De anima” [above, n. 7], p. 12). This interpretation agrees neither with the evidence of T2, which clearly ascribes the version of the text preceding 431 a 14 to Ishāq, nor with the evidence of the Fihrist (T1a), which states explicitly that Hunayn’s Syriac version was a complete one.
26 This is the opinion of Gätje (Studien [above, n. 3], p. 41): “Angesichts dieses Sachverhaltes und der oben dargestellten Parallelen aus Avicenna und A I [=the translation preserved in Averroes’ lemmata before 431 a 14] halte ich es nach wie vor für wahrscheinlich, daß A I in einer Beziehung zur ersten, unvollständigen Übersetzung Ishāq’s steht und daß A I + A II [=the translation preserved in Averroes’ lemmata after 431 a 14] wohl doch eine spätere Redaktion Ishāq’s darstellen”. Cf. criticism of Gätje’s position by Bos, Aristotle’s “De anima” (above, n. 7), pp. 11-12.
As far as the second question is concerned, to the best of my knowledge, no answer to it has been provided so far. The editor of the Hebrew text Gerrit Bos merely observes that the “Hebrew translation does not show a sudden change in style or vocabulary from 431a14 on.”28 Irvy’s article does not address this issue at all. Even casual examination, however, is sufficient to establish that the second part of the Hebrew text cannot reflect the same translation as the first part (or even a revised version of the former). This becomes clear when one considers the ways in which both parts render key Greek terms, such as, e.g., the Aristotelian term ἐκ (=Latin: qua). Before 431 a 14 this term is rendered rather consistently by הפָּרָם מַדִּרְדֶּרֶךְ (=Hebrew: מַדִּרְדֶּרֶךְ, Latin: secundum quod).29 From this point on, this term is rendered, also rather consistently, by מִדְרַכָּה (=Hebrew: מִדְרַכָּה or מִדְרַכֶּה, Latin: secundum quod, but sometimes more literally: in eo quod).30 One may conclude, therefore, that the second part of the text is certainly not by Ishāq. Most likely, we have here a Syro-Arabic version by a later translator who supplemented Ishāq’s incomplete version.31 At present, there seems to be no reason to question Steinschneider’s suggestion that this translator was Ibn Zur‘a. I shall therefore refer to this version as “Ibn Zur’a’s supplement.”

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

---

28 Bos, Aristotle’s “De anima” (above, n. 7), p. 1.2, n. 18. From this he concludes that the underlying Arabic version was produced by a single translator: in his view (following Steinschneider), Abū ‘Īsā ibn Ishāq [=Ibn Zur‘a] – see n. 25 above.

29 See, e.g., 403 a 13 = Bos p. 47.59 (אֵקָה הַמָּחֲרוֹת), p. 18.5 Crawford (secundum quod): 405 a 2–24 (twice) = p. 5.3.177-178 Bos, p. 41.6–8 Crawford: 418 a 23 = p. 89.332 Bos, Crawford 227.4: 431a11 = p. 126.323 Bos, p. 467.2–3 Crawford; cf. n. 69 below. (I do not, of course, mention the cases in which Ishāq mistook ἐκ for one of its homographs). Cf. similar renderings in Ishāq’s translation of Themistius’ commentary: p. 45.6 Lyons (three times = Heinze 40.1–2, Todd 57), 90.4–5 (three times = Heinze 59.16, Todd 79), 91.3–5 (four times = Heinze 59.33–34, Todd 79), 91.14–15 (twice = Heinze 59.33–34, Todd 80), 96.10–11 (twice = Heinze 62.5–6, Todd 82), 98.1–2 (twice = Heinze 62.27, Todd 82), 116.5–6 (twice = Heinze 70.34, Todd 91), 118.3 (=Heinze 71.34, Todd 92), 130.10 (=Heinze 77.17, Todd 98), 182.6 (twice = Heinze 100.21–22, Todd 125), 209.5–6 (Heinze 114.24, Todd 140). Sometimes, however, ἐκ is rendered by מַדִּרְדֶּרֶךְ (e.g. Lyons 141.6, Heinze 82.9, Todd 104 – this expression is typically used by Ishāq to render the Greek ἐκ + inf., e.g., in 430 a 14–15, cf. Passage 6 in Appendix II below) or by מַדִּרְדֶּרֶךְ (e.g. Lyons 130.15–16 [twice], Heinze 77.22, Todd 99). Elsewhere, מַדִּרְדֶּרֶךְ is used, from this point on, the old, Pseudo-Ishāq’s translation, though one cannot exclude the possibility that he was also familiar with Ibn Zur’a’s supplement.32 The fact that Ishāq’s


