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From Translator to Commentator:  
Todros Todrosi’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 Todros Todrosi 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 Todros 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 Todros’s aims and his own unique methodology in this section and sketched a picture of the ways in which Todros 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 Todros dedicated to the study and explanation of Aristotle’s Organon. We describe Todros’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 Todros’s use of Averroes’ Long Commentary on the Posterior Analytics in order to explain Averroes’ Middle Commentary on the Posterior Analytics, and it illustrates Todros’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, Todros Todrosi.

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 Todros Todrosi 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 Todros Todrosi’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 Todros Todrosi. Our goal was to clarify Todros’s aims
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

---


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-Gazālī.

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. 1r-1v: "אמר טדרוס טדרוסי מזרע היהודים: כונתינו בזאת החכמה, רוצה לומר, חכמת ההגיון, לקבץ בספר היותר מועיל בנתינת הגעת תועלת ההגיון ופרטי כונותיו התכליתיות, ממאמרי ל…”.
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. 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-
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].

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. 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. 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: הנה באה שלמה העתקת ברחי ראש אמיר אמרות המפרש אמר המקבץ לארסטו, והנה שלמה שלמו פרטי כונות הפרישות אשר ראינו לקבצם מספרי מפרשי הפילוסופים באומרו. לאומין מעשה מפורש ו서비스 הנ嗪 הלקראת, או אומין מעשה מפורש ו서비스 הנзна עת האבר פנין בקולוסס המפרשים מספר התלמוד ועל רשרה ש אינו מסייעו עת א🐛 והאבר.

7 On the similar promised account of the De Caelo, see Harvey - Horezky, “Averroes ex Averroe” (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.\textsuperscript{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 Todros 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 beʿurim, 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.\textsuperscript{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? Todros explains in his preface that he will begin with the Prior Analytics, not the Categories because

\[\ldots\text{although [the Categories] is the first book of this science, since this book inquires into being } qu\text{a 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.}\textsuperscript{11}

In other words, for Todros, since (1) in Avicennian fashion, the Categories should be treated in metaphysics,\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{13} there was no need to treat

\textsuperscript{9} This may have been Gabriella Berzin’s point when she noted: “At the end of the [logical part] of the anthology, Todrosi 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: Todros Todrosi’s Translation of Kitāb al-Najāt, On Psychology and Metaphysics, Brill, Leiden 2014, p. 4, n. 15.

\textsuperscript{10} In Todros’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.

\textsuperscript{11} See above, n. 4.


\textsuperscript{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

---

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”.
of the art of logic. We will complete our first intention in this book in two parts, by way of the intention we specified, God willing, may He be blessed, amen.\textsuperscript{18}

In other words, it seems that Ṭodros in this section on the \textit{Posterior Analytics} intends to follow his method of dividing his account into two parts, and indeed the actual account begins with the words, “the first part”, in large letters. What does Ṭodros do here? The “first part” contains extracts from Qalonimos’ Hebrew translation of Averroes’ \textit{Long Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics} that Ṭodros edited and modified, including relatively minor changes in certain terms and words, due to Ṭodrosi’s terminological and stylistic preferences. Curiously, he includes in this part, at the beginning, also citations from texts by Themistius, Avicenna and al-Ġazālī that were not long commentaries.\textsuperscript{19}

Ṭodros’s method, which presents two layers of interpretation in the long commentaries of Averroes and other leading scholars of Aristotelian philosophy, is described again at the end of this first part of the section on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, where Ṭodros declares:

\begin{quote}
Said [Ṭodros] the gatherer: here, in this first part, [we have] completed the particulars of the intentions of the matters [taken] from the treatises of the commentators among the philosophers, and, in particular, Averroes’ \textit{Long Commentary} on this book [\textit{Posterior Analytics}]. After this will come the second part, in which we will bring from the fine and comprehensive language of the long commentaries, [applying it] to the concise language of [Averroes’] middle [commentary], in order to explain his sublime language, since it is [so] concise, or to direct to the conceptualization of the truth in it, or to facilitate the understanding of its truth by way of the intention we specified, God willing.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

Indeed, in the second part, Ṭodros executes his intention to “bring and apply”.

