



Revised Plan for the Publication of a Corpus Commentariorum Averrios in Aristotelem

Harry A. Wolfson

Speculum, Volume 38, Issue 1 (Jan., 1963), 88-104.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%28196301%2938%3A1%3C88%3ARPFTPO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Speculum is published by Medieval Academy of America. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/medacad.html>.

Speculum

©1963 Medieval Academy of America

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2002 JSTOR

REVISED PLAN FOR THE PUBLICATION OF A *CORPUS COMMENTARIORUM AVERROIS* IN *ARISTOTELEM**

By HARRY A. WOLFSON

AVERROES AS A NATURALIZED HEBREW AND LATIN AUTHOR

BIBLIOGRAPHERS, by the practice of their profession, will always list Averroes among Arabic authors. But if there is a process of naturalization in literature corresponding to that in citizenship, the writings of Averroes belong not so much to the language in which they were written as to the language into which they were translated and through which they exerted their influence upon the course of the world's philosophy. In the original Arabic the career of Averroism was brief. It came to an end with the abrupt disappearance of philosophic activity among the Arabic-speaking peoples, which synchronizes with the death of Averroes. Arabic philosophy, unlike Hebrew and Latin, did not enjoy a fruitful though declining old age. It was cut off in its prime through untoward political conditions. Among his own people Averroes left no disciples to continue his teachings nor an active opposition to keep them alive. His name, it has been pointed out by Renan, is not even mentioned in the standard Arabic works of biography.¹ Of his commentaries on Aristotle the longest and the most important ones are lost in the original language, and of those extant the number of manuscripts is very small and some of them are written in Hebrew characters and have been preserved by Jews. Most of the manuscripts in Arabic characters had been unknown until very recently, when they were dug up in oriental libraries.

The tremendous influence which Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle had upon the history of Western philosophy was achieved through the Hebrew and Latin translations.

The earliest date of the completion of a Hebrew translation of an Averroian commentary on Aristotle is 1232,² but it has been shown that some translations were made at an earlier date.³ The latest date of the completion of a Hebrew translation of an Averroian commentary is 1337.⁴ Between these two dates, almost all of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle were translated into Hebrew, and four of the more important ones were translated twice. Ten translators are connected with this task: Jacob Anatolio, Jacob ben Machir Ibn Tibbon, Kalonymus ben Kalonymus, Moses ben Samuel Ibn Tibbon, Moses ben Solomon of Salon, Shem-Tob ben Isaac of Tortosa, Solomon Ibn Ayyub, Todros Todrosi, Zerariah Gracian, and one whose name is not known. The bulk of the work, however, was done by Moses ben Samuel Ibn Tibbon (flourished between 1240 and 1283) and Kalonymus ben Kalonymus (1286- after 1328).

* The original plan, as submitted to the Mediaeval Academy of America, was published in *SPECULUM*, VI, 3 (July 1931).

¹ Cf. Renan, *Averroès et Averroïsme*, 2nd ed. p. 36 ff. He is, however, frequently mentioned by Ibn Khaldūn, who also made abridgments of his works. Cf. F. Rosenthal's translation of *The Muqadimah*, I, xlv, and Index.

² Cf. Steinschneider, *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters* (1893), p. 58.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

The popularity which these commentaries enjoyed among Jews is attested by the great number of manuscript copies that are extant to the present day — as, e.g., about twenty of the Epitome of the *Physics*, about eighteen of the Epitome of *De Caelo*, about thirty-six of the Middle Commentary on *De Caelo*, and about twenty-five of the Epitome of *Parva Naturalia*. The intensive study of these commentaries, which was pursued by individual scholars as well as by organized classes in schools, gave rise to critical and interpretative works which may be here referred to indiscriminately as supercommentaries. There are such supercommentaries on almost every commentary of Averroes, the only exceptions being the Epitomes of the *Metaphysics*, the Middle Commentary on *Meteorologica*, and all of the Long Commentaries. On some of the commentaries there is more than one supercommentary, as, e.g., about a dozen each on the Middle Commentaries of the *Organon* and *Physics*, five on the Middle Commentary of *De Anima*, and four on the Middle Commentary of the *Metaphysics*. The writing of these supercommentaries continued for about three centuries, from the beginning of the fourteenth to about the end of the sixteenth. Some of the greatest names in Jewish philosophy are represented among the supercommentators, such as Narboni, Gersonides, and various members of the Shem-Tob family.