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

32 It is even possible that despite the fact that Avicenna’s commentary after 431 a 14 seems to be based on Pseudo-Ishāq’s translation, it is Ibn Zur’a’s version that was recorded in the manuscript of the De Anima at his disposal; the evidence of T2 that Avicenna’s manuscript of the De Anima after 431 a 14 contained “multiple emendations by the commentator” may explain why Avicenna may have refrained from using this translation, even if it was indeed recorded in his manuscript. Avicenna seems to have had Pseudo-Ishāq’s translation in a separate (and complete) manuscript, as is indicated by the fact that he refers to this translation on one occasion before 431 a 14 (at 429 a 11, cf. Avicenna, al-Tāʾlīqāt ʿalā...
second and complete translation of the *De Anima* was not available to Avicenna and Averroes, and presumably to Ibn Zur‘a as well (otherwise he would not have needed to supplement it), lends support to the assumption that it never existed.

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

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

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

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

---

**Notes**

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

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

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

36 On two occasions, Alfred Ivry deals with passages from Ishāq’s translation of Themistius’ commentary that render Aristotle verbatim [Ivry, “Arabic Text” [above, n. 9], pp. 70-1 and 73]; yet he seems to be unaware of the fact. See, e.g., his explanation of the similarity between Ishāq’s translation of Themistius and the Hebrew and the Latin versions: “It is significant that the Latin of the *Long Commentary* (and essentially the Hebrew of Zeraḥyah) is a verbatim translation of [the Arabic version of] Themistius’ *text*, which reads: […] It is thus possible that Averroes adopted the Ishâqian translation.
Why is Isḥāq’s translation of Themistius’ quotations from Aristotle’s *De Anima* so close to Isḥāq’s translation of the *De Anima* itself? There are several possible answers to this question: (1) (a) Isḥāq translated both Themistius and the *De Anima* directly from Greek, and (b) he was so consistent in his terminology and translation techniques as to render the same Greek text in the same way; (2) (a) Isḥāq consulted his own translation of the *De Anima* when translating Themistius’ *Commentary*, or (b) vice versa. Statement (1a) seems to be correct. As far as (1b) is concerned, it seems that even though Isḥāq’s translations are indeed remarkably consistent, this in itself would not be sufficient to explain such a close alignment between the two texts as exhibited by the passages edited in Appendix II below. There seems to be a closer relation between the two translations, which goes beyond their having been produced by the same individual. In one case at least, textual evidence seems to point to the possibility (2a). Presumably, when translating Themistius’ *Commentary*, Isḥāq took care that future Arabic readers of Themistius would be able to recognize and locate the relevant passages in the *De Anima*, and hence used the “standard” Arabic *De Anima* translation (his own!) for Themistius’ quotations from the *De Anima*. By contrast, it seems that the possibility (2b) in not borne out by textual evidence. It seems clear that Isḥāq did not correct his translation of the *De Anima* according to Themistius’ *Commentary*, as one interpretation of the evidence of the *Fihrist* (*T1d*) would have it. There are quite a few cases of textual disagreements between the two Arabic texts (in some cases even going back to a different Greek Vorlage).  

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

37 In 429 a 31 - b 3 Aristotle’s text reads: Ἡ μὲν γὰρ αἴσθησις οὐ δύναται αἰσθάνεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ σφόδρα αἰσθητοῦ, οἷον ψόφου ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων ψόφων, οὐδ’ ἐκ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν χρωμάτων καὶ ὀσμῶν οὔτε ὁρᾶν οὔτε ὀσμᾶσθαι. There are two possibilities to understand the genitive case of the underlined noun ψόφου:  

- as dependent on the verb αἰσθάνεσθαι: “for example, [it cannot perceive] a voice after [lit.: from] intense voices”;
- as dependent on the noun αἴσθησις: “for example, [perception of] voice [=sense of hearing] [cannot perceive] after [lit.: from] intense voices”.