\textit{Ṭodros’s Section on the Posterior Analytics II 19}

We will give now a few examples of Ṭodros’s method from his comments on Averroes’ \textit{Middle Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, II 19, the last chapter of the book and one that acquired a prominent place in the history of epistemology and the philosophy of science. Ṭodros devotes an entire folio (66r-v) to this chapter in this second part.\textsuperscript{21}

The first lemma that Ṭodros brings from Jacob Anatoli’s Hebrew translation of Averroes’ \textit{Middle Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, II 19, is interspersed with short two-word comments taken from Averroes’ \textit{Long Commentary}.

\begin{quote}
See Zonta, “Fonti antiche e medievali della logica ebraica” (above, n. 13), esp. pp. 543-45 and pp. 573-75. Zonta (p. 545) cites one passage from Themistius’ \textit{Paraphrase} of the \textit{Posterior Analytics} inserted by Ṭodros into his commentary of the second part. In this passage, Ṭodros MS, f. 60v-2-8, Ṭodros brings Themisitus as support for Averroes’ comment from the \textit{Long Commentary} that he cites in explanation of the \textit{Middle Commentary}; cf. Averroes’ \textit{Long Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, trans. Qalonimos ben Qalonimos, MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Cod. Hebr 32, f. 286r1-16.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Ṭodros does not brings any quotes from Averroes’ \textit{Long Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, II 19, or from any other commentaries on this chapter, in the first part. The first part ends near the end of II 12, 96 a 9-12. See Ṭodros MS, f. 27v25; up to MS Munich, Cod. Hebr 32, Comm. 67, f. 302r18.
\end{quote}
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].

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

[It] depends on the knowledge of the other.

Averroes’ explicit meaning here is that knowledge of the syllogism depends 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.

The next lemma from the Middle Commentary reads:

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

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.
The following lemmata from the Middle Commentary with Todros’s explanations from the Long Commentary read as follows:

We will preceede [our discussion] with what is required from the doubt. 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. Whether one perceives the principles of demonstration and the things that are known through demonstration. The first is our inquiry, whether the faculty of the soul that apprehends the conclusions is [the one that] apprehends the premises. And we say this: Do you perceive the faculty by which is known, etc. 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. But we forget them. 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. [They are] stronger and more perfect than demonstrative knowledge and we forget them. 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.

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.
The next lemma that Ṭodros brings reads:

\textit{With a faculty and a disposition existing in us by way of this faculty.}\footnote{Ṭodros MS, f. 66v1-2: \( \text{זכז הוהי והכנה נמצאת בנו דרך זה הכח} \). Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v4-5, is again identical to Ṭodros’s citation except it has \( \text{ברחמצה} \) instead of \( \text{ברחמצה} \). The Arabic has \( \text{استعداد} \) and accords with Ṭodros’s version.}

Here, Ṭodros’s version of this lemma differs from the virtually all the manuscripts that contain Anatoli’s Hebrew translation of the \textit{Middle Commentary}. While Ṭodros’s translation reads “a faculty and a disposition [\( \text{ברחמצה} \)]”, the reading of the nearly twenty manuscripts of Anatoli’s translation of the Hebrew commentary that we checked is “a faculty and a happiness [\( \text{合理性} \)]”, although two manuscripts have marginal corrections that agree with Ṭodros’s version.\footnote{In Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS heb. 929, f. 122v16, the body of the text reads \( \text{合理性} \) but in the right margin it is corrected to \( \text{ברחמצה} \); Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 88.34, f. 111v9, also has \( \text{合理性} \), while the left margin has \( \text{ברחמצה} \).}

Did Ṭodros correct his lemma on the basis of the Arabic of the \textit{Middle Commentary}, \( \text{استعداد} \), 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’s slightly earlier supercommentary on Averroes’ \textit{Middle Commentary}.\footnote{See Gersonides, \textit{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 \textit{استعداد} also appears in the following sentence of the \textit{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 \textit{استعداد} derives from its similar appearance to \textit{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.} This is yet further evidence of the importance of Ṭodros’s lemmata for editing the Hebrew translations of Averroes’ \textit{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].\footnote{Ṭodros MS, f. 66v2-3: \( \text{זה הכח הוא זכז הוהי והכנה מדומה מדרך זה הכח והכהנה שיגיעו ממנה רוצה לומר מההכנה אלו המתחיבות או נפרש דרך שיגיעו ממנה} \). We did not find the exact text in the \textit{Long Commentary}, although the content corresponds to Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 340v. Perhaps the explanation is by Ṭodros himself.}