Besides these direct supercommentaries on Averroes, literary material relevant to the study of Averroes' teachings is to be found in almost every Hebrew philosophic text produced since the early part of the thirteenth century. Beginning with Samuel Ibn Tibbon's commentary on the *Book of Ecclesiastes*, to which a translation of some of Averroes' treatises on the Intellect is appended — and this before the first dated translation of a commentary of Averroes in 1232 — there is not a book in Jewish philosophy in which the views of Averroes are not discussed or in which some passage of his writings is not quoted or paraphrased, analyzed, interpreted, and criticized. An example of the use made of the writings of Averroes by independent Hebrew authors and of its importance for the study of Averroes may be found in Crescas' *Or Adonai*.⁵

The first Latin translations of Averroian commentaries on Aristotle appeared in 1230,⁶ but it has been suggested that they may have been made earlier.⁷ Three names are connected with this activity, those of Michael Scot, Hermann the German, and William de Lunis. All of them flourished during the thirteenth century. Among them they translated fifteen (see below) out of the thirty-eight titles into which we shall divide all of Averroes' commentaries.

The incompleteness of the early Latin translations of Averroes, the loss of the original Arabic texts of his commentaries, the spurious views attributed to Averroes by the so-called Averroists, and the fact that Hebrew literature, through translations, had fallen heir to the entire tradition of Arabic philosophy — all this tended to make European scholars dependent upon Hebrew for a complete and accurate knowledge of Averroes. When, therefore, in the sixteenth century the translation of the works was resumed, all the new translations were made from the Hebrew. Of some works several translations were made; in some in-

⁵ Cf. the writer's *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle*, (1929), "Index of Passages," pp. 741-743.

⁶ Cf. Renan, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

stances new translations were made from the Hebrew even when mediaeval translations from the Arabic were in existence. Moreover, his Middle Commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *Categories* and *De Interpretatione* were supplemented by translations of Gersonides' supercommentaries. The names of these new translators are Elias Cretensis (Elijah Delniedigo), Jacob Mantinus, Abraham de Balmes, Paul Israelita (Ricius or Riccius), Vital Nissus, and Giovanni Francisco Burana.

INVENTORY OF AVERROES' COMMENTARIES

There is no authoritative contemporary record as to the number of commentaries written by Averroes. Whatever we know about it has been gathered by modern scholars, particularly Moritz Steinschneider,⁸ Maurice Bouyges,⁹ and Georges Lacombe,¹⁰ from a study of the extant manuscripts and printed editions in the various languages, particularly Hebrew MSS. Averroes is known to have written his commentaries on all the works of Aristotle accessible to him, including also the *Isagoge* of Prophyry, which was treated by him as an inseparable introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*. In some instances his commentaries are found in three forms, the Epitome, the Middle, and the Long¹¹ the first of these not being really a commentary in the true sense of the term. In most instances, however, his commentaries are found in two forms, the Epitome and the Middle. In two instances there is only the Epitome and in one instance there is only the Middle.

The following is a complete list of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle:

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <i>Organon</i> | 18. <i>Poetics</i> |
| Epitome | Long |
| 1. <i>Isagoge</i> | 19. <i>Posterior Analytics</i> |
| 2. <i>Categories</i> | <i>Physics</i> |
| 3. <i>De Interpretatione</i> | 20. Epitome |
| 4. <i>Prior Analytics</i> | 21. Middle |
| 5. <i>Posterior Analytics</i> | 22. Long |
| 6. <i>Topics</i> | <i>De Caelo</i> |
| 7. <i>Sophistic Elenchi</i> | 23. Epitome |
| 8. <i>Rhetoric</i> | 24. Middle |
| 9. <i>Poetics</i> | 25. Long |
| Middle | <i>De Generatione et Corruptione</i> |
| 10. <i>Isagoge</i> | 26. Epitome |
| 11. <i>Categories</i> | 27. Middle |
| 12. <i>De Interpretatione</i> | <i>Meteorologica</i> |
| 13. <i>Prior Analytics</i> | 28. Epitome |
| 14. <i>Posterior Analytics</i> | 29. Middle |
| 15. <i>Topics</i> | <i>De Animalibus</i> (including only <i>De Partibus</i> |
| 16. <i>Sophistic Elenchi</i> | <i>Animalium</i> and <i>De Generatione Ani-</i> |
| 17. <i>Rhetoric</i> | <i>malium</i>) |

⁸ *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters* (1893).

⁹ *Notes sur les Philosophes Arabes Connus des Latins au Moyen Age* (1922), reprinted from *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, VIII (1922), 13 ff.

¹⁰ *Aristoteles Latinus*, I (1939); II (1955).