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

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

39 See nn. 54 (?), 58, 65, 78, 82, 90, 91, 94, 98, 101, 102, 103, 115 (?), 116, 119 (?), 120, 124, 126, 134, 135, 137, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147 below.
Appendix I: An Interpretation that Has Its Origin in Textual Transmission

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


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


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

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

40 De Libera, Averroès (above, n. 8), p. 32.
41 De Libera, Averroès (above, n. 8), p. 270, n. 411.
42 This is not to say, of course, that Averroes could not have been influenced by Alexander in his interpretation of the tripartition.
43 The verb לעך (literally: “to put”) is often used in Zeraḥya’s translation to render the Arabic جميل (for which the Latin translator commonly uses facere), cf. 430 a 16 (Passage 6: ישות המראות אשר הם בכוח מראות בפועל), 431 a 5 (Passage 7: ישות המראות הם בכוח ויכולים ראה ביצירת הולות), and cf. Index, p. 188 Bos, s.v. לעך.
44 On the לעך in Passage 6: ישות המראות הם בפועל corruption in both Themistius’ text and the lemma (but after Averroes) see n. 128 below.
45 But not in others, as the Hebrew version and Averroes’ Middle Commentary testify.
46 See n. 68 below.
Appendix II: Reconstruction of Select Passages from Ishāq’s Arabic Translation of the De Anima

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bos, p. 62.380 - 63.389</th>
<th>Lyons, 21.12 - 22.6</th>
<th>Crawford, p. 87.1 - 10, 88.1 - 89.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ابادت هشکا اور شیوه تعیین هواز برد</td>
<td><strong>יצירה</strong> &quot;אני破损&quot;, כי אלו破损 هو破损 צי צי צי צי</td>
<td>Intellectus autem videtur esse substantia aliqua que fit in re et non corrumpitur. Si enim corrumpetur, magis dignum esset ut corrumpatur in fatigatone que est apud senectutem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

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

48 See, e.g., n. 52 below, and cf. n. 43 above.

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

50 See nn. 52 below, and cf. MC 33.10: "אֵלָיָּה>>>ב". H. Ivry, “Arabic Text” (above, n. 9), p. 70, n. 62 regards the version "בלבד ("solely") as “idiosyncratic” and “equivalent to shai’/ res”, but does not suggest this emendation. For an explanation of the Arabic פִּינְכֶשׁ see n. 53 below.


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

53 יש什么呢~ **יִהְיוּ דְבָרָא**. The Greek verb is rendered etymologically (**יִהְיוּ דְבָרָא**), and the neutral noun ישנוי~ **יקסן פִי** is supplied after the preposition rendering the Greek prefix.

54 (עֶמְרָנָה or) *A* \*H (cf. p. 73.20 Bos in Passage 2 below for another occasion of *A* \*H, cf. MC 33:10: "עֶמְרָנָה")


56 Fragments of this passage are cited by Averroes in the third part of his LC, cf. Crawford p. 408.630-633, 409.637-639 (=de Libera, Averroës [above, n. 8], p. 77), 446.71-74, 76-81, 82-84 (=de Libera, ibid., pp. 114-15), partially quoted in nn. 72 and 74 below.
Reconstructing Ishāq ibn Hunayn's Arabic Translation of Aristotle's De Anima

Bos, p. 62.380 - 63.389

Lyons, 21.12 - 22.6

Crawford, p. 87.1-10, 88.1 - 89.9

Sed videmus quod illud quodd accidit in sensibus ex hoc accidit in corpore. Senex enim si recipiét oculus iuvenis, videret ut iuvenis. Et sic senectus non est dispositio in qua anima patitur aliquid, sed dispositio in qua anima est sicut est apud ebrietatem et egritudinem. Et intelligere et considerare diversatur quando aliquid

57 H (it seems that Bos marks his addition inaccurately, and it should be read scriptum). Bos' addition of the verb scriptum is based on the Latin diversantur, for which see n. 64 below.

