

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

Graeco-Latin translations. He “was known to have quoted both from the translation by Scot and from the one by Moerbeke. It was from the latter that he adopted the traditional division into *Historia animalium*, *De Partibus animalium* and *De Generatione animalium*, which is missing in Scot” (p. XV).

A substantial part of the introduction is devoted to the manuscripts. They are many, because – as we have just seen – Scot’s translation was widespread. Of the seventy-three manuscripts known, “the earliest and most distinguished” one is Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Chigi E. VIII. 251*, which contains also Avicenna’s *Liber de Animalibus*, translated by Scot “around 1230-1232, when he was in the service of Frederick II at his court in Southern Italy and Sicily” (p. XXXII). The manuscript is described by Erik Kwakkel (pp. XXXII-XLVII). It is a miscellany whose parts “were meant to be united in one volume from the moment of their conception” (p. XXXII) and its special importance attracted the attention of the great codicologists Giovanni Mercati and Giulio Battelli: Mercati suggested that it was a dedication copy for the Emperor (p. XXXIII), Battelli and others sided with him. Kwakkel comes to the conclusion that “the two texts were copied in the period between 1225 and 1250, making MS 251 the oldest surviving manuscript witness of both Scot’s translation of Aristotle’s *Books on Animals* and of Avicenna’s subsequent version and commentary” (*ibid.*). On the basis of a previous study of him dedicated to this specific point, Kwakkel highlights another important feature of this manuscript: “The manner in which the *Abbreviatio Avicenne* was corrected by a team of correctors (...) indicates that the translator himself was involved in the production of the second part of MS 251!” (p. XLI).

This very important documentary piece of the Arabo-Latin Aristotle contains also a methodological lesson. As Aafke van Oppenraay states in her Introduction, “The misreadings and mistranslations which were obviously made by Scot have been deliberately retained in the text of this edition, but are indicated in the second apparatus and/or in the notes” (pp. X-XI). It goes without saying that this requires the capacity to pinpoint the original word or sentence, by clearly distinguishing between errors of the textual tradition and errors of the translator. This depends upon the skillfulness of a percipient, expert editor, and we are deeply grateful to Van Oppenraay for offering such a model.

EC

A. de Libera – J.B. Brenet – I. Rosier-Catach (eds.), *Dante et l’averroïsme*, Collège de France – Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2019 (Docet omnia, 5), 430 pp.

The Introduction by A. de Libera (pp. 9-45) opens the Proceedings of a 2015 conference dedicated to old and new assessments of Dante’s (alleged) ‘Averroism’. The term stands here for the cluster of ideas and attitudes of the Latin scholars who made extensive use of Averroes’ approach to Aristotle in the second half of the 13th century. Dante’s allegiance to Averroism is labelled a myth: “Si l’averroïsme de Dante est un mythe, sa critique, sa ‘déconstruction’ passe pour celle de l’interprétation qui lui a donné la forme qu’elle a revêtue aujourd’hui” (p. 22). De Libera outlines the topics dealt with in this volume against the backdrop of 19th century French intellectual history, where the whole story began. It is his conviction that it was then – and because of Dante – that historians started paying attention to Siger of Brabant, a thinker who was previously almost unknown. They did so as a result of the appreciative