

Studia graeco-arabica

Logica graeco-arabico-hebraica

Edited by Yehuda Halper

11/2

2021

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 (Executive Editor), Cristina D'Ancona, Maria Fasciano, 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 11/1 and 11/2 (2021), claims and customer service: press@unipi.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)

ISBN 978-88-3339-614-9 / ISBN 978-88-3339-615-6 (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 2021 by Pisa University Press Polo editoriale - Centro per l'innovazione e la diffusione della cultura

Università di Pisa

Piazza Torricelli 4 - 56126 Pisa

P. IVA 00286820501 · Codice Fiscale 80003670504

Tel. +39 050 2212056 · Fax +39 050 2212945

E-mail press@unipi.it · PEC cidic@pec.unipi.it

www.pisauniversitypress.it

Studia graeco-arabica. Vol. 1 (2011)- . - Pisa : Pacini editore, 2011- . - Annuale. Dal 2021: Pisa : Pisa university press.

180.05 (23.)

1. Filosofia araba - Periodici 2. Filosofia greca - Periodici

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

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 Raḍawī 300, f. 1v; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v

From Translator to Commentator: Ṭodros Ṭodrosi's Presentation of Aristotle's Organon

Steven Harvey, Oded Horezky

Abstract

The present article studies a fascinating manuscript, a *unicum*, housed in the British Library, Heb MS Add 27559. This manuscript of works by Ṭodros Ṭodrosi of Arles features a lengthy Hebrew anthology of logical and scientific texts, written by Greek and Arabic philosophers, some of which were translated by him into Hebrew for the first time. In a previous study that appeared in 2021, we examined the section from the book on natural science of this anthology that Ṭodros devoted to the study and explanation of Aristotle's *Physics* and which he completed in Trinquetaille in 1333 at the age of twenty. In that paper, we uncovered Ṭodros's aims and his own unique methodology in this section and sketched a picture of the ways in which Ṭodros intended to assist his contemporary readers in the study of natural science. In the present paper, we shed new light on this manuscript through an examination of the book on logic that Ṭodros dedicated to the study and explanation of Aristotle's *Organon*. We describe Ṭodros's *modus operandi* and examine the nature of his discussions in each of the sections of his book on logic, with special attention to the section on the *Posterior Analytics*, and we show to what extent they correspond to what we uncovered in his treatment of the *Physics*. The paper analyzes Ṭodros's use of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics* in order to explain Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics*, and it illustrates Ṭodros's use of al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on the *Topics* in order to explain Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on that book. The paper, just as our 2021 study that it complements, contributes to our knowledge of the fundamental status of Averroes' middle commentaries on the *Corpus Aristotelicum* among medieval Jewish scholars, as well as to our growing awareness and appreciation of the achievements of this fourteenth-century Provençal Jewish scholar, Ṭodros Ṭodrosi.

Introduction

The present study is our third on a fascinating manuscript, a *unicum*, housed in the British Library, Heb MS Add 27559. This manuscript, in part a version of a work compiled by Ṭodros Ṭodrosi of Arles in Trinquetaille in the 1330s, is a Hebrew anthology of logical and scientific texts, written by Greek and Arabic philosophers, some of which are translated into Hebrew for the first time.

A preliminary version of our first study, “Uncovering Ṭodros Ṭodrosi's Method of Commenting on the Commentator”, was presented in Krakow in July 2018 as a lecture at a session in memory of Mauro Zonta – the scholar who has done the most in recent times to call attention to the great importance of Ṭodros Ṭodrosi.¹ Our goal was to clarify Ṭodros's aims

¹ The lecture was presented at a session on Ṭodros Ṭodrosi at the XIth EAJS Congress in Krakow, July 2018. The session was one of two on medieval Jewish philosophy, organized by close friends and colleagues, in fond memory of Professor Mauro Zonta. For a revised and expanded version of the lecture, see now: S. Harvey – O. Horezky, “Averroes ex Averroes: Uncovering Ṭodros Ṭodrosi's Method of Commenting on the Commentator”, *Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism* 21 (2021), pp. 7-78.

and methodology of the section of the manuscript that treats Aristotle's *Physics* – in fact, the largest section – and to sketch a clear picture of the ways in which Ṭodros intended to assist his contemporary readers in the study of natural science. What we found is that Ṭodros's *modus operandi* for his treatment of the *Physics* and, presumably, other books of natural science, was to divide his discussions in two. The first part would briefly present the best comments of the commentators that are interesting, but not directly related to explicating the Aristotelian text. In the case of the section corresponding to Aristotle's *Physics*, this part comprised selections from the Hebrew translation of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *Physics*, generally attributed to Qalonimos ben Qalonimos.² The second part was a commentary on Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Physics*, which used almost exclusively, citations from Qalonimos's Hebrew translation of the *Long Commentary* to explicate the text; in other words, he used Averroes to explain Averroes. This finding conforms to Ṭodros's preface to the book on natural science, but, as we will see, it also accords with his preface to the book on logic. In the present study, we will, *inter alia*, examine the nature of Ṭodros's discussions in the book on logic, and his *modus operandi* there. Do they correspond to what we uncovered in his treatment of the *Physics*?

Our second study, "Variations and Consistencies in Hebrew Scientific Terminology: Hebrew Versions of Aristotle's *Physics* in the 13th and 14th Centuries", was presented in February 2019 at the conference, "Translating Ibn Rushd into Hebrew", at the Maimonides Centre for Advanced Studies, Hamburg.³ Here, *inter alia*, we showed that in his explication of Aristotelian natural science, Ṭodros Ṭodrosi did not hesitate to change the vocabulary of the Hebrew translation of the *Long Commentary* for stylistic reasons and perhaps to make it easier to understand, but when it came to technical terminology, he tended to keep the translator's vocabulary, which by his time had become rather standard. In the present paper, we will touch very briefly on Ṭodros's changes to the Hebrew of his source texts in logic. We will be most interested in his *modus operandi* in the sections of the book on logic and the extent to which each section is similar to that in the section on the *Physics*.

Ṭodros's Preface to the Book on Logic

What then goes on in Ṭodros's book on logic? Let us begin by considering Ṭodros's preface to his book on logic, which parallels and is very similar to his preface to the book on natural science but is longer and more detailed. The preface to the book on logic reads as follows:

Said Ṭodros Ṭodrosi from the seed of the Jews, may the memory of the righteous be for a blessing:
Our intention in this science, i.e., the science of logic, is to gather in a book what is most useful for providing the attainment of the utility of logic and the particulars of its ultimate intentions, from

² On Qalonimos as the likely translator into Hebrew of Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *Physics*, see S. Harvey, "The Hebrew Translation of Averroes' *Prooemium* to his *Long Commentary* on Aristotle's *Physics*", *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 52 (1985), pp. 59-60; and G. Tamani – M. Zonta, *Aristoteles hebraicus. Versioni, commenti e compendi del Corpus Aristotelicum nei manoscritti ebraici delle biblioteche italiane*, Supernova, Venice 1997, p. 38. Qalonimos translated the *Middle Commentary* on the *Physics* in Arles in 1316. In this paper, we attribute the translation of the *Long Commentary* to Qalonimos.