58 H and probably 'I, the additions illud quod and accidit in corpore being, in all likelihood, due to the Latin translator. The first addition is absent in the manuscripts in the quotation of Aristotle's text in the commentary (cf. LC 88.33, but Crawford follows here the Venetian edition that added these words to harmonize the text of the commentary with that of the lemma). The second addition is not quoted at all, and the only two manuscripts (D and G) that quote the text up to the words ex hoc, omit the word etc. that would indicate that the quotation is truncated. Neither has Averroès' commentary any indication that this addition (which hardly makes any sense) was known to him. For a text corresponding to A cf. LC 87.25-26: accideret ei apud senectutem illud quod accidit sensibus; Avicenna's Marginal Notes, p. 85.21-22: κοιτᾶται μή σε ηδονή. Καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔργαζε ἀλλὰ ἐος ἕνα ἡμείς μὴ ἔργαζε σε ἔναν. H and cf. the identical text in MC 33.12-13: אֲרוּם אֵינֶהוּ לְנַפְסָו מֵאֲרוֹם. In certain cases (cf. n. 60 below), Zeraḥya's translation seems to follow the MC rather than the Arabic translation of the De Anima.

59 cf. n. 60 below. Zeraḥya's translation seems to have known the reading. A, *L, *H (cf. MN 87:2-3: את ה'אポイント, כפו כף) par diversantur. Both the Arabic and the Latin translation, but this is incorrect - cf. the same variant reading in mc 33.13, corrected by Ivry on the basis of a marginal reading to -; evidently here, as in n. 59 above, Zeraḥya's translation follows the MC).

60 (but possibly identical with A and shortened by the Latin translator, cf. shortening below: videret ut iuvenis ~ H, and cf. the identical text in MC 33.12-13: אֲרוּם אֵינֶהוּ לְנַפְסָו מֵאֲרוֹם. In certain cases (cf. n. 60 below), Zeraḥya's translation seems to follow the MC rather than the Arabic translation of the De Anima.

61 Lyons here (and on p. 23.3) mistakenly vocalizes lākinna instead of lākin.

62 Both nouns are in the plural in the Greek original: ἐν μέθαις καὶ νόσοις.

63 cf. n. 72 below) that "[l]e latin diversari correspond ici au grec μαραίνεσθαι, se consumer, s'épuiser (et non pas διαφέρειν). .. Averroès semble alléguer une version fautive qui expose diversantur (de μαραίνεσθαι) par divers sunt (de διαφέρειν)" hardly seems tenable for the following two reasons: (1) such a meaning of the verb diversari is not attested in dictionaries of medieval Latin; (2) this suggestion seems to presuppose that Averroès wrote his commentary in Latin rather than in Arabic.

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

65 cf. n. 72 below) that "[l]e latin diversari correspond ici au grec μαραίνεσθαι, se consumer, s'épuiser (et non pas διαφέρειν). .. Averroès semble alléguer une version fautive qui expose diversantur (de μαραίνεσθαι) par divers sunt (de διαφέρειν)" hardly seems tenable for the following two reasons: (1) such a meaning of the verb diversari is not attested in dictionaries of medieval Latin; (2) this suggestion seems to presuppose that Averroès wrote his commentary in Latin rather than in Arabic.

...
أحسب بشيء ما آخر، فإنما ما هو في نفسه فلا علة به، وإنما التمييز أو المحبّة أو البغضاء. لذاك لكنه ليس checklist a, *h. The reading (in lieu of the original) is dependent on the corruption نفل (see n. 64 above), for it is the latter form that requires a diacritical mark after it. For the word التذكّر (νικασσα in H and L cf. Lyons, p. 23.5; the idiosyncrasy in Arabic seems to have its origin in the corruption εἰσκω > εἰσκασσα ("deem, suppose", =Epic form of εἰσκασσα) in Ishâq’s Vorlage.  

65. diễnομενοισιν. This term was rendered in Pseudo-Ishâq’s translation (PI 20) by the Latin translator, and was subsequently emended by Averroes in the MC to التذكّر (see quotation in n. 68 below). This emendation was obviously made on the basis of the following phrase in Averroes, which he regarded as parallel to the passage: أحقّ بأن يكون شيئاً إلاهيّا وشيئاً غير منفعل وامّا التذكّر والمحبّة والبغضاء فيما أحسب بشيء ما آخر، (cf. n. 71 below), and cf. Lyons, p. 183-12-13 (=p. 101.8-9 Heinze, p. 125 Todd). The translation here seems to be somewhat less literal than elsewhere, and cf. quotations of this passage in p. 446:79-80 for a more literal translation: Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

66. For another rendering of the term التذكّر see n. 79 below.  

67. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

68. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

69. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

70. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

71. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

72. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

73. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

74. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

75. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

76. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

77. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

78. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

79. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.  