¹¹ On the question as to the chronological order in which these three types of commentaries were written by Averroes, see Jacob Teicher, "I Commenti di Averroè sul 'De Anima'," *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, III (1935), 233-256.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 30. Epitome | <i>tudine et Brevitate Vitae)</i> |
| <i>De Anima</i> | 34. Epitome |
| 31. Epitome | <i>Metaphysics</i> |
| 32. Middle | 35. Epitome |
| 33. Long | 36. Middle |
| <i>Parva Naturalia</i> (including only <i>De Sensu</i> | 37. Long |
| <i>et Sensibili, Memoria et Reminiscentia,</i> | <i>Nichomachean Ethics</i> |
| <i>De Somno et Vigilia, and De Longi-</i> | 38. Middle |

The works of Bouyges, Steinschneider, and Lacombe may also be used as guides to the location of the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin manuscripts and of the MSS of the Hebrew supercommentaries. Steinschneider has made use of almost all the public and private collections of Hebrew MSS known in his time. The only two collections which he seems to have left out are those of Spain and the Cambridge University Library. Since his time, however, many Hebrew MSS of Averroes have been acquired by Professor Alexander Marx for the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary from sources unknown to Steinschneider. The Averroes manuscripts of the Joseph Almanzi Collection, which are recorded in Steinschneider's work, are now in Columbia University Library. Several manuscripts of Averroes commentaries are also in the Felix Friedmann Collection in Harvard University Library.

Certain translations and supercommentaries are given by Steinschneider as anonymous. In some instances he tries to identify them. It is not unlikely that when all the MSS are brought together and carefully studied, the identification of some of these anonymous works will become possible and some of Steinschneider's identifications may have to be revised. A few illustrations of what can be done in that direction may be found in the writer's paper, "Isaac ben Shem-Tob's Unknown Commentaries on the *Physics* and His Other Unknown Works," in *Freidus Memorial Volume* (1929), pp. 279-290, Samuel Kurland's paper, "An Unidentified Hebrew Translation of *De Generatione et Corruptione*," in *Proceedings of American Academy for Jewish Research*, v (1933-34), 69-76, and Appendices I and II at the end of this article.

Of the thirty-eight titles of Averroes' commentaries, twenty-eight are extant in the original Arabic. Of these fifteen are in Arabic characters, four both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters, and nine only in Hebrew characters.

Those in Arabic characters are:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Epitome | 8. <i>De Interpretatione</i> |
| 1. <i>Physics</i> | 9. <i>Prior Analytics</i> |
| 2. <i>De Caelo</i> | 10. <i>Posterior Analytics</i> |
| 3. <i>De Generatione et Corruptione</i> | 11. <i>Topics</i> |
| 4. <i>Meteorologica</i> | 12. <i>Sophistic Elenchi</i> |
| 5. <i>De Anima</i> | 13. <i>Rhetoric</i> |
| 6. <i>Metaphysics</i> | 14. <i>Poetics</i> |
| Middle | Long |
| 7. <i>Categories</i> | 15. <i>Metaphysics</i> |

Those both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters are:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Epitome | 3. <i>De Generatione et Corruptione</i> |
| 1. <i>Parva Naturalia</i> | 4. <i>Meteorologica</i> |
| Middle | |
| 2. <i>De Caelo</i> | |

Those only in Hebrew characters are:

Epitome

1. *Isagoge*
2. *Categories*
3. *De Interpretatione*
4. *Prior Analytics*

5. *Posterior Analytics*

6. *Topics*
7. *Sophistic Elenchi*
8. *Rhetoric*
9. *Poetics*

At the time this Plan for the publication of a Corpus of Averroes' commentaries first appeared in the SPECULUM (July 1931), the following commentaries of Averroes in the original Arabic existed in print: (1) Middle Commentary on *Poetics*, by Fausto Lasinio (Pisa, 1872); (2) Epitome of *Metaphysics*, by Mustafa al-Kabbani (Cairo, without date, but at about 1904); (3) Epitome of *Metaphysics*, by Carlos Quiros Rodriguez (Madrid, 1919). To these, since that time, the following have been added: (1) Middle Commentary on *Categories*, by Maurice Bouyges (Beirut, 1932); (2) Long Commentary on *Metaphysics*, by Maurice Bouyges (Beirut, 1938-1948); (3) Epitomes of *Physics*, *De Caelo*, *De Generatione et Corruptione*, *Meteorologica*, *De Anima*, and *Metaphysics* (Hyderabad, 1366: 1947); (4) Epitome of *De Anima*, by Ahmed Fouad El Ahwani (Cairo, 1950).

Hebrew translations from the Arabic are extant of thirty-six out of the thirty-eight commentaries. Those missing are the Long Commentary on *De Caelo* and the Long Commentary on *De Anima*, of neither of which is there the Arabic original; there are only Latin translations made from the Arabic. Whether no Hebrew translation of these two commentaries ever existed or whether they were lost cannot be ascertained. With regard to the Long Commentary on *De Anima*, the question will be discussed below in Appendix I. There is, however, an anonymous Hebrew translation of the Long Commentary on *De Anima* made from the Latin. The identity of the translator will be discussed below in Appendix II.