³ This lecture also was revised for publication; see S. Harvey - O. Horezky, "Variations and Consistencies in Hebrew Scientific Terminology: Hebrew Versions of Aristotle's *Physics* in the 13th and 14th Centuries", in R. Leicht – G. Veltri (eds.), *Translating Ibn Rushd into Hebrew*, Brill, Leiden (forthcoming, subseries *Officina Philosophica Hebraica*).

the treatises of the compositions of those [scholars] who followed the philosophy of Aristotle, be it Themistius or Alexander or al-Fārābī or Avicenna or al-Ġazālī.

My intention is to read and understand, while reading Averroes' middle commentaries on Aristotle's books on this science, the books of the abovementioned philosophers on this science; [and] to compile and copy what is new and most useful in these lengthy books in [one] book in order to save me the trouble of having to read these commentaries, which are very long, a second time.

And I saw fit to translate from the works of those philosophers, which are not long commentaries on Aristotle's treatises, each and every *quaesitus* that seemed to us to be most useful for providing the conceptualization of the matter in the place where the author put it in that work, each in his own way according to the divisions of the general intention of the book. However, from the long commentaries by the commentators on Aristotle's books on this science [logic], we saw fit to bring and apply the comprehensive comments from these comprehensive long commentaries on the concise language of Averroes' middle commentaries on Aristotle's books on this science, whether to explain his obscure language, since it is [so] concise, or to direct to the conceptualization of the truth in it.

Now, since the commentators brought in their long commentaries, in the necessary course of things, teachings and notions, [which are] fine and useful in themselves, [but] which depart from the first intention of the long commentaries on the treatises of the Philosopher [Aristotle], and from which there are no words in these teachings that we could bring and apply to Averroes' middle commentaries, for they are not a commentary on the statements of Aristotle; I thus was obliged to place these teachings, which are fine and useful in themselves [but are not explanations of the Aristotelian text], in each of the books of this science [logic] in one part first; and [to place] the statements that are useful for understanding Aristotle's intention, [and] which can be applied to the words of Averroes' middle commentaries, in a second part.

This is [the procedure] with regard to Aristotle's books for which there exists a long commentary on them [written] by one of the [abovementioned] commentators. However, [regarding] the books for which there does not exist a long commentary, we will carry out our intention in only one part. And we will begin our specified intention with Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* – not with the *Categories*, although [the *Categories*] is the first book of this science, since this book inquires into being *qua* being, and its place is in first philosophy and it is there that the commentators explain the properties of the ten categories and their conditions. Nor [will we begin] with the book *On Interpretation*, since its intentions are easy to understand as well as the conceptualization [of it], and also [because] al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on it has already been translated and spread among many of the scholarly community.⁴

⁴ MS London, British Library, *Add. 27559* (henceforth, *Todros*), f. 1r1-1v15: אמר טדרוס טדרוסי מורע היהודים: זצ"ל: כונתנו בזאת החכמה, רוצה לומר חכמת ההגיון, לקבץ בספר היותר מועיל בנתינת הנגעת תועלת ההגיון ופרטי כונותיו התכליתיות, ממאמרי חברי מי ומי מהנמשכים לפלוסופיות ארסטו, אם תאמסטיוס, אם אלסכנדה אם אבונצ'ה אם אבן סינא, אם אבוהמד אלגזאלי. כונה ממני, לקרוא ולהבין אצל קראי באורי אבן רשד לספרי ארסטו בזאת החכמה, ספרי הפלוסופים הנזכרים בחכמה הזאת; לחבר ולחקות המחושש היותר מועיל מהספריים הארוכים ההם בספך להקל מעלי טרח קריאתם שנית לאריכותם. וראיתי אני להעתיק מחבורי הפלוסופים שאינם פרישה למאמרי ארסטו, דרוש דרוש ממה שנראה לנו היותר מועיל בנתינת ציור הענין במקומו אשר הניחו בו מחבר החבור ההוא, איש על רגלו כפי חלוקות כללי כונת הספך ואולם מפרישות המפרשים ספרי ארסטו בזאת החכמה, ראינו אנחנו להביא ולהפיל הפרושים הרחבים מהפרישות הרחבות ההן על הלשונות הקצרים מבאורי אבן רשד לספרי ארסטו בזאת החכמה, אם לבאר הלשון הנעלם לקצרו ואם להישיר לנפילת ציור האמת בו. האמנם לפי שהמפרשים יביאו בפרישות, להכרח המשך הדברים, מאמרים וענינים טובי התועלת בעצמם, יוצאים מהכונה המכוננת ראשונה בפרישת מאמרי הפילוסוף, והמאמרים ונפילים עליו, אחר שאינם פרישה למאמרי ארסטו, הנה לזאת הביאני ההכרח, להשים אלו ההם לא נמצא להם בבאורי אבן רשד לשון נביאם [1v] המאמרים הטובי התועלת בעצמם בספר מספרי החכמה, חלק אחד ראשונה; והמאמרים המועילים לבאור מכוון ארסטו, האפשרי הנפילה על לשונות באורי אבן רשד, חלק אחר שנית. זה בספרי ארסטו אשר נמצא להם פרישה למי ומי ממהמפרשים. האמנם בספרים אשר לא נמצא להם פרישה, נכלל מכוונתנו בחלק אחד בלבד. ונתחיל זה על צד הכונה אשר יעדנו בספר ההיקש לארסטו, לא בספר המאמרות, ואם הוא ראשון ספרי זאת החכמה, לפי שעיון הספך ההוא הוא עיון הנמצא במה שהוא נמצא ומקומו בפלוסופיא הראשונה, ושמה פרשו המפרשים סגלות עשרת המאמרות ותנאיהם, ולא בספר המליצה, לפי שכונותיו קלות ההבנה והציור, גם שכבר הועתקה ונתפשטה לעדת המון המעינים פרישת אבונצ'ה לאותו הספך.

Here Ṭodros tells us what he plans to do and provides interesting insights about the reception and transmission of Aristotelian logic (and philosophy) among Jewish scholars in Provence in the first half of the fourteenth century. First, it is clear that for Ṭodros, as for Qalonimos and his circle, Aristotle's texts along with the commentaries on them by Averroes, and, in particular, their works on logic and the natural sciences, are the foundations of any philosophical inquiry and provide the framework for it.⁵ As we shall see, this framework is somewhat flexible and open for modifications and innovations. Ṭodros also introduces the important philosopher-commentators that belong to the Greco-Arabic Aristotelian tradition whom he refers to as "those [scholars] who followed the philosophy of Aristotle", among whom he counts Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistius, al-Fārābī, Avicenna, and most interestingly, al-Ġazālī. Second, Averroes' middle commentaries on Aristotle's works receive a special status and, therefore, Averroes is not placed together with the above-mentioned list of commentators, but rather separately. Indeed, Ṭodros's first intention is to read and understand Averroes' middle commentaries, and his primary purpose in employing all other commentaries, including Averroes' long commentaries, is to assist in achieving this aim. For Ṭodros, Averroes' middle commentaries serve as the textbooks and point of departure for philosophical inquiry. Ṭodros holds the study of Averroes' middle commentaries as equal to the study of Aristotle's own texts, i.e. as commentaries that provide faithful and reliable access to Aristotle's own ideas, rather than offering creative commentaries, which go beyond Aristotle's text and which as such present Averroean modifications and developments. In addition, the middle commentaries were at his time relatively widespread among Hebrew readers and likely not very difficult to access.

