ISSN 2239-012X

Studia graeco-arabica

Studia graeco-arabica

3

2013

With the support of the European Research Council

Pacini
Editore

Studia graeco-arabica

The Journal of the Project

Greek into Arabic

Philosophical Concepts and Linguistic Bridges

European Research Council Advanced Grant 249431

3

_____

2013

Cover
Mašhad, Kitābḫāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, grec 1853, f. 186v

The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions.

Studia graeco-arabica

3
———
2013

Book Announcements & Reviews

Siglas

CDA – Cristina D'Ancona
CF – Cleophea Ferrari
CMB – Cecilia Martini Bonadeo
HHR – Henri Hugonnard-Roche
YA – Yury Arzhanov

Book Announcements

Riccardo Chiaradonna (ed.), *Filosofia tardoantica. Storia e problemi*, Carocci editore (Frecce, 132), p. 323.

Albeit not unprecedented, this survey of the philosophical schools in late Antiquity has some trait of innovation in so far as it combines intellectual history with the philosophical discussion of selected topics. Of course, surveys of philosophy in late Antiquity do already exist, but they are much more extended in length than this volume – suffice it to mention the *Cambridge History of Late Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* edited in 1967 by A.H. Armstrong and its successor, the two-volume *Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity* edited by L.P. Gerson in 2010. It is not with these extended histories that one should compare this volume, but with other introductory surveys, like for instance the seminal *Neoplatonism* by R.T. Wallis (Duckworth, London 1972) and the *Neoplatonism* by P. Remes (Acumen, Stocksfield 2008). In doing so, one would realize that, while their focus is either on the history of this philosophical school (Wallis), or on the theoretical problems it raised (Remes), *Filosofia tardoantica* aims at covering both fields. Accordingly, it falls into two parts: "Storia" (p. 25-151) and "Problemi" (p. 155-272). An introductory chapter by the editor R. Chiaradonna discusses the criteria followed in the volume – first and foremost, the issues about the chronological boundaries implied in the label "late Antiquity". At variance with the 2010 *Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, which includes the beginnings of Islamic philosophy and early Medieval thought, this volume narrows the focus on the "filosofia pagana da Plotino al VI secolo" (p. 17), although giving room to a chapter on "Platonismo e cristianesimo" (p. 129-51), by M. Zambon. Another issue the editor addresses is that of the ways for denominating the various stages and affiliations in the history of Platonism. Scholars famously disagree on this point. After a survey of the various opinions, Chiaradonna sides with those who stick to the traditional labels "Middle Platonism" and "Neoplatonism" (p. 16), something L.P. Gerson, the editor of the 2010 *Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, refuses to do. One may wonder why a book devoted to philosophy in late Antiquity deals almost exclusively with Neoplatonism, but the literary output at the end of Antiquity provides ample evidence of the fact that, even when they addressed Aristotle's works, the philosophers of the centuries IV-VI did so from a "Platonic", or, for that matter, a "Neoplatonic" perspective. This is why, after an outline of the philosophical schools other than Neoplatonism (M. Bonazzi - R. Chiaradonna, "Prima di Plotino: le correnti filosofiche in età imperiale", p. 25-46) the volume pivots on Plotinus and the philosophy inspired by him. The chapter on Plotinus (p. 47-66) is authored by R. Chiaradonna, who has already devoted to Plotinus a useful short monograph in 2009 (*Plotino*, Carocci, Roma). Then a chapter by E. Gritti follows ("Orientamenti e scuole nel neoplatonismo", p. 67-83), which deals with the same topic as the groundbreaking essay by K. Praechter, "Richtungen und Schulen im Neuplatonismus". R. Chiaradonna deepens the analysis of the Neoplatonic approach to Aristotle in his chapter "Platonismo e aristotelismo" (p. 85-102). The historical section ends with a chapter by D.P. Taormina on "Platonismo e Pitagorismo" (p. 103-79) and with the chapter by M. Zambon mentioned above, on the intertwining between the formative stage of Christian theological thought and (Neo)Platonism. Part Two, "Problemi", opens with A. Falcon's chapter "Filosofia della natura" (p. 155-71). Neoplatonic "natural philosophy" has attracted some interest in recent times [see for instance R. Chiaradonna - F. Trabattoni (eds.), *Physics and Philosophy*

of Nature in Greek Neoplatonism, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2009 (Philosophia Antiqua, 115)], an attitude which is echoed by P. Remes in her own survey on Neoplatonism mentioned above: "Neoplatonism... shares certain important features with contemporary physics" (p. VII-VIII). This may contribute to explaining why the selection of the main philosophical topics in late Antiquity opens with this chapter. The properly metaphysical issues are addressed in two chapters, respectively by P. d'Hoine - A. Michalewski ("Ontologia ed epistemologia: le Idee e la partecipazione", p. 173-91) and A. Linguiti ("Il primo principio", p. 193-212). Then, a chapter by E. Eliasson, "L'uomo e l'individuo" (p. 213-31) explores the various opinions held on the soul, and another one by A. Linguiti ("Etica", p. 233-52), deals with ethical issues, especially in Plotinus. The last chapter is devoted to the topic that an old-fashioned historiography presented as the peculiar feature of late ancient thought: S. Knipe, "Filosofia, religione, teurgia" (p. 253-70). An up-to-date bibliography (p. 285-309) concludes this useful synthesis.

<div align="right">CDA</div>

Ernst A. Schmidt - Manfred Ullmann, *Aristoteles in Fes. Zum Wert der arabischen Überlieferung der Nikomachischen Ethik für die Kritik des griechischen Textes*, Universitätsverlag Winter, Heidelberg 2012 (Philosophisch-historische Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 49), p. 122.