80. Et formare per intellectum et considerare sunt diversa actiones seu operationes, quae non sunt cause, aliqua sunt cause, aliquid corrumpitur intus; ipsum autem in se nihil patitur. Distinctio autem et amor et odio non sunt cause illius, sed istius quod habet, secundum quod habet. Et ideo etiam, quando hoc corrumpetur, non rememorabimus, neque diligemus alios. Non igtur est illius, sed eius quod est commune, quod amitubrebat. Intellectus autem dignius est ut sit aliquid divinum et aliquid impasse.
Ishāq’s version of the *De Anima* (reconstructed) seems to have been:

\[\text{כִּי זַמִּית נַפְשּׁתָּהּ יֵפְגֵּל לַיִשְׂנָהּ וַיֵּשֶׁב הַיּוֹם}.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bos, p. 76.91-93</th>
<th>Lyons, p. 59.12-15</th>
<th>Crawford, p. 159.1-160.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אלפָּבַת החכמָהּ וְלֹא הַתֵּפֶתָּה יָדוּם יִצְּלֶהֶזֶה בַּר</td>
<td><em>Quam autem intellectus et virtus speculative, nichil adhuc declaratum est de eis. Sed tamen videtur quod hoc sit alius genus anime, et iste solus potest abstrahiri, sicut sempiternum abstrahitur a corruptibili.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bos, p. 87.291-292</th>
<th>Lyons, p. 19.16-20.1</th>
<th>Crawford, p. 216.7-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| או שֶׁלֹּא הָיָה בְּהַשָּׂרָה, וְרָּשָׁה אֵֽלֶּהָ קַֽמְּרָה וַיֵּשֶׁבּוּ הָיָה אֱלֹהָה „וַיְהִי אֶת הַשָּׂרָה..." | Et hoc aut non est alteratio, quoniam additio in ipso erit ad perfectionem, aut est alius genus alterationis. ...

---

81 (=p. 41.14-15 Heinze, p. 58 Todd).
82 A (~φυσις in place of φησί, cf. apparatus of Heinze’s edition) om. *H, *L (not in the *De Anima*).
83 (بالطبع)
84 (A probably reads *H (but may have been changed by the Hebrew translator).)
85 The Latin version seems to be based on a corrupt text, which may be tentatively reconstructed as follows: ...
86 (=p. 46.3-5 Heinze, p. 64 Todd). Cf. Lyons, p. 185.11-13 (=p. 102.11-13 Heinze, p. 127 Todd), p. 187.4-6 (=p. 103.7-9 Heinze, p. 128 Todd).
87 (A (~Heinze, manuscript C: δοσιν, .. ὡς... ἤ) om. *H, *L.
88 (A (~De Anima: ἢς... ἤ) om. *H, *L.
89 (A (~Heinze, manuscript C: ὡς... ἤ) om. *H, *L.
90 (A (~Heinze, manuscript C: δοσιν, .. ὡς... ἤ) om. *H, *L.
91 (A (~Heinze, manuscript C: δοσιν, .. ὡς... ἤ) om. *H, *L. The word ζνετο seems to render the Greek ες ζνετο (or, perhaps, a non-attested variant reading ζνετο).
Passage 5: De Anima, III 4, 429 a 15-16, 24-26, 29-b5 (Ishāq’s version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bos, p. 120.219-220</th>
<th>Lyons, p. 191.3-4</th>
<th>Crawford, p. 413.1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أم ما كان شيخه بل يفظه مدلاً، بل شواهد...</td>
<td>Oportet igitur ut sit non passivum, sed recipit formam. ...</td>
<td>Et ideo necesse est ut non sit mixtus cum corpore. Quoniam, si esset mixtus cum corpore, tune esset in aliqua dispositione, aut calidus aut frigidus, aut haberet aliquod instrumentum sicut habet sentiens. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وكذل ذلك بالواجب ليس مخالطا للبدن ولا يقال فيه إنّه ينفعل أص.</td>
<td>It is unclear which reading underlies the Latin translation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فنقد يجب إذا أن يكون الذي ينفصو بالعقل عبر منفعل إلّا أنه قابل لل بصورة.</td>
<td>Qui autem addiscit postquam fuit in potentia, et accipit scientiam ab eo qui est in perfectione doctor, oportet aut ut non dicatur omnino pati, aut ut dicatur quod alteratio est duplex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reconstructing Ishāq ibn Hunayn’s Arabic Translation of Aristotle’s De Anima