The case is different for Averroes' long commentaries and the long commentaries written by some of the above-mentioned philosophers. Here, as we have seen with regard to his treatment of the *Physics*, Ṭodros argues for the existence of two layers of interpretations that can be found in the long commentaries on Aristotle's *Organon*. One is the creative comments of Averroes, or any other commentator, that are fine and useful in themselves but are not explanations of the Aristotelian text and, therefore, cannot be matched and applied to the middle commentaries. Ṭodros explains that, "in the necessary course of things", it is only natural that while writing such "long" commentaries, new ideas originated in the commentators' minds and were integrated into the text. In other words, Ṭodros sees the long commentary as a creative medium or intellectual framework in which the commentators often present their own ideas. Passages that belong to this creative layer were placed in the first part of Ṭodros's sections on each one of Aristotle's books for which there was a long commentary. The second layer contains those comments from the long commentaries that are relevant for explaining Aristotle's text and that he employs to explain Averroes' middle commentaries. In the preface, he describes this editorial-

For a comparison of the Hebrew text and English translation of Ṭodros's preface to the book on logic to his preface to the book on natural science, see Harvey - Horezky, "Averroes *ex Averroë*" (above, n. 1).

⁵ A different view is offered by Gad Freudenthal and Mauro Zonta, who describe the approach of Ṭodros and his colleague, Judah ben Solomon Nathan, who include in their philosophical works several texts of Avicenna and al-Ġazālī, as one motivated by "a clear philosophical agenda, namely, to promote Avicenna and al-Ġazālī as a philosophical alternative to radical Averroism". For them, Ṭodros's "inclusion of quotations from authors with Avicennian tendencies suggests that when compiling his anthology Ṭodros was guided by an interest in Avicennian ideas running against the dominant Averroist consensus". See G. Freudenthal - M. Zonta, "Avicenna among Medieval Jews: the Reception of Avicenna's Philosophical, Scientific and Medical Writings in Jewish Cultures, East and West", *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 22 (2012), pp. 258-60; and M. Zonta, "The Role of Avicenna and of Islamic 'Avicennism' in the 14th-century Jewish Debate around Philosophy and Religion", *Oriente Moderno*, n.s., 19 (2000), pp. 647-660, part. p. 656.

commentatorial activity as “bring and apply”, i.e., to bring a passage from a long commentary and to apply it to explain the relevant words in Averroes' middle commentary.

Ṭodros also speaks in his preface to the book on logic about another format in which he intends to organize and present his discussion. If there is no available long commentary by any of the above-mentioned philosophers on a particular book of the *Organon*, he will translate extracts from their works that he considers as most useful for studying the subject of that book. In such a case, Ṭodros will present his discussion in only one part, since it is not a commentary on Aristotle's text and therefore cannot be applied to Averroes' middle commentary. Our manuscript seems to provide one clear example of such a case, his treatment of the *Prior Analytics*.

Ṭodros's Book on Logic: Structure, Plan, and Content

What does Ṭodros actually do in the book on logic? The book on logic comprises 93 folios or almost one-third of our manuscript (1r-93v). The first 22 folios concern Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* (1v-22r), the next 45 folios concern the *Posterior Analytics* (22v-67r), and the last and final 26 folios concern the *Topics* (67r-93v). At the end of the section on the *Topics*, Ṭodros writes:

After these [long commentaries on the *Topics*] will come the particulars of the intentions that we will see fit to bring from the commentaries of the philosophers on the book, the *Rhetoric*, in accordance with the intention we have specified, God willing, amen and amen. *Remove from me the way of falsehood; And grant me Thy law graciously* [Ps 119:29].⁶

This is, more or less, the standard wording Ṭodros uses in both the book on logic and that on natural science to conclude his account of one Aristotelian book and move on to another. What is of interest is that he seems to skip the *Sophistical Refutations* and move directly to the *Rhetoric*. What is deeply disappointing is that the next folio of our manuscript begins the book on natural science. What happened to the *Rhetoric*? Did he ever write it? We believe he did, but that the compiler of this manuscript simply did not have it, just as he did not have the promised account of the *De Caelo* in the book on natural science.⁷ Indeed, in his preface to the book on natural science, Ṭodros writes: “[We will follow] the same intention that we specified in the [section] on logic and the [same] path we took there”. This suggests that he had finished what he intended to write in the book on logic, including the announced section on the *Rhetoric*.⁸ There is, however, another reasonable explanation for the mysterious absence of the *Rhetoric* in Ṭodros's anthology. As we have seen, his first intention in his book is to help explain Averroes' middle commentaries, via long commentaries when available. When the time came to write the section on the *Rhetoric*, he would have had good reason to assume that

⁶ Ṭodros MS, f. 93v15-23: The full passage reads: אמר המקבץ: הגה בכאן שלמה העתקת גרגרי ראש אמיר אמרות המפרש אבונצר למאמר השמיני מפרשתו לספר הנצוח לארסטו, ובה שלמה שלמו פרטי כונות הפרישות אשר ראינו לקצם מספרי מפרשי הפילוסופים בדרושי ספר הנצוח. יבאו אחריהם פרטי הכונות אשר נראה להביאם מבאורי הפילוסופים בספר ההלצה על צד הכונה שיעדנו אותה אם ירצה האל, אמן ואמן. דרך שקר הסר ממני ותורתך חנני [תהילים קיט:כט].

⁷ On the similar promised account of the *De Caelo*, see Harvey - Horezky, “*Averroes ex Averroes*” (above, n. 1), pp. 22-4. At the end of the section on Aristotle's *Physics*, the twenty-year old Ṭodros gives his age and the date he completed this section. He then adds, using the exact same language he used to describe his work on the *Physics* that he had just completed: “After this will come what we see fit to bring from the long commentaries on the *De Caelo*, in accordance with the intention we have designated, God willing, amen”.