Das äußerlich kleinformatige aber sehr inhaltsreiche Büchlein beschäftigt sich mit der Überlieferung der *Nikomachischen Ethik* und zwar anhand der Handschrift der Qarawīyīn-Moschee in Fes. Diese Handschrift enthält nämlich die einzige überlieferte Fassung der arabischen Übersetzung der *Nikomachischen Ethik*, welche von Eustathios (Bücher I-IV) und von Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq (Bücher V-X) verfasst worden ist. Beide arabischen Übersetzungen gehen auf griechische Handschriften zurück, die älter als die erhaltenen Codices waren. Diese Tatsache hat für die Konstitution des griechischen Textes Folgen, da verschiedene korrupte Stellen im griechischen Text durch die arabische Version geheilt werden können. Arthur J. Arberry hatte im Jahre 1951 ein Fragment der Handschrift in Fes entdeckt, datiert auf das Jahr 1222, mit dem Inhalt der Bücher VII-X. Sieben Jahre später sah Douglas M. Dunlop einen weiteren Teil in Fes, nämlich die Bücher I-V, das Ende des VI. Buches und eine "Siebte Abhandlung". Diese ist das Fragment eines sonst unbekannten Textes über die Ethik, das spätestens im 9. Jh. zwischen Buch VI und VII interpoliert worden ist. Infolgedessen sind die Bücher VII-X in der arabischen Tradition als Bücher VIII-XI gezählt. D. Axelroth hat im Jahre 1968 Buch X in einer unveröffentlichten Dissertation ediert und übersetzt. Von ʿA. Badawī stammt die Edition der gesamten arabischen Version. Ullmann kommt nach der Untersuchung der verschiedenen Textabschnitte zum Schluß, daß Buch I-IV mit Sicherheit von Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq übersetzt worden ist, daß der Text also in die zweite Hälfte des 9. Jh. zu datieren ist. Die Bücher V-X dagegen sind, wie Vergleiche mit den nachweislich von diesem Autor geschaffenen Übersetzungen der *Metaphysik* und der *Tierbücher* bezeugen, von Eustathios übersetzt worden. Daß die Übersetzung der *Nikomachischen Ethik* von zwei verschiedenen Autoren stammt, spielt in der sprachlichen Beurteilung des Textes eine wichtige Rolle. Die beiden Übersetzer hatten als Vorlage außerdem vermutlich voneinander verschieden Versionen vorliegen, die jedoch beide eine Affinität zum *Laurentianus* zeigen. Im vorliegenden Band werden alle jene Stellen der *Nikomachischen Ethik*, bei denen der arabische Text Rückschlüsse auf verschiedene Lesarten, die durch griechische Codices bezeugt sind oder von den beiden Autoren postuliert werden, erlaubt, in einer Liste aufgeführt. Anschließend werden in einer textkritischen Diskussion die Erkenntnisse, die durch die Auflistung der Stellen gewonnen worden sind, dargestellt und für das Stemma der griechischen Handschriften fruchtbar gemacht.

<div align="right">CF</div>

Manfred Ullmann, *Die Nikomachische Ethik des Aristoteles in arabischer Übersetzung* (Teil 1 Wortschatz, p. 440; Teil 2 Überlieferung, Textkritik, Grammatik, p. 386), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2011 und 2012.

Von Manfred Ullmann sind in den letzten zwei Jahren drei Publikationen zur *Nikomachischen Ethik* in der arabischen Übersetzung erschienen – Meilensteine für die Erschließung der philologischen und codicologischen Probleme, welche die Überlieferung dieses Textes aufgibt. (Siehe die Buchanzeige M. Ullmann - E. Schmidt, *Aristoteles in Fes*).

Die Überlieferung sowie auch eine definitive Neuedition der *Nikomachischen Ethik* sind – auch wenn letztere von A. Akasoy und A. Fidora, Brill, Leiden 2005 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 17) unternommen wurden – bis anhin ein Desiderat der Forschung geblieben. Dies, obwohl der Text zentral ist für die aristotelische Philosophie und grundlegend für die philosophische Ethik des arabischen Mittelalters (zum Beispiel als Quelle von al-Kindī, al-Fārābī, al-ʿĀmirī und besonders von Miskawaih). Die vorliegenden Bände bilden das Fundament für jede weitere Forschung zum Thema. Allen bisherigen Studien gemeinsam ist, daß sie sich auf die Vorarbeiten von Douglas M. Dunlop stützen, der lange Jahre an einer Übersetzung gearbeitet und außerdem die Schwierigkeiten der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Textes in einer umfangreichen Studie dargestellt hat. Auf diesen Arbeiten basiert auch die Edition von A. Akasoy und A. Fidora. Diese Edition hat den Nachteil, daß sie gemäß Ullmann derjenigen von ʿA. Badawī folgt und an zahlreichen Stellen nicht den handschriftlichen Befund berücksichtigt.

Diese Mängel werden nun durch die Studien von M. Ullmann komplett behoben.

Im ersten Band der Studien über die *Nikomachische Ethik* von M. Ullmann ist der Wortschatz der ursprünglichen Übersetzung, wie sie uns in der Qarawiyin-Handschrift aus Fes vorliegt (datiert auf 1222), dargestellt und analysiert. Das Glossar stellt dabei die innerarabischen Strukturen heraus und kann damit den großen Einfluß der Übersetzersprache auf die arabische Schriftsprache belegen. Außerdem kann auf diese Weise der individuelle Stil des Übersetzers herausgearbeitet werden.

Der zweite Band enthält eine Auswertung des ersten im Hinblick auf die Überlieferung, die Textkritik und die Grammatik der arabischen *Nikomachische Ethik*. Die Forschungsgeschichte hat sich dabei selber eingeholt, denn nach der Beendigung des ersten Bandes hat Ullmann, nunmehr in der Lage, das gesamte Material überblicken zu können, die Feststellung gemacht, daß die arabische Übersetzung von zwei verschiedenen Autoren stammen muß. Schon Dunlop hatte darauf hingewiesen, aber erst jetzt ist die Möglichkeit gegeben, dies durch philologische Prüfung zu verifizieren. Der Verfasser identifiziert die Übersetzer mit Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq und Eustathios (Usṭāṯ). Des Weiteren spielt natürlich der Einschub des "siebten Buches" eine Rolle. Ullmann stellt mithilfe einer ausführlichen Vergleichstabelle dar, in welchem Verhältnis im Hinblick auf ihre Sprache die Übersetzungen von Eustathios (*Metaphysik* B-I, die "Tierbücher" des Aristoteles) zur Übersetzung von Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq stehen und beweist damit, daß die Bücher I-IV von Ḥunain und die Bücher V-X von Eustathios stammen. Die Tatsache, daß somit ein großer Textbestand bekannt ist, der eindeutig Eustathios zugeschrieben werden kann, hat eine große Bedeutung für die Erforschung der Übersetzungen des frühen 9. Jh., also auch derjenigen aus dem Kreis al-Kindīs.

Im vorliegenden zweiten Band werden auch die anderen Werke, die zumindest Teile aus der *Nikomachische Ethik* zitieren, mit den vorliegenden Übersetzungen auf ihren Zusammenhang geprüft, also die Zitate, die bei al-ʿĀmirī im *K. al-Saʿāda* enthalten sind (einer ethischen *Anthologie*), der *Kommentar* des Porphyrios, das sogenannte "VII. Buch" und die *Summa Alexandrinorum*. Die sich daran anschließende textkritische Behandlung inklusive der Grammatik des Originaltextes, wie er sich in der Handschrift aus Fes präsentiert, soll, wie Ullmann meint, einer Neuedition vorarbeiten.