Lyons, p. 190:13-191.1

Quoniam autem privatio passionis in sententia et in formatione per intellectum non est consimilis manifestum est in sensu. Sensus enim non potest sentire post forte sensatum, v.g. post sonus magnos aut post colores fortæ aut post odores fortes; intellectus autem, cum intellexerit aliquid forte intelligibilicum, tunc non minus intelliget illud quod est sub primo, immo magis. Sentens enim non est extra corpus; iste autem est abstractus.

Crawford, p. 417.1-4

In his...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, p. 184.11-12&lt;sup&gt;133&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>...universaliter autem non est necesse in tempore. Neque quandoque intelligit et quandoque non intelligit. Et cum fuerit abstractus, est illud quod est tantum, et iste tantum est immortalis semper. Et non renemoratur, quia istic est non passibilis, et intellectus passibilis est corruptibilis, et sine hoc nichil intelligitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, p. 184.8-11&lt;sup&gt;133&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>...et principio nobilius materia. ... Oportet igitur ut in ea sit intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne, et intellectus qui est intellectus secundum quod facit ipsum intelligere omne, et intellectus secundum quod intelligit omne, quasi habitus, qui est quasi lux. Lux enim quodquo modo etiam facit coloris qui sunt in potentia coloris in actu. Et iste intellectus etiam est abstractus, non mixtus neque passibilis, et est in sua substantia actio. Agens enim semper est nobilius patiente, et principium nobilius materia. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, p. 192.11-16&lt;sup&gt;123&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>... vide Lyons' emendation of (apparatus ad loc. and cf. p. 32) that the Hebrew ויהיה and the Latin effectus originate from the Arabic variants ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passage 7: De Anima, III 7, 431 a 4-7 (Išāq’s version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bos, p. 126.317-320</th>
<th>Lyons, p. 20.3.711</th>
<th>Crawford, p. 465.1-6149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>והנה(resolve) נמצא המורגש ישים המרגיש בفعل אחר</td>
<td>Et videmus sensatum facere sentiens in actu postquam erat in potentia, neque patiendo alterationem. Et ideo iste est alius modus motus. Motus enim est actio non perfecta, actio autem simpliciter est alius motus, et est actio perfecti.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בזוז בזוז והוא לא מתעמל אלא י اللبن פעיל והנה מה מזוז בזוז המורגש בזוז אחר</td>
<td>(The latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ ποιοῦ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה 발견ו הסבליון הירחון אחר</td>
<td>(The latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ ποιοῦ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והנה 발견ו הסבליון הירחון אחר</td>
<td>(The latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ ποιοῦ).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

140 Bos has הָרָאָד, which seems to be a misprint (in his apparatus the word is spelled correctly).
141 (=p. 28.34-29.1 Heinze, p. 45 Todd).
142 יخرج החושי [he makes the sensible perishing (the latter translation corresponds more closely to the Greek τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ ποιοῦ)].
143 (ןויסיס) הֶנָּסָס.
144 (or perhaps indefinite) ה, "L. Both A and "H+"L are possible translations of the Greek εξ (δυνάμες) הָנָסָס.
145 (or perhaps indefinite) ה, "L. Both A and "H+"L are possible translations of the Greek ζ (τετελεσμένον).
146 (or perhaps indefinite) ה, "L. Both forms are possible translations of the Greek τοῦ τετελεσμένον.
147 (=de Libera, Averroës [above, n. 8], p. 134).
Appendix III: Reconstruction of a Passage from Ibn Zū‘a’s Supplement