⁸ There is, of course, the possibility that he never wrote this account [and that on the *Poetics*], and we will suggest a justification for this view below.

there was a Hebrew translation of Averroes' middle commentary on it, but, in fact, at the time there were Hebrew translations of all of Averroes' middle commentaries on Aristotle with the exception of those on the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*. How could he explain a Hebrew text that did not exist? We can imagine he spent some time trying to locate the Hebrew translation until he realized that it had not yet been made. He then determined to translate the middle commentaries on the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, which project he completed some four years later in 1337. We do not know if he ever returned to his anthology project and wrote the section on the *Rhetoric*.⁹ On the other hand, it is equally plausible that knowing there was no Hebrew translation of the middle commentary available at the time, he decided to write only a single part on the *Rhetoric*, similar to what he had done with the *Prior Analytics*. If this were his intention, there would have been no need or expectation to refer to the *Middle Commentary* on the *Rhetoric*, and he could have completed his account of it before the *Physics*. In support of this scenario, when Ṭodros writes in the passage just cited, "we will see fit to bring from the commentaries of the philosophers on the book, the *Rhetoric*", the term he uses for commentaries is *be'urim*, that is paraphrastic or middle commentaries and not *perishot*, the term he uses for long commentaries. If he did not have a long commentary on the *Rhetoric* with which to interpret the *Middle Commentary* on it, the section on the *Rhetoric* could not have been in two parts, even if he had a Hebrew translation of the *Middle Commentary* on the *Rhetoric*.¹⁰

In short, the book on logic, as we have it today, contains accounts of only the *Prior Analytics*, the *Posterior Analytics*, and the *Topics*. What about the *Categories* and *On Interpretation*? Ṭodros explains in his preface that he will begin with the *Prior Analytics*, not the *Categories* because

(...) although [the *Categories*] is the first book of this science, since this book inquires into being *qua* being, and its place is in first philosophy and it is there that the commentators explain the properties of the ten categories and their conditions. Nor [will we begin] with the book *On Interpretation*, since its intentions are easy to understand as well as the conceptualization [of it], and also [because] al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on it has already been translated and spread among many of the scholarly community.¹¹

In other words, for Ṭodros, since (1) in Avicennian fashion, the *Categories* should be treated in metaphysics,¹² and (2) *On Interpretation* is easy to understand and, in addition, al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on it is easily accessible in Hebrew translation,¹³ there was no need to treat

⁹ This may have been Gabriella Berzin's point when she noted: "At the end of the [logical part] of the anthology, Ṭodrosi states that Averroes's *Middle Commentary* on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was to follow the extracts on logic, but in fact he concluded it in 1337 after the extracts on *Physics*". He could not explain the *Middle Commentary* until he made it available in Hebrew translation. See G. Elgrably-Berzin, *Avicenna in Medieval Hebrew Translation: Ṭodros Ṭodrosi's Translation of Kitāb al-Najāt, On Psychology and Metaphysics*, Brill, Leiden 2014, p. 4, n. 15.

¹⁰ In Ṭodros's anthology, there are two parts to a section only when there is a Hebrew translation of a middle commentary by Averroes on the Aristotelian book under consideration and a long commentary on that Aristotelian work to explain the middle commentary.

¹¹ See above, n. 4.

¹² See D. Gutas, *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1988, pp. 265-67. On this approach to the *Categories* as a sign of Ṭodros's Avicennism, see Zonta, "The Role of Avicenna" (above, n. 5), pp. 653-54; and Id., *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico*, Paideia, Brescia 1996, p. 252.

¹³ On al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on the *De Interpretatione* in medieval Hebrew translation, see M. Zonta, "Al-Fārābī's Commentaries on Aristotelian Logic: New Discoveries", in U. Vermeulen - D. De Smet (eds.),

these two books here. The last point indicates that Ṭodros's anthology was meant to serve the scholarly community, and not to be merely a useful book for Ṭodros's own use, as he writes in his preface, "in order to save me the trouble of having to read these commentaries, which are very long, a second time". The book on logic thus begins with an account of the *Prior Analytics* and ends with an account of the *Topics*.

This section of our manuscript on logic has been studied a bit more than the book on natural science, which has, with few exceptions, been largely ignored. In his 1973 doctoral dissertation, Shalom Rosenberg noted the importance of this manuscript, which he advised was "particularly worthy of study, since it constitutes an anthology of the logical literature that was available to the author in Arabic". Rosenberg was most interested in Ṭodros's translations of certain logical writing by Themistius. Years later, he and Charles Manekin published an edition and translation of Ṭodros's translation of passages from Themistius's commentary on the *Prior Analytics*.¹⁴ As the editors explained, these interesting passages from Themistius's Greek commentary are preserved and known today only through Ṭodros's translation of them from the no longer extant Arabic translation.¹⁵ Mauro Zonta has described in detail the section from Ṭodros's anthology that corresponds to Aristotle's *Topics* and has identified passages from al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on the *Topics* in that section – a commentary that is also preserved only through Ṭodros's translation.¹⁶ Later in this paper, we will say a bit about Ṭodros's method in the section on the *Topics*.¹⁷

Ṭodros's Section on the Posterior Analytics: Nature and Method

We can now try to answer the questions we have posed about the nature of Ṭodros's book on logic by focusing on his account of the *Posterior Analytics*, the longest section in the book on logic and the one least studied. Ṭodros begins this section as follows:

Our intention in this book, that is, the *Book of the Demonstration* [*Posterior Analytics*], is to gather the particulars of the intentions of the matters we have specified to gather for each one of the books

Philosophy and Arts in the Islamic World. Proceedings of the 18th Congress of the Union européenne des arabisants et islamisants held at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Peeters, Leuven 1998, pp. 219-32, esp. 223-24 and 231; Id., *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico* (above, n. 12), p. 162, n. 61; and Id., "Fonti antiche e medievali della logica ebraica nella Provenza del Trecento", *Medioevo* 23 (1997), pp. 515-94, esp. 527-28. The extant evidence does not point to its wide circulation in Hebrew.

¹⁴ See S. Rosenberg, "Logic and Ontology in Jewish Philosophy of the 14th Century, Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1973, 2 vols, vol. 1, pp. 86-88. See further, S. Rosenberg – Ch. Manekin, "Themistius on Modal Logic: Excerpts from a Commentary on the *Prior Analytics* Attributed to Themistius", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 11 (1988), pp. 83-103; and for the text, Id., "Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Themistius' Commentary on the *Analytica Priora*" (Hebrew), *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 9 (1990), pp. 267-74.

¹⁵ Rosenberg - Manekin, "Themistius on Modal Logic" (above, n. 14), esp. p. 85.

¹⁶ M. Zonta, "About Ṭodros Ṭodrosi's Medieval Hebrew Translation of al-Fārābī's Lost *Long Commentary/Gloss-Commentary* on Aristotle's *Topics*, Book VIII", *History and Philosophy of Logic* 32 (2011), pp. 37-45. See also, Id., "La logica antica nel Medioevo ebraico: modi di trasmissione e nuove testimonianze", in A. Valvo (ed.), *La diffusione dell'eredità classica nell'età tardoantica e medievale: Forme e modi di trasmissione*, Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria 1997, pp. 241-51; Id., "Fonti antiche e medievali della logica ebraica" (above, n. 13), esp. pp. 557-62; and Id., "Al-Fārābī's Commentaries on Aristotelian Logic" (above, n. 13), pp. 228-32.

¹⁷ On Ṭodros's method in the section on the *Topics*, see the chapter in the present volume by A. Lamprakis – D. Davies, "Delineating Dialectic: The Perfect Philosopher in al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on *Topics* VIII 1".