Diese wird durch die beiden Bände ein philologisches Fundament erhalten, von dem viele andere Editionen nicht einmal einen Schatten vorweisen können und das große Bewunderung verdient für die Akribie und Umsicht, mit der es entstanden ist. Eigentlich wäre es deshalb zu wünschen, daß der Erbauer des Fundaments auch das Gebäude darüber errichtet.

<div align="right">CF</div>

La *philosophie arabe. IXᵉ-XIVᵉ siècle*, textes choisis et présentés par Pauline Koetschet, Points, Paris 2011 (Bibliothèque. Essais), p. 298.

A selection of forty-nine short texts, this book aims at presenting the opinions held by various Arab philosophers, most of them Muslim. The book falls into five main sections: logic and language, philosophy of nature and psychology, metaphysics, ethics, and finally political philosophy. The section on logic and language contains the French translation (taken from A. Elamrani-Jamal, *Logique aristotélicienne et grammaire arabe*, Vrin, Paris 1983) of part of the well-known argument between Abū Saʿīd al-Sīrāfī and Abū Bišr Mattā ibn Yūnus, of part of Yaḥyā ibn ʿAdī's treatise on the difference between logic and grammar, and of one of the *Muqabasāt* by al-Tawḥīdī. Then three passages follow, from Fārābī's *K. al-ḥurūf*, from Avicenna's *Logic* of the *K. al-Šifāʾ*, and from Averroes' *Middle Commentary* on the *Posterior Analytics*, translated by the A. In this section also three texts feature on the relationship between philosophy and the Islamic religion: one by al-Kindī, translated by the A., one by al-Fārābī (taken from S. Diebler, *Al-Fārābī. Philosopher à Bagdad au Xᵉ siècle*, Seuil, Paris 2007), and one by Averroes, translated by M. Geoffroy (*Averroès, Le livre du discours décisif*, Flammarion, Paris 1996). The section on nature and soul contains a passage on the infinite number of souls by Ṯābit ibn Qurra translated by M. Rashed (*Thābit ibn Qurra. Science and Philosophy in Ninth-Century Baghdad*, ed. R. Rashed, W. de Gruyter, Berlin - New York 2009), Avicenna's account of movement, and a passage by Abū l-Barakat al-Baġdādī's on falling bodies (both in the French translation by S. Nony, unpublished). The soul and its relationship with the body are presented through Abū Bakr al-Rāzī's description of the Platonic tripartite soul taken from R. Brague's French translation of *al-Ṭibb al-ruḥanī* (Razi, *La médecine spirituelle*, Flammarion, Paris 2003); then, three passages from Avicenna's book *On Soul* of the *K. al-Šifāʾ* follow, translated by the A.: on the "flying man", on the individuality of the soul, and on the internal senses. The subset of texts on intellect contains a passage by al-Fārābī taken from the *Epistle on Intellect* translated by D. Hamza (Abū Nasr al-Fârâbî, *L'épître sur l'intellect. Al-Risâla fî-l-ʿaql*, L'Harmattan, Paris 2001), one by Ibn Bāǧǧa translated by the A., and one by Averroes, in the translation of the Latin version by A. De Libera (*Averroès, L'intelligence et la pensée*, Flammarion, Paris 1998). The section on metaphysics contains a passage from Kindī's *First Philosophy* (taken from R. Rashed - J. Jolivet, *Œuvres philosophiques et scientifiques d'al-Kindī. II. Métaphysique et cosmologie*, Brill, Leiden - Boston - Köln 1998), two doxographical records of Abū Bakr al-Rāzī's theory on the five co-eternal substances, translated by the A., al-Fārābī's account of the difference between theology and metaphysics (translated by Ph. Vallat, unpublished), and three short passages on the distinction between essence and existence, two of them by Avicenna translated by G.C. Anawati (Avicenne, *La Métaphysique du Shifāʾ. Livres VI à X*, Vrin, Paris 1985) and A.-M. Goichon (Ibn Sīnā, *Livre des directives et remarques*, Commission international pour la traduction des chefs-d'œuvre, Vrin - Beyrouth - Paris 1951), and one by Suhrawardī, translated by the A. Another subset of metaphysical topics is that of the eternity of the world versus its creation at a given point in time: four passages are presented, by al-Kindī

(trans. Rashed - Jolivet, 1998, see above), by Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and by Saadia Gaon, both translated by the A., and one by Maimonides in the XIXth century translation of S. Munk. The section on metaphysics ends with two passages on causality, one from Ġazālī's *Incoherence of the Philosophers* which is taken from M.-A. Sinaceur, "Al-Ghazâlî et l'ironie de Malebranche sur Averroès", *Arabica* 34 (1987), and one from Averroes' *Incoherence of the Incoherence*, translated by the A. The section on ethics contains a passage by al-Kindī and one by Maimonides translated by the A., both on the topic of how to dispel sorrow; a passage by Avicenna follows, on the premises in ethical reasoning (trans. by Goichon, 1951, see above), and three passages on asceticism, one by Abū Bakr al-Rāzī taken from P. Kraus, "Raziana I: la conduite du philosophe", *Orientalia* 4 (1935); one by Yaḥyā ibn ʿAdī translated by the A.; one by Miskawayh translated by R. Arnaldez (Miskawayh, *Le Petit Livre du Salut*, Maison du Livre, Tunis 1987). The relationship between ethics and politics is dealt with in two passages, one from Fārābī's summary of Plato's *Laws* (trans. Diebler, 2007, see above) and one by Ibn Ḫaldūn in the translation by A. Cheddadi (Ibn Khaldūn, *Le Livre des Exemples. I Autobiographie. Muqaddima*, Gallimard, Paris 2002). The section on politics contains four texts by al-Fārābī: two in Diebler's translation (see above); one translated by the A., and one translated by P. Jaussen, Y. Karam and J. Chlala (al-Fārābī, *Idées des habitants de la cité vertueuse*, Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Le Caire 1949). Averroes' *Decisive Treatise* is represented by a passage on the necessity to keep away the uneducated people from any attempt at interpreting the divine Law (trans. Geoffroy, 1996, see above). A passage by Avicenna (trans. Anawati, 1985, see above), one by Ibn Bāǧǧa translated by Ch. Genequand (Ibn Bāǧǧa, *La conduite de l'isolé et deux autres épîtres*, Vrin, Paris 2010), one from Ibn Ṭufayl's *Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓān* translated by L. Gauthier (Ibn Ṭufayl, *Le philosophe sans maître. Histoire de Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓān,* S.E.N.D., Alger 1969), and one from Averroes' *Incoherence of the Incoherence* in M. Geoffroy's translation (Averroès, *L'Islam et la raison*, Flammarion, Paris 2000) conclude the section and the volume.

CDA

La philosophie ismaélienne. Un ésotérisme chiite entre néoplatonisme et gnose, par Daniel De Smet, Cerf, Paris 2012 (Les conférences de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études 6), p. 190.