The remaining lemmata from the \textit{Middle Commentary} with Ṭodros’s explanations from the \textit{Long Commentary} read as follows:

\textit{And this is the unimaginable.}\footnote{Ṭodros MS, f. 66v4: \( \text{לכל הבלתי מדמה} \) = Florence MS 88.32, f. 214v10.} 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,
many times in a single event, as what happens with the horsefly and the light of the candle.\textsuperscript{42} And the image is taken from them.\textsuperscript{43} The image that is between these forms is taken from them.\textsuperscript{44} As it happens in war.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{46} Through which it is verified to be true.\textsuperscript{47} Averroes explained what is described to be true.\textsuperscript{48} And there is no single genus among the things that are apprehended.\textsuperscript{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 “intellation”.\textsuperscript{50} Therefore, the principles of demonstration are greater [or more important] for verification.\textsuperscript{51} He means since they come from the intellect.\textsuperscript{52} They are of one exemplar.\textsuperscript{53} He [Aristotle] means, that every intellation of everything that is intelled 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

---

\textsuperscript{42} Todros MS, f. 66v4-6, with variant readings from Munich MS Hebr 32, f. 340v2-4, provided in square brackets: אמוד תומש [אמוד תומש] בשככת וה אל的命运 מצוות על [לפיו הוא מובא] על עמו [על עמו] ועם [堞ים] [פגע] רחמן פגוע: 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 ססלאס, perhaps referring to the kind of locust mentioned in Deut. 28:42 in his translation of the Long Commentary, which Todros replaced with לוודא (mosquito). Gersonides in his supercommentary on the Middle Commentary, British Library MS 18687, f. 184r2, gives הבש (fly) as an example of the unimaginable. The two sixteenth-century Latin translations of the Long Commentary, made from the Hebrew trans., have 팔תח (Abraham de Balmes, butterflies or moths) and tabano (Giovanni Francesco Burana, horsefly); see Aristotelis Opera cum Averrois Commentariis, Apud Iunctas, Venice 1562, vol. 1,2, p. 562D.

\textsuperscript{43} Todros MS, f. 66v6: יitizer מכמה מהוור הב שבראש הת裥 נטועות המTouchableOpacity וה Tolant ומשתים ביריעה זו: 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.

\textsuperscript{44} Todros MS, f. 66v6-7: מצוות ומעדות ומӘה תועדו המ UObject: 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.

\textsuperscript{45} Todros MS, f. 66v7-10: עליה מאמר את ההאמתה והאמונה זבא לחוד.

\textsuperscript{46} Todros MS, f. 66v10:gow [=Florence MS 88.32, f. 215r5].

\textsuperscript{47} Todros MS, f. 66v10-11: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 341v24-26: שהאמנה בלה המוקדמין המ DateFormatter נכתבים בבלבלות פרש בך אפרים. I am not aware of the corresponding text in the Long Commentary, for it does not correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 341v20-21.

\textsuperscript{48} Todros MS, f. 66v11-13: זביא את הדרת מהירה ב럭: – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15: ייצר המחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭. I am not aware of the corresponding text in the Long Commentary, for it does not correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15.

\textsuperscript{49} Todros MS, f. 66v12-13: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭. I am not aware of the corresponding text in the Long Commentary, for it does not correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15.

\textsuperscript{50} Todros MS, f. 66v13-14: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭. I am not aware of the corresponding text in the Long Commentary, for it does not correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15.

\textsuperscript{51} Todros MS, f. 66v14: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: – Cf. Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭. I am not aware of the corresponding text in the Long Commentary, for it does not correspond to the content of Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 343v14-15.

\textsuperscript{52} Todros MS, f. 66v15: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: 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 Todros himself; cf. above, n. 39.