And we have already discussed the syllogism in the *Book of the Syllogism [Prior Analytics] and the demonstration* in this book [i.e. in the *Posterior Analytics*].²²

The next lemma that Ṭodros bring from the *Middle Commentary* reads:

[It] depends on the knowledge of the other.²³

Averroes' explicit meaning here is that knowledge of the syllogism depends (נתלית, متعلق) on knowledge of the demonstration and vice versa, a point that would be known to Ṭodros's readers only if they had the *Middle Commentary* in front of them. This lemma is followed by two distinct sentences that Ṭodros combines and attaches from Averroes' *Long Commentary* with some modifications. Ṭodros's version reads:

This is [because] syllogistic knowledge is [achieved] by demonstration, as Aristotle said, and that the thing from which the inquiry [comes] is demonstrative knowledge. For this reason, he called them by one name.²⁴

The next lemma from the *Middle Commentary* reads:

From where will we receive our knowledge of the [first] principles of demonstration?²⁵

Ṭodros explains this lemma with the following comment from the *Long Commentary*:

From where will we receive the knowledge of the first [principles] of demonstration? And through which faculty will they reach [us]? And how will they arrive? And what is their nature? [Since] it is clear that [these questions] do not [belong] to the art of logic, he presented this inquiry after he completed His intention and His will regarding the syllogism and the demonstration, and in order to strengthen the inquiry that leads to the knowledge of demonstration, and to reject the doubts about it, such as whether the principles of demonstration are known through demonstration or without demonstration? And if they are known without demonstration, whether they are known through other things [i.e. other mediated causes or premises] or by themselves? For this reason, [Aristotle began] to speak here about the nature of these premises in a sufficient [way] for anyone who studies these *quaesita*. This is the intention of Averroes' language.²⁶

²² In all our citations from Ṭodros's text in this section, the lemmata from the *Middle Commentary* are distinguished from the comments from the *Long Commentary* by bold letters. See Ṭodros MS, f. 66r1: וכבר דברנו בהקש בספר ההקש; ובמפת בזה הספר – Cf. Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics*, Hebrew trans. by Jacob Anatoli, MS Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, *Plut.* 88.32, f. 214r6: וכבר דברנו בהקש ובמפת. Averroes' *Long Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics*, MS Munich, *Hebr* 32, f. 337r25-28. Unless mentioned otherwise, references to both commentaries will be to these manuscripts of the Hebrew translations cited by Ṭodros. For the Arabic text of the *Middle Commentary*, see Averroes, *Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics*, ed. M.M. Kassem - C.E. Butterworth - A.A. Haridi, The American Research Center in Egypt, Cairo 1982, II, 19, pp. 179-183. The Arabic of Book II of the *Long Commentary* appears to be no longer extant.

²³ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r2: נתלית בידיעה באחר = Florence MS *Plut.* 88.32, f. 214r8.

²⁴ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r2-5: ולזה הוא הידיעה המופתית. וזהו קרא שניהם בשם אחד (...) וזה מאמרו בראש ספר ההקש שאשר כווננו – Cf. Munich MS *Hebr* 32, f. 337r24-30: אליו הנה הוא המופת ואשר ממנו החקירה הוא הידיעה המופתית.

²⁵ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r5-6: [العلم بمبادئ البرهان] = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r9-10.

²⁶ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r6-13: לפי שהידיעה מאין הגיעונו ראשונות המופת ובאי זה כח יגיעו ואיך יגיעו ומה טבעם גלוי שאיננה ממלאכת – Cf. Munich MS *Hebr* 32, f. 337r24-30: ההגיון הביא זאת החקירה אחרי השלימו כונתו ורצונו מההקש והמופת ולמען תתחזק החקירה בעבורה ידיעת המופת ולדחות הספק שנאמר אם

The following lemmata from the *Middle Commentary* with Ṭodros's explanations from the *Long Commentary* read as follows:

We will precede [our discussion] with what is required from the doubt.²⁷ Since the perfect knowledge will indeed arrive after it is preceded by [assuming] the contrary propositions regarding the reality of a thing and its denial.²⁸ **Whether one perceives the principles of demonstration and the things that are known through demonstration.**²⁹ The first is our inquiry, whether the faculty of the soul that apprehends the conclusions is [the one that] apprehends the premises.³⁰ **And we say this: Do you perceive the faculty by which is known, etc.**³¹ Now we will investigate whether the way of cognition by which the premises are acquired is itself the same as that by which the conclusions are acquired.³² **But we forget them.**³³ And this is Plato's view, who was of the opinion that the intelligibles are not generated by themselves, and that learning is [by] recollection.³⁴ **[They are] stronger and more perfect than demonstrative knowledge and we forget them.**³⁵ But we find that what we know by demonstration, we will not be able to completely forget, all the more so what we know by knowledge that is stronger than the demonstrative one.³⁶

The important point here is that our knowledge of the first intelligibles is stronger than the knowledge that we acquire through demonstration. Since we cannot completely forget the latter, we certainly cannot forget the former. Hence, Plato's theory of knowledge, as expressed in the *Meno* and *Phaedo*, as a process of recollecting what our souls once knew but forgot, is unsound.

יודעו התחלות המופת במופת או בזולת מופת ואם נודעו בזולת מופת האם יודעו מפני זולתם או מפני עצמם לזאת דבר הנה מטבע אלה ההקדמות אולם הידיעה מאין הגיע: Cf. Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 338r5-15: מה שבו די למעין בידיעת הדרושים הנזכרים. זאת כונת לשון בן רשה לנו ראשונה המופתים ובאי זה כח הגיעו ואיך הגיעו ומה טבע אלה ההקדמות הנה הוא נראה שאיננו מחכמת ההגיון ולכן הביא זאת החקירה אחר הספור בשכבר נשלם למה לו מה היתה כוונתו מענין ההקש המופת. אבל בעבור שהיתה הידיעה באלה הדברים ממה שתהיה מובטחת בה היא הידיעה במופת יתן הספק אם יודעו ראשונות המופת במופת או בזולת מופת ואם נודעו בזולת מופת הנה אם יודעו מפני זולתם או מפני עצמם ובעי בור אלה הדברים אראה שיוכר הנה מטבע אלה ההקדמות אשר הם ראשונות במופת מה שאפשר שיראה מעניינם בזה המקום במה שיקוב המעין.

²⁷ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r13-14: (ما يجب من التشكيك) = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r14, and most of the other manuscripts are word for word the same as Ṭodros but have בספק instead of ספק. One manuscript of the *Middle Commentary*, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS *Cod. Hebr.* 106, f. 174va.11-12, has בספק מן הספק, which may combine two separate readings. Indeed, while most Arabic manuscripts of the *Middle Commentary* have מן הספק. One manuscript has [מן]= מן. One manuscript has [ב]= ב; see Averroes, *Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics*, p. 180 Kassem-Butterworth-Haridi, sec. 152, n. 2. Ṭodros's manuscript of the *Middle Commentary* may well have read מן.

²⁸ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r14-15 with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 338r27-29, provided in square brackets: כי [בעבור שהיתה] הידיעה השלמה [היותר שלימה] אמנם הגיע אחרי [אחר] הקדים [שיקדמוה] המאמרים ההפכים [המתפכים] בקיום דבר ובטולו.