Out of these thirty-six commentaries of Averroes in Hebrew translation the following existed in print at the time this Plan first appeared in SPECULUM (July 1931): (1) Epitome of the *Organon* (Riva di Trento, 1559); (2) Epitome of *Physics* (Riva di Trento, 1560); (3) Middle Commentary on *Rhetoric*, by J. Goldenthal (Leipzig, 1842); (3) Middle Commentary on *Poetics*, by Fausto Lasinio (Pisa, 1872).

Fifteen out of the thirty-eight commentaries were translated into Latin during the thirteenth century directly from the Arabic. They are:

Epitome

1. *Parva Naturalia*
by Michael Scot

Middle

2. *Isagoge*
3. *Categories*
4. *De Interpretatione*
5. *Prior Analytics*
6. *Posterior Analytics*
by William of Luna
7. *Rhetoric*
8. *Poetics*
9. *Nicomachean Ethics*

by Hermann the German

10. *De Generatione et Corruptione*
11. *Meteorologica*

by Michael Scot

Long

12. *Physics*
13. *De Caelo*
14. *De Anima*
15. *Metaphysics*

by Michael Scot, except for the Prooemium to the *Physics*, which is by Theodorus Antiochenus

Nineteen were translated during the sixteenth century from the Hebrew. The four of which there are no Latin translations are: (1) Epitome of *Physics*, (2) Epitome of *De Caelo*, (3) Epitome of *De Anima*, (4) Middle Commentary on *De Anima*.

The list below contains: (1) all the Latin translations of Averroes' commentaries in the 1575 edition by the Juntas, (2) those in the 1560 edition by Cominus de Tridino which are not in the aforementioned 1575 edition, (3) those in the 1483 edition by Andreas Torresanus de Asula et Bartholomaeus de Blavis which are not in the aforementioned 1560 edition, and (4) those which are only in the 1481 edition of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* by Philipus Venetus. Names marked by asterisks are those of mediaeval translators from the Arabic; all the others are names of sixteenth-century translators from the Hebrew.

Organon

Epitome

1. *Isagoge*
2. *Categories*
3. *De Interpretatione*
4. *Prior Analytics*
5. *Posterior Analytics*
6. *Topics*
7. *Sophistic Elenchi*
8. *Rhetoric*
9. *Poetics*

Nos. 1-9, by Balmes in 1575, of which 1-7 are in Vol. I, ii, and 8-9 in Vol. II, 192D-197.

No. 4, by Burana, in Vol. I of 1560.

Middle

10. *Isagoge*
11. *Categories*
12. *De Interpretatione*
13. *Prior Analytics*
14. *Posterior Analytics*
15. *Topics*
16. *Sophistic Elenchi*
17. *Rhetoric*
18. *Poetics*

Nos. 10-12, by Mantinus, in Vol. I of 1575; by *William, in Vol. I of 1560.

Nos. 13-14, by Burana, in Vol. I, i-ii, of 1575; by *William, in Vol. I, i, of 1483.

No. 15, by (a) Balmes and by (b) Mantinus, the latter only Books I-IV, both in Vol. I, iii, of 1575.

No. 16, by Balmes, in Vol. I, iii, of 1575.

No. 17, by Balmes, in Vol. II of

1575; by *Hermann, in 1481. No. 18, by Mantinus in Vol. II of 1575; by Balmes, in Vol. III of 1560; by *Hermann, in 1481.

Long

19. Posterior Analytics

By (a) Balmes, by (b) Buraña, and by (c) Mantinus, the last only Book I, 1, 71a, 1-22 830b, 10, all in Vol. I, ii, of 1575.

Physics

20. Middle

By (a) Mantinus, only Books I-III, in Vol. IV of 1575; by (b) Vitalis Dactylomelos, extant only in manuscript (cf. Renan, *Averroes*,² p. 382; Steinschneider, *Hebr. Uebers.*, p. 986).

21. Long

By *Michael, minus Prooemium, which was translated by (a) *Theodorus Antiochenus and by (b) Mantinus, all in Vol. IV of 1575.

De Caelo

22. Middle

By Paulus Israelita, in Vol. V of 1575.

23. Long

By *Michael, in Vol. V of 1575.

De Generatione et Corruptione

24. Epitome

By Vitalis Nisus, in Vol. V of 1575.

25. Middle

By *Michael, in Vol. V of 1575.

Meteorologica

26. Epitome

By Elias Cretensis (Elijah Delmedigo), in Vol. V of 1575.

27. Middle

By Elias Cretensis, only portions of Books I-III; dispersed and embodied in the Epitome; in Vol. V of 1575.

By *Michael, only Book IV, in Vol. V of 1575.

De Animalium (including only *De Partibus Animalium* and *De Generatione Animalium*)

28. Epitome

By Mantinus, in Vol. VI, i-ii, of 1575.