Passage 8: De Anima, III 8, 431 b 20-22 (Ibn Zū‘a’s version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וננְקַב עַתָּה עַל הַמִּרְדֻס הַעֲנִיָּנִים אַלּוֹ שְׁמַעְתָּם</td>
<td>أمّا في وقتنا هذا فنجم على جهة الجملة التي قيلت في النفس. لأن النفس هي على نحو ما جميع الأشياء.</td>
<td>فنجمسم عليه أن تكون محققة أو محسوسة.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| בְּנֵסְמָה | فنقول إن النفس هي على نحو ما جميع الأشياء، والأشياء إمّا أن تكون محققة أو محسوسة. | إنّ النفس هي على نحو ما جميع الموجودات. وإنّ إن تكون م الحققة أو محسوسة.
| והנща | إنّ النفس هي على نحو ما جميع الأشياء، والأشياء إمّا أن تكون محققة أو محسوسة. | إنّ النفس هي على نحو ما جميع الموجودات. وإنّ إن تكون م الحققة أو محسوسة.
| <scripsi> | <scripsi> | <scripsi>

The following comparison proves that Ibn Zū‘a’s translation is not identical with Pseudo-Isḥāq’s translation and shows that it differs substantially from Ishāq’s style of translation and terminology. The table below compares the reconstructed fragment of Ibn Zū‘a’s translation with the corresponding passages from Pseudo-Isḥāq’s translation and Ishāq’s translation of Themistius’ verbatim quotation of this passage in Aristotle. The Greek text of this passage of the De Anima reads as follows: Νῦν δὲ περὶ ψυχῆς τὰ λεχθέντα συγκεφαλαιώσαντες, εἰπομεν πάλιν ὅτι ἡ ψυχή τά ὄντα πώς ἐστι πάντα. The Vorlagen of the translators may have been slightly different from this text and from each other.}

---

150 לו בדעתו | scripsi | > Bos.
151 וננְקַב thông | MC possibly */H, *L.
152 פנְקַב | MC, *H om. *L.
153 בְּנֵסְמָה | †MC, *H, *L.
154 הַעֲנִיָּנִים | †MC, probably *H, which seems to be the original reading.
155 פנֵים | corresponds to the Greek participle συγκεφαλαιώσαντες.
156 שְׁמַעְתָּם | †MC, *H.
157 בְּנֵסְמָה | †MC, *H, *L.
158 ἡ ψυχή τά ὄντα πώς ἐστι πάντα. | =de Libera, Averroès [above, n. 8], p. 169.
159 Of course, this passage has no correspondence in Ishāq’s incomplete translation of the De Anima.
160 For observations on Ibn Zū‘a’s Vorlage see nn. 156 and 158 above.
161 Averroès’ Middle Commentary has — see n. 154 above.
162 Averroès’ Middle Commentary has جميع (as in Pseudo-Isḥāq’s translation) — see n. 157 above.
163 For this rendering of the Greek νῦν δέ in Ishāq’s translation cf., e.g., De Anima, II 7, 419 a 7 (=p. 92.371 Bos, p. 240.1 Crawford) and II 8, 419 b 4 (=p. 93.398 Bos, p. 247.1 Crawford) rendered by —ابل ذه النكتون / in hoc autem loco (or: in hoc autem loco).
164 For this rendering — see n. 70 above.
165 Lyons adds — see n. 70 above.
Appendix IV: Avicenna’s Commentatorial Technique in His Marginal Notes on the De Anima

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ishāq (Passage 1, section)</th>
<th>Avicenna (p. 89.13-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘وأيّا التمييز (وقد عرفنا ما يريد به) والحبّة والبغضاء فليسَت علا لذاك لكنّ هذا الذي لم يذكر، فإنه لم يكن لذاك لكنك للمشترَك الذي تلف. فإنا، العقل’</td>
<td>‘ وأيّا التمييز (وقد عرفنا ما يريد به) والحبّة والبغضاء فليسَت علا لذاك لكنّ هذا الذي لم يذكر، فإنه لم يكن لذاك لكنك للمشترَك الذي تلف. فإنا، العقل’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ishāq (Passage 5, section)</th>
<th>Avicenna (pp. 101.23, 102.1 - 2,13-14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘ولذلك أنّ الحس لا يقدر أن يحسّن عن محسوس قويّ’</td>
<td>‘فهذا يقول: ‘وذلك أنّ الحس لا يقدر أن يحسّن عن محسوس قويّ’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>