The lectures held by the A. in 2006-2007 at the École Pratique des Hautes Études are collected in this book and count as an introduction to the philosophical sources and their transformation in the Ismāʿīlī branch of the Šīʿa ʿAlī.

Chapter One (*L'ismaélisme, une tradition chiite à faces multiples*) discusses the various sources of the Ismāʿīlī tradition (Greek late Antique philosophy, the Christian gnosis, the Iranian religions, and the Jewish *Aggadah*). It also takes into account the synthesis of these sources as it is propounded by Abū Yaʿqūb al-Siǧistānī (d. after 971) and Hamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d. 1021 ca.). The views of these two Ismāʿīlī thinkers are compared with the doctrines held in the encyclopaedia of the Iḫwān al-Ṣafāʾ (whose affinity with Ismāʿīlīsm is undeniable, p. 34). The Ismāʿīlī thinkers and the Iḫwān al-Ṣafāʾ share the conviction that to legal worship another, higher kind of worship must be added, the philosophical one (*al-ʿibāda al-falsafiyya al-ilāhiyya*). However, at variance with the Iḫwān al-Ṣafāʾ, who willingly acknowledge their debt to Greek philosophy, the Ismāʿīlī thinkers display antagonism towards it and claim that if there is some truth in Greek philosophy, this depends upon the teaching imparted by the prophets sent by God. "Il en résulte une attitude ambiguë envers la philosophie. De fait, la doctrine ismaélienne s'avère hautement tributaire du néoplatonisme et de l'aristotélisme arabes, certains auteurs

comme al-Sijistânî et al-Kirmânî n'hésitant pas à s'appuyer sur les écrits des grands *falâsifa* de l'islam, en particulier al-Kindî (m. vers 870) et ses disciples (Isaac Israeli, al-ʿÂmirî), ainsi qu'al-Fârâbî (m. 950). Mais ils ne citent pour ainsi dire jamais leurs sources réelles, maintenant la fiction que leur système émane directement de l'enseignement de l'imam, l'unique source de connaissance" (p. 42).

Chapters Two (*L'Ultime au-delà de l'être et du néant. Les voies radicales du "tawhîd ismaélien"*), Three (*L'orgueil de l'Intellect-Démiurge. Une relecture philosophique d'un thème gnostique*) and Four (*Une interprétation philosophique du Coran à la lumière de la Bible: l'exégèse ismaélienne de l'Arbre du Bien et du Mal*) go deeper into the details of this admittedly idiosyncratic cross-pollination of religious and philosophical traditions. Chapters Five (*La transmigration des âmes: réincarnation et métamorphose*) and Six (*La rédemption finale du monde sensible: "évolution" et alchimie dans l'ismaélisme tayyibite*) explore the eschatology that results from this cross-pollination: resurrection is only spiritual, and the accounts of the Scripture about it are nothing if not allusions to the "cycle of disclosure" (*dawr al-kašf*) in which the science of concealed things will eventually be revealed (p. 138); the history of mankind is that of the return of the whole reality to its spiritual origins under the guidance of the imams, thus repairing for the downfall produced by the sin of one of the spiritual creatures of the higher world, exactly as in the Gnostic systems (p. 166).

The analysis of various aspects of the Ismāʿīlī tradition ends in a balanced account of its relationship with late ancient philosophy: "(…) la science exposée dans les écrits ismaéliens relève de la philosophie pour autant qu'elle se veut rationnelle, basée sur la raison (ʿaql) et la démonstration (burhân). Néanmoins, elle se distingue de la *falsafa*, la philosophie pratiquée par les *falâsifa* (pluriel de *faylasûf*), les philosophes musulmans, chrétiens et juifs opérant en terre d'Islam. Si ces derniers considèrent généralement Aristote comme leur 'maître à penser' par excellence, les ismaéliens revendiquent au contraire une philosophie révélée, une 'sagesse' (*hikma*) à la fois chiite et exotérique. (…) L'historien de la philosophie qui de nos jours étudie la littérature ismaélienne, y trouve une multitude de thèmes et de notions relevant du néoplatonisme antique (…). La parenté avec le néoplatonisme est si grande qu'on a introduit le terme 'ismaélisme néoplatonicien' pour caractériser les systèmes développés par les propagandistes (*duʿât*) ismaéliens sous l'autorité réelle ou supposée des imams. Pourtant, ce terme pourrait prêter à confusion. Malgré toutes les ressemblances doctrinales, la pensée ismaélienne est très différente du néoplatonisme antique (…). Les Ismaéliens ne se considèrent pas comme des exégètes de Platon, mais comme des commentateurs du Coran (…). Ils se rattachent plutôt au 'néoplatonisme arabe', c'est-à-dire aux adaptations islamisées de textes néoplatoniciens antiques réalisées par des savants non-ismaéliens dans l'entourage des traducteurs gréco-arabes à Bagdad" (p. 169-71).

A very useful concise book, *La philosophie ismaélienne* contains also a glossary and an updated bibliography.

<div align="right">CDA</div>

A.M.I. van Oppenraay - R. Fontaine (eds.), *The Letter before the Spirit: The Importance of Text Editions for the Study of the Reception of Aristotle*, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2012 (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus, 22), p. XXI, 516.

In this wonderful volume dedicated to the memory of H.J. Drossaart Lulofs, the founder of the *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus* project, A.M.I. van Oppenraay processes the majority of lectures given in the Congress she organized at the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands in The Hague, 2-5 June 2009.

The 'Spirit' of Aristotle's philosophy "has solely been passed down to us through the 'Letter' of the written text tradition" (Introduction, p. 2). Hence, the focus of the volume is on the critical editions of Aristotle's (and some pseudo-Aristotle's) works in their Semitic, Graeco-Latin and Semitico-Latin translations; some contributions are also aimed at spelling out the mutual relations of the different traditions of one and the same Aristotelian text.

In the inaugural lecture of the Congress (p. 11-36), D. Gutas made a survey of the methods and practices in editing Aristotle's texts, from Aristotle's lifetime to the present. The survey extends over many different stages: the nebulous Hellenistic transmission, the Roman edition, the textual criticism by several generations of commentators, the Syriac, Arabic, and Latin translations, the pre-modern printed editions, the modern critical editions. In particular, he concentrates on the role of the Arabic tradition of Aristotle's texts as a necessary task for future critical projects.