De Anima

29. Long

By (a) *Michael, but comments 5 and 36 in Book III also by (b) Mantinus, both in Vol. VI, i, of 1575.

Parva Naturalia (including only *De Sensu*

et Sensibili, Memoria et Reminiscentia, De Somno et Vigilio, and De Longitudine et Brevitate Vitae)

30. Epitome

By *Michael, in Vol. VIII of 1575.

Metaphysics

31. Epitome

By Mantinus, in Vol. VIII of 1575.

32. Middle

By Elias Cretensis, only Books I-VII, in Vol. VIII of 1560.

33. Long

By *Michael, Minus Prooemium to Book XII, which is by by (a) Paulus Israelita and by (b) Mantinus, all in Vol. VIII of 1575.

Nicomachean Ethics

34. Middle

By *Hermann, in Vol. III of 1575.

The result of this inventory is that of the thirty-eight commentaries twenty-eight are extant in the original Arabic, and of these fifteen are in Arabic characters, four are both in Arabic and in Hebrew characters, and nine are only in Hebrew characters. Hebrew translations from the Arabic exist of thirty-six out of the thirty-eight commentaries, the two missing are also missing in the Arabic, and of one of the two missing there is a translation from the Latin. Latin translations exist of thirty-four out of the thirty-eight commentaries, and of these fifteen are mediaeval translations made directly from the Arabic, including the two which are missing both in Arabic and in Hebrew; the remaining nineteen are sixteen-century translations made from the Hebrew. Of these nineteen translated from the Hebrew four were translated two times, one was translated three times, and six were new translations of commentaries of which there had already existed mediaeval Latin translations directly from the Arabic. In addition to Latin translations from the Hebrew of whole commentaries, there are (a) two Latin translations from the Hebrew of Averroes' own Prooemium to one of his Long Commentaries, which was missing in the mediaeval Latin translation from the original Arabic of that commentary; (b) a new Latin translation from the Hebrew of two Comments in a Long Commentary of which a Latin translation from the Arabic already existed in the mediaeval Latin translation of that commentary.

THE PROJECT

The facts brought out in the Inventory convince one beyond any doubt that the publication of a complete and properly edited corpus of Averroes' Commentaries in only one of the three languages is almost impossible. Both the Arabic and the Latin are dependent upon the Hebrew for the filling out of their respective lacu-

nae. All of them — the Arabic, the Hebrew, and the Latin — are dependent upon each other for the establishment of accurate texts — unless we think that the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts can be established independently of each other by merely counting the scribal errors in their respective manuscripts and adding to them some conjectural emendations. Furthermore, the Arabic, the Hebrew, and the Latin are in need of each other for the determination of the exact meaning of words and phrases and in general for the proper study of the text. Without such reciprocal help, the corpus would be only an additional shelf of unintelligible volumes, for the knowledge of Averroes' commentaries expired among the Arabic-speaking peoples with the death of the author at the end of the twelfth century, and among readers of Hebrew and Latin it has lingered only among a few of the initiate since the seventeenth century. Finally, no proper study of the commentaries of Averroes is possible without the help of the Hebrew supercommentaries. Not only do these supercommentaries contain all the important critical, historical, and interpretative material necessary for the study of the subject matter of the commentaries, but owing to their inclusion of great portions of the commentaries in the form of quotations, they are also valuable for the establishment of the text.

The object of the plan, therefore, is to prepare an edition of the commentaries of Averroes simultaneously in the three languages — the language in which they were originally written, the language in which they have been most thoroughly expounded and most completely preserved, and in the language through which they became known to Western philosophy. The edition, furthermore, is to be equipped with all the necessary textual and philological information that may be helpful to anyone who may wish to study these commentaries in their manifold bearings upon the various phases of the history of philosophy.

The method to be followed in editing the work can best be described by showing what critical apparatus, glossaries, and other equipments the edited volumes are expected to have.

CRITICAL APPARATUS

Each of the texts in the three languages is expected to have three critical apparatuses, which may be designated as *A*, *B*, *C*.

Apparatus *A* is to contain the variant readings of the MSS of a given text in one of the three languages. This Apparatus will naturally differ in the three texts, though occasionally the variant readings in the text of one language may be found to have some bearing upon the variant readings of the text of another language, in which case they will be recorded in more than one text.

Apparatus *B* is to show the relation between the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts. This apparatus will be divided into two parts, each part containing translations of the variant readings in the text of one of the other two languages into the language of the text that is being edited.

