

The Arabic Version of Aristotle's Historia Animalium. Book I-X of the Kitāb al-Ḥayawān. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Selected Glossary by L.S. Filius in Collaboration with J. den Heijer – J.N. Mattock (+), Brill, Leiden-Boston 2019 (*Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus*, 23), VIII + 539 pp.

This very welcomed critical edition of the Arabic *Historia Animalium* completes the edition of the version of Aristotle's zoological works known as *Book of Animals* (*Kitāb al-Ḥayawān*). Of the five treatises *Historia animalium*, *De Partibus animalium*, *De Generatione animalium*, *De Motu animalium*, *De Incessu animalium*, the Arab readership became acquainted with three: *Historia animalium*, *De Partibus animalium*, and *De Generatione animalium* which were conflated in a unique work comprised of nineteenth books or chapters (*maqālāt*). Of these, J. Brugman and H.J. Drossaart Lulofs edited in 1971 the part corresponding to the *De Generatione animalium* (*maqālāt* 15-19) and R. Kruk edited in 1979 the part corresponding to the *De Partibus animalium* (*maqālāt* 11-14). Now the edition of the part corresponding to the *Historia Animalium* (*maqālāt* 1-10) comes to complete the Arabic text which was the outcome of the blending of the three Aristotelian works. We are in the dark about the origins of the *Book of Animals* as it has come down to us: does it feature the Arabic translation of a compilation of the three treatises already extant as such, or an *ex novo* creation out of them during the process of translation into Arabic? Be that as it may, the testimony offered by the Arabic proves to be significant also for the establishment of the Greek, as the translation was made out of a text which antedates the earliest manuscripts known to us. Filius writes: "A valuable aspect of the Arabic translation is that it was made on the basis of Greek MSS that are considerably older than the oldest Greek MS that is still extant today, so that it may furnish valuable material for the establishment of the original Greek text" (p. 3). A note of caution is added immediately after, which is important too. Not only the Arabic translation was carried out at a remove of many centuries with respect of the moment when Aristotle's zoological works were written, but also "the fact that the MSS that we do possess of the Arabic translation date from at least four centuries after the Arabic translation was made, implies that the text unavoidably bears traces of being altered by subsequent copyists" (pp. 3-4).

The *Kitāb al-Ḥayawān* is mentioned in the well known inventory of authors and books *Kitāb al-Fihrist* by Ibn al-Nadīm, written towards end of the 10th century. Here is credited with the translation Ibn al-Biṭrīq, one of the translators from Greek working for al-Kindī, namely at the earliest stages of the translations from Greek into Arabic of scientific and philosophical works. The passage of the *Kitāb al-Fihrist* is quoted and discussed by Filius in the light of the previous scholarship that challenged this claim. Indeed, while it appears from its lexical and syntactical features that the translation belongs to the early stage mentioned above, the name of Ibn al-Biṭrīq advanced in the *Kitāb al-Fihrist* does not match the terminology typical of this translator, as shown by Endress in 1966 and confirmed by Brugman and Drossaart Lulofs in their edition of 1971. These scholars pointed rather to Uṣṭāṭ (Eustathius), the translator of the *Metaphysics*. Now that a complete Graeco-Arabic glossary as an extraordinary useful complement has been offered by Manfred Ullmann together with his critical edition of the Arabic *Nicomachean Ethics* (2011-2012) – a translation carried out in part by Uṣṭāṭ – Filius is in a position to confirm that the translator of the *Book of Animals* was him. Notwithstanding some differences between the two translations, that of the *Nicomachean Ethics* and that of the *Book of Animals*, "it seems very probable that Uṣṭāṭ, one of the most important translators in the Circle of al-Kindī, was the translator of the *Liber de Animalibus*" (p. 14).

R. Kruk contributed to this edition a chapter entitled “The Reception of *De Animalibus* in the Arabic Tradition” (pp. 15-22), “As the many references in Arabic literature show, *De Animalibus* was widely known in the Arabic tradition. Caution, however, is needed: a substantial part of the zoological quotations that referred to Aristotle cannot be traced to the zoological works, but are part of the vast pseudo-Aristotelian zoological tradition” (p. 16). Chapter Four compares the *Book of Animals* with a coeval work bearing the same title by the literate and Mu‘tazilite theologian al-Ġāhiz (d. 868-9). This work depends upon Uṣṭāṭ’s translation of Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium*, the only part of the compilation quoted (p. 23).

After the description of the manuscripts which form the basis of this edition, a series of “Notes to the Arabic Text” (pp. 29-66), followed by an Index (pp. 67-73) and a list of the “Differences between the Greek and the Arabic Texts” (pp. 67-101) are placed before the edition. Also the bibliography (pp. 102-10) is placed before the edition (pp. 111-385). A “Concise Glossary to the Arabic-Greek Text” (pp. 386-539) completes this very useful edition of an important testimony of the Arabic Aristotelian tradition.

EC

Aristotle De Animalibus. Michael Scot’s Arabic-Latin Translation, Part One: Boks I-III: History of Animals. A Critical Edition with an Introduction, Notes and Indices by A.M.I. van Oppenraay with a Description of the Base Manuscript by E. Kwakkel, Brill, Leiden – Boston 2020 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus 5.1A), LVI + 270pp.

After having published the Latin version of the *Generation of Animals* (1992) and *Parts of Animals* (1998), Aafke van Oppenraay offers here another important documentary piece of the Arabic-into-Latin translations: the initial part of Aristotle’s zoological corpus. Van Oppenraay’s edition is the twin-outcome of the critical edition of the Arabic text by L.S. Filius (see above, pp. 194-5), which formed the basis of the Latin version. This latter was the work of Michael Scot, one of the most famous and prolific translators from Arabic into Latin, to whom we owe also the Latin versions of Averroes’ commentaries; the translation of Aristotle’s zoological corpus was carried out in Toledo around 1215 (p. IX).

Among the reasons of the great importance of this edition stands also the fact that the Latin version made available by A. van Oppenraay can be compared with the Latin version carried out directly from Greek by William of Moerbeke, some fifty years after Scot’s Arabic-into-Latin version. Moerbeke’s translation was made available in 2011 by the late lamented Pieter de Leemans for the series *Aristoteles Latinus*. Important as it might be this comparison from the viewpoint of the Greek text, from a historical point of view the two translations did not have the same importance. It was Scot’s translation which was more influent. Indeed, it was not superseded by Moerbeke’s, notwithstanding the fact that the latter had been carried out from the Greek original and should have been preferred, at least according to our criteria. For one reason or another, however, it was not so: “Michael Scot’s Arabo-Latin translation, which was copied into the fifteenth century, is used in preference to the more recent Graeco-Latin translation by William of Moerbeke” (p. XIV). Van Oppenraay outlines the impact of Scot’s translation on Albert the Great and Thomas of Cantimpré, who were teacher and pupil in the Dominican studium of Cologne and who both commented upon Aristotle’s zoological corpus. Thomas Aquinas is a different case, as he made use of both the Arabo-Latin and the