This kind of comparative assessment is exemplified in C. D'Ancona's study *The Textual Tradition of the Graeco-Arabic Plotinus. The Theology of Aristotle, its "Ruʾūs al-Masāʾil", and the Greek Model of the Arabic Version* (p. 37-71). D'Ancona shows the independence of and anteriority to the archetype of the direct tradition of the lost Greek manuscript of the *Enneads* which served as the model for the Arabic version. This manuscript, lost to us, contained an item which is lacking in the direct tradition: the list of the "arguments", whose Arabic version features in part in the so-called *Theology of Aristotle* as the "Headings of questions" (*ruʾūs al-masāʾil*). She sides with P. Henry's assessment about the Greek origin of this list, and argues that it is the partial translation of both the *kephalaia* and the *epicheiremata* added by Porphyry to his edition of Plotinus' writings. The argument is based on a detailed analysis of the first five items of the Arabic list and in particular of the obscure "Heading" 5, whose Greek retroversion has a peculiar "Porphyrian" ring.

In *A Christian Arabic Meteorological Treatise attributed to ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Faḍl (11th c.) or to Bonaventura de Lude (17th c.). Its Greek, Arabic and Latin Sources. Prolegomena to a Critical Edition* (p. 73-94) H. Daiber describes a unique representative of the *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus* and of the *Aristoteles Latino-Semiticus*. He analyzes the authorship of an Arabic treatise on meteorology, the *Book on the influences on the air with special attention to the philosophical sciences* (*Kitāb Taʾṯīrāt al-ǧauw al-muḫtaṣṣ bi-ʿilm al-falsafa*). In the earliest manuscript, dated 1648 and housed in St.-Petersburg, this treatise is attributed to ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Faḍl, a Christian scholar of the 11th century. However, in other manuscripts it is attributed to Bonaventura de Lude, who served as the custodian for the Capuchin missions in Syria and the surrounding regions and was in Aleppo from 1629 to his death (1645 or 1647). According to Daiber, both attributions are wrong. The Latin sources (e.g. Seneca's *Quaestiones Naturales* and Macrobius' *Commentarii in somnium Scipionis*), as well as of the Greek ones (e.g. Aristotle's *Meteorology*, *Physics*, and *Historia animalium*), suggest another story, and so do the Arabic sources as Avicenna's *Meteorology* of the *Šifāʾ*, not to mention the Old Testament. An allusion to the eruption of Etna in 1566 allows Daiber to suggest that the author was an Arab Christian scholar from Antioch or the neighbouring region, who was acquainted with Renaissance Italy.

In *The Arabo-Latin Aristotle* (p. 95-107) Ch. Burnett examines the contents of the two manuscripts Aosta, Biblioteca del Seminario, 71 (late 12th - early 13th c.) and Milan, Biblioteca Trivulziana, 764 (13th c.). Both represent the Arabic-Latin tradition of Aristotle's *Libri naturales* in the translations of Gerard of Cremona (1114-1187) and Alfred of Shareshill (1197-1220). This tradition is called by Burnett *Corpus Arabo-Latinum*, a distinct *corpus* from the well-known *corpus vetustius* and the *corpus recentius* of Aristotelian natural philosophy. Burnett compares the contents of the two manuscripts with the list of Gerard of Cremona's translations (*Commemoratio librorum*) drawn up by his *socii* in 12th century Toledo. In addition, he compares the order of appearance of Aristotle's works in these manuscripts with the order in which Aristotle's works are presented in the *Commemoratio* and in

another text translated by Gerard, the *De Scientiis* by al-Fārābī. Burnett shows that "the translation of the works of Aristotle by Gerard of Cremona should be regarded as a continuation of the Alfarabian Peripatetic tradition" and that the activity of translation by Alfred of Shareshill is the continuation of Gerard's project and the beginning of the erosion of the purely Arabic nature of Gerard's translations. Both are witness to a peculiar interpretation of Aristotle, that by al-Fārābī.

H. Takahashi devoted his study (p. 109-30) to the 13th century Syriac scholar Barhebraeus and his Aristotelian encyclopaedic work *Cream of Wisdom*, the edition of which has been one of the most important items of the *Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus* project. First Takahashi outlines the Syriac reception of Aristotle and Barhebraeus's list of works. In the second part he presents a report on the progress of the critical edition and some observations on his own work on the parts of Barhebraeus' work relating to the *De Caelo* and *De Generatione et corruptione*. Takahashi demonstrates that the author composed his work "by abridging and juxtaposing materials selected from his Arabic and Syriac sources" (p. 128) such as Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī's *Kitāb al-muʿtabar*, Avicenna's *Šifāʾ*, and Nicolaus Damascenus's *On the Philosophy of Aristotle*. Concerning this last source, the *Cream of Wisdom* is promising from the viewpoint of the recovery of lost parts of Nicolaus's text, as well as of other earlier Graeco-Syriac texts.

In *Barhebraeus's Analytics: Medical Analytics* (p. 131-57), J.O. Schmitt, who is currently editing the sections on the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics* of Barhebraeus's *Cream of Wisdom*, shows that both parts are related to medicine. In the section concerning the *Prior Analytics* Barhebraeus makes use of the fourth syllogistic figure, the first formulation of which is usually ascribed to Galen. But Galen is not one of Barhebraeus's direct sources. He relies on the (still unedited) *al-Mulaḫḫaṣ* by Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī; the general structure of this part is closer to Avicenna's *Healing*, and it is systematized and shortened, as in Avicenna's *Salvation* and in al-Qazwīnī's *al-Šamsiyya*. The section concerning the *Posterior Analytics* is related to medicine in so far as Barhebraeus uses many medical examples present also in Avicenna, even if his terminology is closer to the Greek and may derive from medical literature or other Syriac sources dealing with the *Analytics*.

In *The Sefer Ha-Nefesh. A First Attempt to translate Aristotle's De Anima into Hebrew* A. Fidora analyzes the doctrine of *creatio mediante intelligentia*, i.e. the creation of human souls through the angels, comparing Dominicus Gundissalinus's *Tractatus De Anima* (Toledo, second half of the 12th c.) with its anonymous Hebrew translation (end of the 12th - beginning of 13th c.). This comparison proves to be important both for the reconstruction of the texts and for the later reception of the topic of the *creatio mediante intelligentia*. In the critical edition of Gundissalinus's *Tractatus De Anima* the reader finds a long list of arguments supporting the *creatio mediante intelligentia*, but also a note of caution to avoid the misunderstanding that the angels could create souls on their own behalf. In his *De Homine* Albert the Great, who was acquainted with both the list and the note of caution, interprets the latter as follows: "the Toledan author tried to justify himself with respect to the saints" (p. 168). Fidora shows that in the Hebrew version the translator maintains that the note of caution is not a part of the text, but "an addition by the copyist" (p.169) which he then translated putting it into the text. As for the text which lies behind the gloss Fidora suggests that it seems to be a passage from Peter Lombard's *Book of Sentences*, probably used to smooth the heterodox character of the Arabic doctrine of *creatio mediante intelligentia* in a Christian context.