\textsuperscript{53} Todros MS, f. 66v15: ייצר מחמד את הדרת מהירה ב럭: 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 Todros himself; cf. above, n. 39.
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.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{Ṭodros Ṭodrosi’s Presentation of Aristotle’s Organon}

We have seen that while Ṭodros modifies the language of the Hebrew translation of the \textit{Long Commentary} on the \textit{Posterior Analytics}, just as he does in the case of the \textit{Physics}; he does not change even one word of his citations from the \textit{Middle Commentary}. The reason is that the \textit{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 \textit{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 even while spelling out its error and the reason for it.

One example will make perfectly clear Ṭodros’s policy not to change the wording even while spelling out its error and the reason for it.\textsuperscript{55} This insistence on citing Averroes

\texttt{\textsuperscript{54} Ṭodros MS, f. 66v15-19, with variant readings from Munich MS Hebr. 32, f. 344r14-18, provided in square brackets:}

\texttt{\textsuperscript{55} Averroes, \textit{Middle Commentary on Aristotle’s Posterior Analytics}, ed. Kassem - Butterworth – Haridi, p. 68, sec. 34:}
word for word applies only for his lemmata in the second part of his sections that follow his two-part method, where the lemmata are taken from the Hebrew translations of Averroes’ middle commentaries.

**Todros’s Section on the Topics**

We have seen that Todros follows the same two-part method of making known the teachings of the *Posterior Analytics* as he applies in his account of the *Physics*. As we have already indicated, this is not his method in the section on the *Prior Analytics*. Todros writes explicitly in his opening words to this section:

**Said [Todros] the gatherer:** Our intention in this book, that is the *Book of the Syllogism* [the *Prior Analytics*], is to gather the particulars of the intentions of the matters we have specified to gather for each one of the books of the art of logic. And since we have not found a long commentary on this book [written] by one of the [well-known] commentators, we will complete what we intended in this [book] in [only] one part, by way of the intention we specified, God willing, amen and amen.59

Todros could not find a long commentary on the *Prior Analytics* by one of the well-known commentators in Arabic or Hebrew, and so there was no long commentary to explicate Averroes’ *Middle Commentary* on the *Prior Analytics*. His treatment of the *Prior Analytics* accordingly has only one part. In this part, as Shalom Rosenberg and Charles Manekin have shown, he features Themistius’s lost commentary. As we have suggested, a similar method may have been adopted in Todros’s missing (or unwritten?) section on the *Rhetoric*.

The remaining extant section on the logic, that on the *Topics*, follows the two-part division, similar to that we have just seen used in the *Posterior Analytics*. Todros explains in his opening remarks to the second part of the section on the *Topics*:

**Said [Todros] the gatherer:** Behold here is completed the translation of the particulars of the intentions of the matters we have seen fit to gather from the treatises of the commentator, Abū Naṣr [al-Fārābī], in his commentary *beʾuro* on the Book of the *Topics* and in his *Long Commentary*.

correcting Anatoli’s transliteration and providing its meaning. Todros proceeds to explain the meaning of the passage. In the *Long Commentary*, Munich MS *Hebr.* 32, Textus 86, f. 320r14, Qalonimos translates *كرش* with *كرش* (stomach; Latin [530D]: *venter* [De Balmes], *ventriculus* [Buran]). Todros’s explanation of the lemma in the *Middle Commentary* is his own, but for his commentary on the very similar following lemma (Todros MS, f. 65r3-8), he again cites from Averroes’s *Long Commentary* (321r).

60 See above, notes 13 and 14. See further, Zonta, “Fonti antiche e medievali della logica ebraica” (above, n. 14), esp. p. 565-72. Zonta identifies citations from other authors in this section, esp. from the *Kitāb al-Qiyās* of Avicenna’s *Kitāb al-Šifā* (p. 571).
[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 incom-
prehensible”, 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 usu-
ally 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’ (hem) 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. 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 héb. 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 מחוץ/שאלו אם כן 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 ואלו ההקדמות מוזלתו, whereas the two Qalonimos manuscripts have אם לא יקבלם מזולתו. 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 héb. 932, fols. 84v-85r) and similarly explained via al-Fārābī’s Long Commentary.