Apparatus *C* is to show the relation of Aristotelian passages contained in Averroes' commentaries to their corresponding Greek texts. Such an Apparatus will be necessary because of the occurrence of Aristotelian passages, in some form

or other, in every one of the three series of commentaries. In the Long Commentary the Aristotelian text is given *in extenso* and is on the whole distinguishable from the commentary proper. In the Middle Commentary the Aristotelian texts are either reproduced verbally or given in paraphrase form. Though quotations and paraphrases of Aristotle are supposed to be introduced by the word "dixit," still it is not always possible to distinguish them from the rest of the commentary. In the Epitome, quotations and paraphrases of Aristotle occur only casually. In preparation of this Apparatus, it will be necessary to compare the commentaries with the original works of Aristotle, to mark off, first, all the passages that are supposed to be translations of Aristotle, and, second, all the passages that are supposed to be paraphrases of Aristotle, and then, to mark these two off from each other and both of them from the commentary. The passages which are either translations or paraphrases of Aristotle are to be compared with the original Greek, word for word and phrase for phrase, and the differences discovered are to be recorded in Apparatus C.

While these three Apparatuses are to be kept distinct from each other, certain elements may have to be transferred from one Apparatus to another.

TYPOGRAPHICAL DISPOSITION OF TEXT

In printing, the three strata of the text, viz., (1) translations of Aristotle, (2) paraphrases of Aristotle, and (3) Averroes' own comments, are to be indicated by the use of different type or by a difference in spacing between letters or between lines.

REFERENCES TO SOURCES

Not many sources are mentioned by Averroes. But occasionally he refers to works of Aristotle, to some other place in his own commentaries, to Greek commentators of Aristotle, such as Alexander and Themistius, and to earlier Arabic authors, such as Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Avempace. In all such instances the sources are to be identified and whenever a printed edition or manuscript of the source in question exists, proper references are to be supplied.

GLOSSARIES

Each commentary is to have at the end a glossary in four languages, arranged as follows: (1) For the Arabic — Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, Greek. (2) For the Hebrew — Hebrew, Arabic, Latin, Greek. (3) For the Latin — Latin, Arabic, Hebrew, Greek. But in order to make the work also useful to the student of Aristotle, there should be a fourth glossary — Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, to be printed together with each text of the commentary.

ORGANIZATION OF STAFF

In order to carry out the work effectively it is necessary to have a staff organized along the following lines: (1) Editor-in-Chief, selected from among the (2) Board of Editors, consisting of the following three members: Editor of the Arabic

Series, Editor of the Hebrew Series, Editor of the Latin Series; (3) Advisory Board; (4) Editors of the individual works.

While in some cases it may be possible for one editor to edit the same work in the three languages, it is on the whole advisable to have an Arabist, a Hebraist, and a Latinist associated in the edition of any commentary which exists in the three languages. Among the three editors, however, there must be one who has a knowledge of the three languages, so that he may be able to coördinate the work on all three texts. It is the belief of the writer that there will be no difficulty in getting properly qualified men in sufficient number to carry out the program as laid out.

PUBLICATION

The polyglot form, with the three texts printed one beside the other or one below the other, would perhaps be most ideal for the publication of this corpus. But practical considerations may make such a plan impossible. Besides, there is nothing tangible to be gained by it. The various apparatuses and glossaries will furnish to the student of any single one of the texts all the information that he may gather from the other two texts. Those few who are able to use themselves all the three texts will find it just as easy to handle three monoglot volumes as one polyglot one.

Consequently, while the editing of the texts must be done simultaneously in the three languages by editors working in association with each other, the publication of the texts may be treated, if necessary, as three independent undertakings. There will be three series of publications of the same corpus:

- A. The Arabic Series
- B. The Hebrew Series
- C. The Latin Series
- D. Translations and Studies

Whenever the Hebrew or the Latin possesses several translations of the same text, all the translations are to be printed, either one or all of them critically edited, as the case may require.

A special subdivision of the Hebrew Series will be supercommentaries on Averroes. These will have to be considered as an integral part of the Corpus. Similarly, the Latin Series will have to include the Annotations of Zimara and others as well as the Latin translations of the Hebrew supercommentaries of Gersonides.

While the present plan contemplates an edition of only the commentaries of Averroes, which is to include his *Quaestiones* to the various books of Aristotle, it may be extended to include also the publication of the other works of Averroes and of the works of other Arabic and Jewish philosophers, which happen to exist in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin.

SERIES OF TRANSLATIONS AND STUDIES OF AVERROES

As the Corpus is to be something more than a mere collection of texts, it should also have room for annotated translations into modern languages of selected

commentaries of Averroes and for monographs dealing with certain phases of Averroes' philosophy. The scholars who will be entrusted with the editing of the texts as well as other competent scholars are therefore to be encouraged to undertake translations or independent studies of the works included in the Corpus. Such works are to form a Fourth Series of the Corpus.

APPENDIX I

Was There a Hebrew Translation from the Arabic of Averroes' Long *De Anima*?