To the thirteenth century Hebrew psychological literature and its Avicennian trend is devoted also the essay by Y. Scwartz (p. 173-94). Despite the fact that Avicenna's psychology was translated into Hebrew only in part and somewhat later, it became influential – mixed with the metaphysics of Ibn Gabirol's *Fons vitae* – through Dominicus Gundissalinus's *Tractatus De Anima* and its anonymous Hebrew translation. Then it inspired the *Shaʿar ha-Shamayim* by Gershom ben Solomon of Arles and the *Tagmule ha-nefesh* by Hillel ben Samuel of Verona. Scwartz analyzes comparatively all these

writings to show the progressive improvement of vocabulary due to the use of 13th century scholastic Latin literature in Jewish milieus. The growth of the philosophical discourse was largely enriched in the second half of the 13th century thanks to the Hebrew translations of the Arabic Aristotelian texts, especially Averroes's Commentaries. Gershom ben Solomon of Arles and Hillel ben Samuel of Verona were deeply interested in Gundissalinus's Avicennian psychology, but only in the narrow perspective of theological questions such as the creation of the soul and its afterlife. As for the question of the rational capacities of the soul, they were more conversant with their contemporary debate, that of the Latin Averroes and Thomas Aquinas' s criticisms.

S. Harvey answers the question *Are the Medieval Hebrew Translations of Averroes' Commentaries on Aristotle still of Value and Worth Editing*? (p. 195-210) by examining two cases: that of those Hebrew translations for which Averroes's Arabic text is still extant and is available in Arabic editions (e.g. the Long Commentary on *Metaphysics*), and that of the Hebrew translations for which the Arabic text is no longer extant (e.g. the Middle Commentary on *Nicomachean Ethics*). Harvey demonstrates the high value of the medieval Hebrew translations of Averroes's commentaries, with their word-by-word accuracy. They prove to be decisive for editing the Arabic text even when Averroes's original Arabic is still extant. Also, they give valuable insights into the technical vocabulary of the Arabic.

R. Fontaine (p. 211-25) examines the section on Aristotle's natural philosophy of the Hebrew encyclopedic work *Midrash ha-ḥokhmah* by Judah ben Solomon ha-Cohen of Toledo, a rather unknown author of the 13th century who displays a critical attitude towards Aristotle's philosophy. Written originally in Arabic, the *Midrash ha-ḥokhmah* was translated in central Italy. It falls into two main parts, a survey of Aristotelian philosophy based on Averroes, and a survey of the 'mathematical' sciences based on Euclid's geometry, on Ptolemy's and al-Bitrūǧī's astronomy, and on Ptolemy's astrology. It also includes three treatises on Jewish religious subjects. This work "marks the beginning of what can be called the *second stage* of the reception of Aristotle by medieval Jews, that is the study of Aristotle as interpreted by Averroes" (p. 213). Despite his critical attitude towards Aristotle, Judah offers a trustworthy account of Aristotle's doctrines, which was crucial in the process of Aristotle's reception in Jewish medieval philosophy.

In *Contamination and Interlingual Contamination as a Challenge to the Averrois Opera: the Case of the Judaeo-Arabic transmission of Averroes' Manuscripts* (p. 227-65) H. Eichner takes into account Wolfson's proposal for the *Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem*, criticising the separation between the Long, Middle and Short Commentaries and the separation between the traditions in different languages (Arabic, Latin, Hebrew). She then moves onto the problem of what she calls the "interlingual contamination" in editing Averroes's works. A series of examples is meant to show different kinds of "contaminations", with special emphasis on the Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts of Averroes' commentaries.

In *Textual and Philosophical Issues in Averroes's Long Commentary on the De Anima of Aristotle* (p. 267-87) R. Taylor discusses the extant Arabic fragments of Averroes's *Long Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*. Scholars disagree about the relationship and the chronology of the Long and the Middle Commentaries on this Aristotelian treatise: Taylor analyses the opinions of H. Davidson, A. Ivry, and others in order to better understand the doctrine of the separate Material Intellect. The latter is, in Taylor's eyes, a sort of "thesaurus of abstracted intelligibles in act shared by all thinking human beings" (p. 267). In addition, he offers a possible solution to two textual issues of Long Commentary on Aristotle's *De Anima*. At the end of his essay there is an Appendix with five passages that show the parallel texts, sometimes identical, in Averroes's Long and Middle Commentaries on Aristotle's *De Anima*.

A. Bertolacci deals with *A Hidden Hapax Legomenon in Avicenna's Metaphysics: Considerations on the Use of Anniyya and Ayyiyya in the Ilāhiyyāt of the Kitāb al-Šifā* (p. 289-309). The necessity

of a critical edition of Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt* of the *Kitāb al-Šifāʾ* is shown through an inspection of the manuscript tradition about the term *anniyya* (existence), which features in the title of the first chapter: "Chapter on the beginning of the search of the subject matter of the first philosophy, so that its *anniyya* among the sciences becomes evident" (p. 294). According to Bertolacci, *anniyya* should be corrected to *ayyiyya* (essential quality) on the basis of a marginal correction of the manuscript Cairo, Dār al-kutub 826, which is also the reading of other manuscripts. Bertolacci argues in favour of *ayyiyya* also in other sections of the *Kitāb al-Šifāʾ*, in particular in Avicenna's reworking of Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Avicenna's use of *ayyiyya* might be a survival of Kindian terminology in a work which mostly depends on a Farabian model.

J. Janssens devoted his paper (p. 311-30) to the problems he faced in the edition of the *Physics* of the *Avicenna Latinus*. The Latin translation of Avicenna's *al-Samāʿ al-ṭabīʿī* of the *Kitāb al-Šifāʾ* was made in two different places and times: the translation of the first two books and the beginning of book three was made in Toledo in the third quarter of the 12ᵗʰ century; then, the translation was continued by a Christian-Jewish team in Burgos. However, it was not finished, according to Janssens, because of the 1277 condemnations. In addition, while the Toledo translation survives in 22 manuscripts and in the Renaissance edition of Venice (1508), that of Burgos has reached us only in one manuscript of the 15ᵗʰ century (Vat. *Urb. lat.* 186), which presents many mistakes. The editor of this text has to face changes in style and vocabulary in addition to the typical issue of Arabic-Latin versions, that of double translations. The Latin translation of Avicenna's *al-Samāʿ al-ṭabīʿī* was of great importance for the reception of Aristotle's *Physics* in the West, as shown by Janssens through analysis of the notions of motion and time in Albert the Great.