²⁹ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r15-16: = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r17. ואם תראה התחלות המופת והדברים שיודעו במופת:

³⁰ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r16-17, with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 339r6-8, provided in square brackets: ראשונה היתה דרישתנו [שני דרושים אחד משניהם] אם כח הנפש [הכח מן הנפש] שישגי [אשר ישגי] התולדות הוא אשר ישיג ההקדמות.

³¹ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r17-18: וכו' (يعلم) = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r15.

³² Ṭodros MS, f. 66r18-19, with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 339r8-10: ועתה [והשני] נדרוש אם הצד: 339r8-10: וזה נאמר התראה הכח אשר בו נדע [יעלם] וכו'.

³³ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r20: אותם (ناسون) = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r21. אמנם אנחנו שוכחים [אנחנו שוכחים] אותם:

³⁴ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r20-21, with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 339r17-19, provided in square brackets: וזהו דעת [זהו אשר רמזו אליו הוא סבות] אפלטון שיראה [זהו שהוא יראה] שהמושכלות בלתי מתחדשות בעצמם ושהלמוד הזכרה [אמנם הוא הזכרה].

³⁵ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r21-22: חזקות ושלמות מידיעת המופת ואנחנו שוכחים אותם = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214r24-25.

³⁶ Ṭodros MS, f. 66r22-66v1, with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 339r29-30, provided in square brackets: כי אנחנו נמצא מה שנדעוהו במופת לא נוכל לשכחו [אי אפשר שנשכח] כלו כל שכן מה שנדעו בידיעה [שיודע בו ידיעה] חזקה יותר מן המופתית [יותר חזקה ויותר בטוחה מידיעת המופת].

The next lemma that Ṭodros brings reads:

With a faculty and a disposition existing in us by way of this faculty.³⁷

Here, Ṭodros's version of this lemma differs from the virtually all the manuscripts that contain Anatoli's Hebrew translation of the *Middle Commentary*. While Ṭodros's translation reads "a faculty and a disposition [הכנה]", the reading of the nearly twenty manuscripts of Anatoli's translation of the Hebrew commentary that we checked is "a faculty and a happiness [הצלחה]", although two manuscripts have marginal corrections that agree with Ṭodros's version.³⁸ Did Ṭodros correct his lemma on the basis of the Arabic of the *Middle Commentary*, استعداد, or did he stick to his principle of citing exactly from the Hebrew translation in front of him? As we will see later, Ṭodros does not deviate from Anatoli's translation even when he corrects the translation of the lemma he has just cited. In the present lemma, Ṭodros indeed cites from the Hebrew translation in front of him that had "disposition" and not "happiness". This is confirmed from the citations of the passage in Gersonides' slightly earlier supercommentary on Averroes' *Middle Commentary*.³⁹ This is yet further evidence of the importance of Ṭodros's lemmata for editing the Hebrew translations of Averroes' middle commentaries. The lemma is explained with the following comment:

The meaning of "by way of this faculty and disposition" is that these principles will come [to us] from it, i.e. from the disposition, or we [might] explain "by way of this faculty" that we acquire [the principles] from it [i.e., from the faculty].⁴⁰

The remaining lemmata from the *Middle Commentary* with Ṭodros's explanations from the *Long Commentary* read as follows:

And this is the unimaginable.⁴¹ But we think that some of the animals do not imagine [i.e., do not have an imaginative faculty], since they will repeat doing what is harmful to them,

³⁷ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v1-2: עם כח והכנה נמצאת בנו דרך זה הכח. Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v4-5, is again identical to Ṭodros's citation except it has והצלחה instead of והכנה. The Arabic has استعداد and accords with Ṭodros's version.

³⁸ In Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS heb. 929, f. 122v16, the body of the text reads והצלחה but in the right margin it is corrected to והכנה; Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 88.34, f. 111v9, also has והצלחה, while the left margin has והכנה.

³⁹ See Gersonides, *Commentary on Averroes' Middle Commentary on the Posterior Analytics*, London, British Library, MS Add. 18687, f. 183v13-14, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS heb. 961, f. 48r12. The term استعداد also appears in the following sentence of the *Middle Commentary*, cited by Gersonides, but not by Ṭodros. Curiously, a third manuscript of Gersonides' supercommentary (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS heb. 920, f. 109r) has "disposition" in our lemma but "happiness" in the following sentence. The mistake in the translation of استعداد derives from its similar appearance to سعادة, the word for happiness. Perhaps Anatoli originally translated the Arabic version he had in front of him with "happiness" and he or someone else later corrected it to "disposition". Both versions circulated and the correction seems to be attested in the manuscripts in the preceding note.

⁴⁰ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v2-3: הטעם מדרך זה הכח וההכנה שיגיעו ממנה רוצה לומר מההכנה אלו ההתחלות או נפרש דרך זה הכח הוא. שמינעו ממנה. We did not find the exact text in the *Long Commentary*, although the content corresponds to Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 340v. Perhaps the explanation is by Ṭodros himself.

⁴¹ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v4: [الغير متخيل] = והוא הבלתי מדמה = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v10.

many times in a single event, as what happens with the horsefly and the light of the candle.⁴² **And the image is taken from them.**⁴³ The image that is between these forms is taken from them.⁴⁴ **As it happens in war.**⁴⁵ Since he [Aristotle] made known how the soul acquires the universal intelligible habits [habitus] from sensible ones, he wanted to employ here poetical speech, for through this analogy he makes learning a pleasure.⁴⁶ **Through which it is verified to be true.**⁴⁷ Averroes explained what is described to be true.⁴⁸ **And [there is] no single genus among the things that are apprehended.**⁴⁹ He [Aristotle] means, that you will not find in us an apprehension that is more complete and with stronger perfection than the apprehension that is called “knowledge”, except for the one that is that called “intellection”.⁵⁰ **Therefore, the principles of demonstration are greater [or more important] for verification.**⁵¹ He means since they come from the intellect.⁵² **They are of one exemplar.**⁵³ He [Aristotle] means, that every intellection of everything that is intellected is of one exemplar, i.e. that everything that is in the intellect agrees with everything that is external to the soul or that the apprehension of everything

⁴² Ṭodros MS, f. 66v4-6, with variant readings from Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 340v2-4, provided in square brackets: [ואולם נחשוב [ואמנם יחשב] שקצת החי לא ידמה מצד שגותו [לפי שהוא יכפול] על המזיק לו פעמים רבות בעת אחת [בענין אחד פעמים]. The example of the horsefly or stinging fly is clear, but it seems that each translator or commentator uses the kind of insect that he pictures flying into the fire again and again. Qalonimos used צלצל (*šelašal*, perhaps referring to the kind of locust mentioned in Deut. 28:42) in his translation of the *Long Commentary*, which Ṭodros replaced with יתוש (mosquito). Gersonides in his supercommentary on the *Middle Commentary*, British Library MS 18687, f. 184r2, gives זבוב (fly) as an example of the unimaginable. The two sixteenth-century Latin translations of the *Long Commentary*, made from the Hebrew trans., have *papilioni* (Abraham de Balme, butterflies or moths) and *tabano* (Giovanni Francesco Burana, horsefly); see Aristotelis *Opera cum Averrois Commentariis*, Apud Iunctas, Venice 1562, vol. 1,2, f. 562D.