STEINSCHNEIDER in his *Hebraeische Uebersetzungen* offered evidence to show that there had existed a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima*. We shall examine his evidence.

First, in the Bodleian Library (Neubaur 1353.6) there is a supercommentary by Joseph b. Shem-ṭob on the section dealing with the rational faculty in one of Averroes' commentaries on Aristotle's *De Anima*. The manuscript contains no statement as to which of the three Averroes' commentaries on that work is the subject of the supercommentary. Neubauer in his catalogue of the Bodleian Hebrew manuscripts (1886) simply says "according to Averroes' paraphrase," where the term "paraphrase" is evidently used by him, as it is throughout the catalogue, in the sense of Epitome. Steinschneider in his *Hebraeische Uebersetzungen* (1893) takes it to be the Long Commentary (§ 73, p. 150), on the basis of which he tries to show that in the latter part of the fifteenth century there was still in existence a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long *De Anima*, for at the end of his preface Joseph b. Shem-ṭob promises to write a super commentary on the whole book.

However, on the basis of the incipits quoted by Steinschneider himself (*op. cit.*, nn. 725-730 on pp. 207-208) it can be shown that the commentary used as the subject of the supercommentary here is the Middle Commentary. According to these incipits, the supercommentary is described as a "Treatise on the Rational Faculty." It then begins with a passage which is introduced by the Hebrew word for "He says." Then follows a comment on the foregoing passage, which is introduced by the Hebrew word for "Commentary." Then follows another passage introduced by the Hebrew words for "Says Averroes," and this is followed again, by a passage introduced by the Hebrew word for "Commentary." Finally, there is a passage introduced, again, by the Hebrew words for "Says Averroes." Commenting on these incipits, Steinschneider says that "they agree with the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary" (*ibid.*, p. 208). This, however, is not so. The description of the supercommentary as a "Treatise on this Rational Faculty," the words "He says," "Says Averroes," and "Commentary," and the passages which follow these words are all taken verbatim from Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of Averroes' Middle Commentary (MS Jewish Theological Seminary.)

It may be added that Joseph b. Shem-ṭob's statement that there was no supercommentary on the commentary in question (quoted *ibid.*, p. 207, n. 725)

applies equally to the Middle Commentary as to the Long Commentary, for at the time that the statement was made there were in existence only some annotations on it by Solomon b. Joseph Enabi (cf. *ibid.*, p. 150).

Second, the Junta editions of 1550 and 1575 contain two Latin translations of Comments 5 and 36 of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima* III, one by Michael Scot made directly from the Arabic and the other by Mantinus made from the Hebrew during the sixteenth century. This is taken by Steinschneider to show that a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long *De Anima* was still in existence during the lifetime of Mantinus (*ibid.*, p. 151). However, this is not conclusive. These two comments happen to deal with problems concerning the intellect and it is therefore quite possible that long before the time of Mantinus they had been detached from the rest of the commentary and translated into Hebrew, having been regarded as independent treatises on the intellect, on a par with other similar treatises on the intellect by Averroes, which exist in Hebrew translation. It may be added, in passing, that Mantinus' translation of Comments 5 and 36 are not made from the Hebrew translation from the Latin Long *De Anima* to be discussed in the next Appendix.

While the evidence advanced by Steinschneider does not prove the existence of a Hebrew translation from the Arabic of the Long *De Anima*, there is the evidence of an eyewitness who testifies to his having seen a Hebrew translation of Book III of the Long *De Anima*. Isaac Abravanel (1437–1508), writing to Saul ha-Kohen Ashkenazi of Candia, in answer to a letter addressed him on the fifth day of the fifth day of the Second Adar of the year 5266 (2 March 1506), says as follows: "We in these lands have of works of Aristotle in our language, together with the Long Commentaries of Averroes, only the *Posterior Analytics* of the *Organon*, the *Physics*, the Third Book of *De Anima*, and the Tenth Book of the *Metaphysics*" (*She'elot . . . Sha'ul ha-Kohen* [Venice, 1574], p. 15d). This quotation calls for the following comments: First, the phrase "in these lands" refers to Italy, where Abravanel lived after the banishment of the Jews from Spain in 1492. Second, for that which I have translated "in our language" the printed Hebrew text has the reading *bi-leshono* "in his language," which is quite evidently a misprint for *bi-leshonenu* "in our language." Third, it is to be assumed that the translation of the Long commentary on the Third Book of *De Anima*, like the translations of the other Long Commentaries mentioned by him, was a translation made directly from the Arabic. Fourth, according to the catalogues of Hebrew manuscripts in Italian libraries, published long after the time of Abravanel, there is a Long *Posterior Analytics* in Parma, but no Third Book of the Long *De Anima* anywhere; as for the two other Long Commentaries mentioned by Abravanel, of the Long *Physics* there were in Turin, before the fire of 1906, only Books I–IV and of the Long *Metaphysics* there are Books VII–X and XII in the Vatican, wrongly ascribed to Alexander (cf. *Hebr. Ueber.*, § 87, p. 172, n. 488). There can be no question, however, of the trustworthiness of Abravanel's precise statement as to what he had seen in Italy of the Hebrew Long Commentaries. Abravanel was a close student of the Hebrew translations of Averroes' commentaries, to which he

refers and upon which he draws so frequently in his own works. His statement is evidently based upon manuscripts he saw in private collections. Many private collections of Hebrew manuscripts existed at that time in Italy.