In *The Critical Edition of Aristotle's De Animalibus in the Arabic-Latin translation of Michael Scot. Its Purpose and its Significance for the History of Science* (p. 331-44) A.M.I. van Oppenraay reminds the fact that "whenever Aristotle's biology was cited during the Middle Ages and even during a large part of Renaissance, the citations invariably continued to derive from the Arabic-Latin translation of Michael Scot" (p. 331). Scot's translation was much more popular than the Graeco-Latin translation by William of Moerbeke, to which scholars had recourse only when they wanted a more precise rendering of a Greek passage. Scot's translation of Aristotle's *De Animalibus* has come down to us in 62 manuscripts. Among these, the basic one is Roma, Biblioteca Vaticana, *Chisianus* E. VIII 251, probably a presentation copy for the Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen produced during Scot's lifetime. Van Oppenraay, who is preparing the critical edition of this text, shows how many inaccurate quotations from Scot's translation occur in scientific books and articles.

S. Donati presents a long essay entitled *The Critical Edition of Albert the Great's Commentaries on De Sensu et sensato and De Memoria et reminiscentia: its significance for the study of the 13ᵗʰ century reception of Aristotle's Parva naturalia and its problems* (p. 345-99). First the manuscript tradition of Albert the Great's *corpus* of writings related to the *Parva naturalia* is discussed, with special emphasis on the structure of the manuscript tradition of Albert's commentaries on the *De Sensu et sensato* and *De Memoria et reminiscentia*. Donati is preparing the critical edition of these works. Albert the Great's approach was decisive in recognizing the role of the *Parva naturalia* in the Peripatetic science of the soul. His four commentaries on the *Parva naturalia*, and his five independent treatises devoted to the study of the affections and the operations of the soul were widespread in the Latin world and oriented the reception of these Aristotelian treatises, rather neglected before Albert the Great.

V. Cordonier and C. Steel, *Guillaume de Moerbeke traducteur du Liber De Bona fortuna et De l'Éthique à Eudème* (p. 401-46) suggest that William of Moerbeke is the translator of the *Liber De Bona fortuna*, devoted to the role of good luck in moral life. This work began to circulate in the University of Paris around 1270. It is a combination of two chapters on *eutuchia*: the first from

the *Magna Moralia* (1260 b 30 - 1207 b 19) and the second from the *Eudemian Ethics* (1246 b 37 -1248 b 11). The latter was originally part of a larger extract from book VIII of the *Eudemian Ethics*, which included the chapter on *kalokagathia* (1248 b 11 - 1249 b 25). According to Cordonier and Steel, Moerbeke was the translator also of this second extract. Besides, they compare Moerbeke's selective translation of the *Magna Moralia* (1260 b 30 - 1207 b 19) with Bartholomaeus of Messina's complete version of the same work. Their conclusion is that Moerbeke's translation was not a revision of that of Bartholomaeus of Messina, but a new one.

The last two contributions in the volume are devoted by G.A. Kiraz and P. Tombeur to the advanced digital tools for the editions of Ancient and Medieval texts. G. Kiraz presents the Multi-Lingual Scholar™, a DOS-based web processor for the edition of Syriac texts and gives three examples of its usage during the 1990s (p. 447-61). P. Tombeur in *Édition critique et moyens informatiques: une édition assistée, 'armée'* (p. 463-91) presents the state of the art with respect to the work of critical editions assisted by the text processing system.

The *Letter before the Spirit* is a useful volume for scholars of many different fields. It makes clear that there is still a lot of work to be done in editing ancient and medieval texts in order to gain a deeper understanding of the development of philosophical and scientific thought.

CMB

P. Adamson (ed.), *In the Age of Averroes in the Sixth/Twelfth Century*, The Warburg Institute - Nino Aragno Editore, London - Turin 2011 (Warburg Institute Colloquia, 16), p. 288.

In the Introduction (p. 1-7) to this miscellaneous volume, the editor P. Adamson presents the twelfth and the early thirteenth centuries AD as an age of flourishing philosophy in the Islamic world. Philosophy benefited from its integration within Islamic theological thought. Criticizing the traditional picture which sees philosophy in Islam as destroyed by Ġazālī's *Incoherence of the Philosophers*, the volume concentrates on the first few generations after Ġazālī's death (1111 AD) up to the figures of the philosopher and physician ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī (d. 1231) in the East and of the Andalusian mystic Ibn ʿArābī (d. 1240). In this survey I will follow a chronological arrangement of the contributions which is not that followed by the editor, who does not indicate his own criteria.

In his paper (p. 45-75), F. Griffel argues that Ġazālī's project was that of selecting the more acceptable aspects of *falsafa* – especially those found in Avicenna – to integrate them into Muslim rationalist theology. This sort of Avicennism was one of the two competing readings of Avicenna's philosophy during the first half of the twelfth century, namely the orthodox Avicennism, such as that of the student-student of Avicenna al-Lawkarī (d. after 1109), and the critique of Avicennism independent of Muslim theology, such as that of Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī (d. ca. 1165). The *kalām*-critique of Avicennism by al-Ġazālī and that by Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī are similar to one another: they share in a sceptical approach about the possibility of intending philosophy as a demonstrative science built up on apodictic arguments which lead to certainty, which was Aristotle's view and also that of al-Fārābī and Avicenna. On the contrary, both al-Ġazālī and, in particular, Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī proposed a dialectical turn in Arabic and Islamic philosophy. Philosophy became "the consideration of an exhaustive list of relevant dialectical arguments that have unequal convincing forces" (p. 72).

Two other studies are devoted to particular aspects of al-Ġazālī's and Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī's philosophy. S. Nony investigates Abū l-Barakāt al-Baġdādī's dynamics in the context of a detailed

study of his physics which develops some of John Philoponus's doctrines (p. 93-116). A. Shihadeh faces the reception of al-Ġazālī's *Doctrines of the Philosophers* (*Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa*) and analyzes the preface and concluding statements of the *Maqāṣid* thanks to a newly-discovered manuscript of the work: MS Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, *Ar.* 5328 (p. 77-92; photographic reproductions of the first and the last page of the *Maqāṣid* are given, p. 82-3).

A vivid portrait of the developments in *kalām*, and not only of Sunnī Ašʿarite supremacy in twelfth century Islam, is offered by G. Schwab, who explores the survival of Muʿtazilism in the Eastern regions of the Caliphate such as Ḫūzistān, Ǧibāl, Fāris, Daylamān, Ǧīlāl, Ṭabaristān, Ǧurǧān, Ḫurāsān, Ḫwārazm and Yemen (p. 251-82).