⁴³ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v6: [ينتنع منها التشابه] = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v11-12.

⁴⁴ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v6-7: הדמו שבין אותם הצורות יתעורר מהם. We did not find the exact corresponding text in the *Long Commentary*, although it corresponds to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, fols. 340v-341r

⁴⁵ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v7: כמו שיקרה במלחמה = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v24-25.

⁴⁶ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v7-10: למה שהודיע איך תקנה הנפש מפני הקנינים המוחשים הקנינים הכוללים המושכלים רצה לעשות בזה מאמר – Cf. Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 341v24-26: אמנם יהיו מפני הקנינים המורגשים הקנינים הכוללים המושכלים ואם עשה בזה משל שיריי לפי שמדרך זה הדמיון שישים הלמוד ערב.

⁴⁷ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v10: [نصّدق] = Florence MS 88.32, f. 215r5.

⁴⁸ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v10-11: וצדק ממנה: פרש בן רשד אשר יתואר בצדק – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v8.

⁴⁹ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v11: [المدرّكات] = Florence MS 88.32, f. 215r9.

⁵⁰ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v11-13: ירצה שלא תמצא בנו השגה יותר תמימה ולא יותר חזקת השלמות מן ההשגה שתקרא הידיעה אלא אשר – Cf. Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 343v14-15: ורצה שלא ימצא השגה יותר שלימה ויותר חזקת תכלית מן ההשגה אשר יקרא – Cf. Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 343v14-15: הידיעה לא אשר תקרא שכל.

⁵¹ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v13-14: [التصديق] = Florence MS 88.32, f. 215r11-12, except that Florence and five other manuscripts we checked have the אמונה for التصديق (assent or verification). Ṭodros correctly has ההאמתה, as do six other manuscripts of the *Middle Commentary*, although a thirteenth manuscript has ההאמתה with האמונה, written above it (see Paris MS heb. 929, f. 223r16). Gersonides' supercommentary also has ההאמתה (British Library MS 18687, f. 184v10). האמונה may not have been a translation of التصديق, but a scribal misreading of ההאמתה (a simple misreading of ת for נ). For *taṣḏīq* and some Hebrew equivalents, see H.A. Wolfson, “The Terms *Taṣawwur* and *Taṣḏīq* in Arabic Philosophy and Their Greek, Latin and Hebrew Equivalents”, *The Moslem World* 33 (1943), pp. 1-15.

⁵² Ṭodros MS, f. 66v14: ירצה להיות מגעות מהשכל. We did not find the exact corresponding text in the *Long Commentary*, although it seems to correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 344r. Once again, the explanation may be by Ṭodros himself; cf. above, n. 39.

⁵³ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v15: הם על משל [مثال] אחד = Florence MS 88.32, f. 215r16-17.

that it apprehends is of one exemplar, for what is in it [i.e. in the intellect] of it accords with the existence that goes out of it, and this is the cause of our verification by the intellect.⁵⁴

Ṭodros's Custom of Not Changing the Wording of His Lemmata from the Medieval Hebrew Commentaries

We have seen that while Ṭodros modifies the language of the Hebrew translation of the *Long Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics*, just as he does in the case of the *Physics*; he does not change even one word of his citations from the *Middle Commentary*. The reason is that the *Middle Commentary* is the text he is explicating and he expects his readers to have this commentary in front of them. His citations from the *Middle Commentary*, at times only a few words and often meaningless out of context, are intended to direct the reader to the passage he is explaining. These words, therefore, must be exactly the same as those in the Hebrew translation. One example will make perfectly clear Ṭodros's policy not to change the wording of the Hebrew translation of the *Middle Commentary*. In commenting on a passage in *Posterior Analytics* I, 9, Averroes writes: "An example of this is that the art of music posits that the interval of four harmonizes, and one grasps the cause of this harmonization from arithmetic".⁵⁵ Here Ṭodros extracts his lemma from this sentence, citing word for word from Jacob Anatoli's Hebrew translation: "That the interval four occurs by accident and one grasps the cause of this accident".⁵⁶ Ṭodros then adds: "This language is translated in error, and the correct [translation] is that the interval of four harmonizes and one grasps the cause of this harmonization". Ṭodros then explains, "The cause of the mistake of the translator is that the Arabic word [*ittifāq*] is equivocal [and can mean] *miqreh* ['accident'] or *haskamah* ['harmonization']".⁵⁷ What is telling for appreciating Ṭodros's methodology is that he keeps the original mistaken translation, even while spelling out its error and the reason for it.⁵⁸ This insistence on citing Averroes

⁵⁴ Ṭodros MS, f. 66v15-19, with variant readings from Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, f. 344r14-18, provided in square brackets: ירצה וכל השכל אצל כל הדבר המושכל [כל הדבר] הוא על משל [דמיון] אחד ארצה [ר"ל] שכל מה שבשכל [שכל משכל] הוא מסכים לכל מה שחזן חזן [לכל חזן שהוא] לנפש [לשכל] או שהשגתו לכל מה ששיגהו על משל [והוא על דמיון] אחד בהיות מה שבו ממנו [ממנה] מסכים למציאותו יוצא ממנו והיה זה הוא [חזן ממנו והיה זה] סבה באמתנו [בצדקנו] בשכל.

⁵⁵ Averroes, *Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics*, ed. Kassem - Butterworth - Haridi, p. 68, sec. 34: مثال ذلك ان صناعة الموسيقى تضع ان البعد الذي بالاربعة متفق ويوقف على سبب هذا الاتفاق من صناعة العدد.

⁵⁶ Averroes, *Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Posterior Analytics*, Hebrew trans. by Jacob Anatoli, Florence MS 88.32, f. 175r22-23: the body of the text reads "accident" but in the margins it is corrected to "harmonization": המשל בזה שמלאכת הנגון תניח שהמרחק אשר בארבעה יקרה ויעמוד על סבת זה המקרה ממלאכת החשבון.

⁵⁷ Ṭodros MS, f. 36r8-11: זה הלשון הועתק בטעות והנכון הוא שהמרחק אשר בארבעה יסכים [בשוליים: יאות] ויעמוד על סבת זאת [ההסכמה [בשוליים: האותות]]. וסבת שיגאת המעתיק היות מלת הערב משותפת אל המקרה ואל ההסכמה.