If we move to the second half of the twelfth century, we meet Suhrawardī (1154-1191), the founder of the philosophical tradition of Illuminationism. The main 'eastern' author of this period taken into account in the volume, Suhrawardī had as his own target of criticism Avicenna. However, it is exactly with the analysis of Avicennian doctrines that he took issue to build up his own thought. This fact is suggested by two papers which are devoted to Suhrawardī's psychology and epistemology, respectively by J. Kaukua and H. Heichner. J. Kaukua focuses on the notion of self-awareness in Suhrawardī's *Ḥikmat al-išrāq* and analyzes the intermingling of topics derived from Avicenna and the Arabic Plotinus (p. 141-57). H. Heichner investigates Suhrawardī's epistemological theory of 'knowledge by presence', arguing that the notion of 'presence' features in the discussions on Avicenna epistemology of Suhrawardī's times (e.g. in Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, d. 1210). According to Heichner, Suhrawardī extends the notion of 'presence' to the mind-body relationship, creating in this way a unified epistemological theory which includes apperception, perception, and apprehension of external objects (p. 117-40).

In the West of the Muslim world, the twelfth century is dominated by Averroes (1126-1198) and his predecessor in Andalusia, Ibn Ṭufayl (d. 1185). T. Kukkonen studies Ibn Ṭufayl's psychology in *Ḥayy ibn Yaqẓan* through the notion of 'heart', which has three meanings: bodily organ, vital spirit, hylomorphic form. Kukkonen shows that Ibn Ṭufayl's psychology derives from Avicenna. In his effort at systematizing the Aristotelian, Neoplatonic, and Galenic traditions at his disposal about the soul, Ibn Ṭufayl depends upon Avicenna. However, he parts company with him in so far as he inherits some eschatological traits of Fārābī's philosophy. Ibn Ṭufayl's notions of 'heart' as the locus of ordinary human experience and of 'soul' as the form or perfection of a living body are alternative to that of 'heart' in Ġazālī's *Revivification of the Religious Sciences* as the point of contact between the human and the divine, and to that of the 'Avicennian' human soul as a substance which is part of the supernal realm. According to Ibn Ṭufayl, there is no satisfactory formula – either medical, or philosophical, or Sufi – for the principle which is the point of conjunction (*ittiṣāl*) of the human with the supernal realm (p. 195-214).

Averroes gives the name to the volume, even if he was one of the few philosophers of Islam immune to the 'Ghazalian trend', and even if he made the ancient authority of Aristotle prevail over that of Avicenna. Two papers on Averroes in the present volume add further evidence to the careful attention paid by him to Aristotle in discussing philosophical problems. D. Black discusses how Averroes deals with *De Anima* 424 a 28, where Aristotle describes the capacity of a sense organ to perceive as a *logos*. This term was translated as *intentio* by Michael Scot who, according to Black, unmistakably read *maʿnan* in the Arabic text. *De Anima* 424 a 28 counts as the main reason why Averroes in all his psychological writings upheld the intentionality of perception. Black discusses the implications of such a doctrine over the course of Averroes' philosophical journey (p. 159-74). M. Di Giovanni outlines the most representative views held in scholarship about the hylomorphic composition of material substances in Aristotle. He then discusses Averroes' approach to the problem of substantial form in his Long Commentary on *Metaphysics* (p. 175-94).

One paper is devoted by R. Fontaine and S. Harvey to Jewish philosophy at the eve of what they call the "age of Averroism", when in the mid and late thirteenth century Averroes's commentaries became the medium through which Jews learned Aristotle's philosophy and science. They focus on the *Exalted Faith* by Abraham Ibn Daud (born ca. 1110). *Exalted Faith* was the first book of Jewish Aristotelianism; written in Arabic, but it is only the Jewish translation of the fourteenth century that has come down to us. Fontaine and Harvey show the Farabian and Avicennian vein of Ibn Daud's reading of Aristotle. They do so through analysis of the term 'Necessary Existent' to denote the Supreme Being. In the discussion of this notion Ibn Daud seems to borrow heavily from Avicenna, be it directly from the latter's writings or indirectly, from Ġazālī's *Maqāṣid al-Falāsifa* (p. 215-27).

The last Andalusian authors who are considered in the volume are the Sufi mystic Ibn ʿArābī and the younger Ibn Sabʿīn (d. 1270). A. Akasoy remarks that since the thirteenth century the Muslim readers of Ibn ʿArābīʾs works and of those of his followers recognized in them unorthodox traits. The idea of 'philosophical Sufism' emerged especially among Muslim polemicists whose opinion deeply impacted on subsequent biographical sources. Akasoy points to the elements which lead the medieval polemicists to see a connection between *taṣawwuf* and *falsafa* through the analysis of Ibn Taymiyya (1263-1328) and the bio-bibliographical compendia (p. 229-49). She points to three major reasons: al-Ġazālī's experience of combining philosophical theory, ascetic practice and Sufi doctrines; "a coherent esoteric Neoplatonic philosophy with Shiite undertones inspired by the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ with Ibn Sīnā and al-Ġazālī as possible mediators" (p. 247); the use of the terminology and/or concepts of Ibn Sīnā's metaphysics, in particular connected with being" (p. 248).

The last Eastern author dealt with in this volume is ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī. Thanks to the translation and the analysis of some passages from the still unedited biographical part of his *Two Pieces of Advice* D. Gutas concentrates first on the status of philosophy and its Avicennian mainstream in twelfth century Baghdad, in the context of the Niẓāmiyya College and of Ġazālī's legacy. Gutas then focuses on the social context of the practitioners of philosophy. In those days, Avicenna's philosophy was so successful as to become "the fashion of the day and no intellectual could afford to show himself ignorant of it" (p. 19). This excessive diffusion of Avicenna's philosophy generated misapplications by people too little-educated to pursue it, and caused reactions against such practitioners. Sometime this critique against the practitioners became a critique against Avicennian philosophy in itself. With al-Ġazālī, a sort of *ad hominem* attack was initiated, according to which Avicenna and, more generally, the philosophers had to be criticized because of their irreligious behaviour. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī struggles against this generalization, thanks to the recollection of the exemplary lives of the philosophers of the Greek and Islamic past (p. 9-26).

The analysis of some passages from the medical part of the *Two Pieces of Advice* and from other writings by ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī allows N.P. Joosse to raise the question whether he was a philosopher as well as a physician, and whether he was merely a theoretical physician or also a practising one. By discussing ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādīʾs methodology and philosophical epistemology, Joosse shows ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Baġdādī's preference for the study of theoretical medicine. This study was made possible for him by the Ayyūbid patronage. He must be considered a polymath, well-educated in humoral medicine and well-versed in the medical theory of his lifetime according to the ideal of "an Aristotelian *physikos*" (p. 41), far away from the Galenic rule that the best practitioner in medicine must be a philosopher (p. 27-43).

In the Age of Averroes offers useful material about what the editor calls the "second formative period" of philosophy in the Islamic world, "after Avicenna and beginning with influential reaction he provoked from al-Ġazālī" (p. 2).

CMB