⁵⁸ Another very good example of this is this following lemma from this *Middle Commentary*, cited in Ṭodros MS, f. 64v20: "Behold it has a *qirsh*, but it has no teeth" (הנה לו קרש ואין לו שנים). We could not find this lemma or any mention of קרש or its meaning in Florence MS 88.32, 212r22-26, which reads "and it has no teeth" (ואין לו שנים), or in most other copies of the *Middle Commentary*. Eventually, as we expected, we found the exact wording in Munich MS *Hebr.* 106, f. 173ra.20; cf. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS *heb.* 977, f. 170r21-24, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS *heb.* 928, f. 143r20-23. Averroes' Arabic text on *Posterior Analytics* II 14, 98 a 17, reads: *فله كرش وليس له أسنان* (Kassem - Butterworth - Haridi, p. 175, sec. 143). If Munich preserves the correct reading – and it is a literal translation of the Arabic – it transliterates *كرش* (*ἐγχεῖς* [*omasum*]) instead of translating it and does so incorrectly (קרש instead of כרש [cf. Paris MS *heb.* 928: כרס]). After citing word for word from a manuscript like the Munich one, Ṭodros adds: "Said the inquirer, Ṭodros: I do not understand the intention of the translator with the word קרש. In fact, the Arabic term is כירש, and its meaning for other animals is similar to the meaning of אצטון [מכאן] [stomach] for man" (Ṭodros MS, f. 64v20-22). After

[*perishato*] on the eighth treatise of it in the first part [of this section on the *Topics*]. After it will come the second part of this section by way of the intention we specified, God willing, amen and amen.⁶¹

Actually, the second part of Ṭodros's section on the *Topics* differs from that of the *Posterior Analytics* and the *Physics*. He divides this second part into two sub-parts. Both sub-parts are commentaries on Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Topics*, as is Ṭodros's custom in the second parts. The first sub-part (fols. 75v-85v) covers the second of the three treatises of Averroes' *Middle Commentary* and corresponds to Books III-VII of Aristotle's work (Averroes' second treatise comments on Books II-VII); the second (85v-93v) covers Averroes' third treatise, which corresponds to Aristotle's Book VIII. While Ṭodros uses al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on the *Topics* to explain Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on Book VIII, he does not seem to have had any long commentary for the other books of the *Topics* and thus primarily relies on his own understanding of the text.⁶²

Alexander Lamprakis and Daniel Davies, in their chapter in the present volume, illustrate Ṭodros's method in the second sub-part, in this case using al-Fārābī's hitherto lost *Long Commentary* on the *Topics* to explicate Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Topics*, with two fine examples.⁶³ The two examples, their texts T1 and T2 – edited in their Appendix and translated in the body of their article – are clearly presented in their context as Ṭodros's use of al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* to explain Averroes' *Middle Commentary*. They then analyze al-Fārābī's teachings here and compare them to those in other writings of his. For our purposes in this study, we would add that the lemmata from Averroes' *Middle Commentary* that begin T1 and T2 occur one after the other in the commentary and are cited by Ṭodros word for word from the Hebrew translation.⁶⁴ Moreover, in the lemmata that follow over the next folio, all are

⁶¹ Ṭodros MS, f. 75v15-20.

⁶² Mauro Zonta has correctly identified many of Ṭodros's sources in the section on the *Topics*, although he does not follow Ṭodros's division of the section into two parts. For the folios comprised in the first sub-part, he lists only passages from Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Topics*. He describes this sub-part as short, "almost incomprehensible", passages "interspersed with short glosses of commentary by the author"; see Zonta, "Fonti antiche e medievali della logica ebraica" (above, n. 14), esp. pp. 557-59. We have not examined this sub-part, but a quick glance of folios 75v-76r shows Ṭodros provides lemmata of only a few words or, at times, a line to which he offers usually very brief explanations. There is much skipping in the text of the *Middle Commentary* with the lemmata being taken on these folios from passages corresponding in the edition of C.E. Butterworth – A.A. Haridi, The American Research Center in Egypt, Cairo, 1979, to pp. 61, 63, 74, 66, 67, 69, 87, 69, 71, 76, in this order. But, if it is true that the commentary on Averroes' *Middle Commentary* in this sub-part is not taken from any long commentary (*perishab*) or even al-Fārābī's *be'uro* (a text, as we have seen, he says he cites in the first section), why did he break his custom in this first sub-part – only here in the entire anthology – and provide a commentary on the *Middle Commentary* not based on a longer commentary? Indeed, as we have just seen, at the beginning of the section on the *Prior Analytics*, he states explicitly that he will not have a second part to his section on that book for he could not find a long commentary on it. In the case of the *Topics* he had al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* but only for Book VIII and thus the second sub-part returns to his customary style of commentary on a *Middle Commentary* by Averroes.

⁶³ Lamprakis – Davies, "Delineating Dialectic: The Perfect Philosopher in al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary* on *Topics* VIII 1", in the present volume, pp. 13-26.

⁶⁴ Cf. Ṭodros's text, Ṭodros MS, f. 87r1-12 and 87r12-87v12, with Qalonimos's Hebrew translation of the *Middle Commentary*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS *heb.* 932, f. 85r, and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS *Hebr.* 26, f. 384r. One minor difference is that the word 'they' (*bem*) before the verb in T2 is not present in the extant Ṭodros manuscript.

taken word for word from Qalonimos's translation of the *Middle Commentary*.⁶⁵ This seems to be Ṭodros's method throughout this sub-part, which, as we have seen, covers only Book VIII of the *Topics*.

Conclusion

Our goal in this study has been, *inter alia*, to describe Ṭodros's *modus operandi* and to examine the nature of his discussions in each of the sections of his book of logic, with special attention to the section on the *Posterior Analytics*, and to show to what extent they correspond to what we uncovered elsewhere in his treatment of the *Physics*? We have seen that for those books for which Ṭodros had access to a Hebrew translation of an Averroean middle commentary and a long commentary on it, he indeed follows the same two-part method of making known the teachings of a book that he applies in the *Physics*, with the second part being the explanation of the middle commentary primarily through a long commentary by Averroes or, as in the case of the *Topics*, one by al-Fārābī.

⁶⁵ The following lemmata from Qalonimos's Hebrew translation of the *Middle Commentary* on the *Topics* (Paris MS *heb.* 932, f. 85r-v, and Munich MS *Hebr.* 26, f. 384r-v) are cited by Ṭodros in Ṭodros MS, f. 87v12 to f. 88r11: אם לא יקבלם מזולתו/ואלו ההקדמות תעשינה/הבטחון מהמשיב ... בתכלית הפרסום/מהעשות ההקדמות החצוניות והם ההקדמות מחרץ/שאלו אם לא יקבלם מזולתו/ואלו ההקדמות תעשינה/הבטחון מהמשיב ... בתכלית הפרסום/מהעשות ההקדמות החצוניות והם שיהיו מפורסמות והם שיהיו מפורסמות ... אמנם יעשו על צד ההגלות וכו' ... והם שיהיו מפורסמות. Once again, Ṭodros cites them word for word from Qalonimos's Hebrew translation. There seemed to be one minor exception. In the first of these lemmata, Ṭodros has זולתו/ואלו, whereas the two Qalonimos manuscripts have זולתו/ואלו. A check of a third manuscript, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS *Hebr.* 284, fols. 69r-70a – the oldest of the three – supported Ṭodros's reading. Similarly, with regard to the lemmata in the second sub-part that precede those discussed by Lamprakis - Davies (Ṭodros MS), all are cited word for word from Qalonimos's translation (see Paris MS *heb.* 932, fols. 84v-85r) and similarly explained via al-Fārābī's *Long Commentary*.