APPENDIX II

The Identity of the Hebrew Translator from the
Latin of Averroes' Long *De Anima*

IN 1888 the then Royal Library in Berlin purchased through Ephraim Deinard from the library of Landsberg in Kremenetz, Russia, two manuscripts, one an anonymous Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima* and the other a Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long Commentary on *Metaphysics* made from the Arabic by Moses ben Solomon of Salon (cf. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Uebers.*, pp. 151, 172). According to a note on the *De Anima* by its former owner, Mendl Landsberg, the manuscript was purchased by him from a bookseller in the month of Nisan of the year 5609 (March–April 1849) and that two folios missing in the manuscript were copied for him from another manuscript, which he had located after a long search. Nothing is known about that other manuscript. As a list of manuscripts owned by Bisliches of Brody, which was published in Geiger's *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, III (1837), 283, contains an item described as "Aristoteles de anima und dessen Metaphysik, übersetzt ins Hebr., mit einem ausführlichen Comm. von Moses ben Salomo aus Xilon¹ in Spanien," Steinschneider suggested that the two manuscripts purchased might be those originally owned by Bisliches (cf. *Die Handschriften-verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* [1897], §§ 214, 215, p. 64).²

The colophon in the Landsberg manuscript of the Long *De Anima* does not give the name of the translator nor does it say from what language it was translated. All that the copyist says in it is that "I Samuel Phinehas, the youngest of the scribes, have written this book of the Long *De Anima* for Abraham di Benevento, completing it on Thursday, second day of the month of Ab, in the year" and here follows a quotation of part of Lamentation 3:27, in which a dotted word amounts to the year 5235 (6 July 1475).³ It is not clear, however, whether Benevento was the city where the Abraham referred to lived and hence where the manuscript was written or whether it was only the family name of Abraham, and it was some other city where he lived and where the manuscript was written. A comparison of certain passages in this Hebrew translation with those in the Latin

¹ "Xilon" here is a conjectural identification by Julius Fürst, who furnished the list, of the name of the city written in Hebrew as *Shilon*. It is now generally identified as Salon in France.

² In his *Hebr. Uebers.* (1896), §87, p. 172, however, Steinschneider lists the manuscript of the Long *Metaphysics* purchased by Berlin from the Landsberg collection and the Bisliches manuscript mentioned in Geiger's *Zeitschrift* as two different manuscripts.

³ Steinschneider in his above-mentioned catalogue of the Berlin Hebrew manuscripts gives 1497 as the equivalent of the Hebrew *anno mundi* mentioned in the colophon, which is evidently a misprint.

translation, supplied by Professor Samuel Rosenblat, led Professor F. Stuart Crawford, who edited the Latin translation for the Mediaeval Academy, to conclude that the Hebrew translation was made from the Latin translation. Nine of these comparisons are referred to by Crawford in the Prolegomena of his edition (pp. xi–xii). Some of these will be commented upon at the end of this Appendix.

In examining this Hebrew translation of the Long *De Anima* with a view to discovering some clues as to the identity of the translator, I found it contains the following peculiarities.

First, the three Books of the *De Anima* are divided into seventeen Summae (Hebrew *kelalim*) and each Summa is subdivided into chapters (Hebrew *perakim*). From Bouyges' edition of Averroes' Long Commentary on *Metaphysics* it may be gathered that no such divisions and subdivisions are used by Averroes in his Long Commentaries. Nor, as I am told by Crawford, are there any such divisions and subdivisions in the manuscripts of the Latin translations of the Long Commentary on *De Anima*. Nor, again, are there such divisions and subdivisions in the 1483 edition of the Latin translations of the Long Commentaries. They do appear, however, in the sixteenth century Latin editions, but, in the case of the Long *De Anima*, which I have examined, they do not agree with those in the Hebrew manuscript.

Second, while the Arabic name Ibn Bājja appears in this Hebrew translation as a transliteration of Avenpace, the form in which this name occurs in the Latin translation, the names Empedocles and Hippocrates appear in it in their customary Hebrew transliterations from the Arabic as Ibn Dokles and Abukrat. Similarly the forename of Alexander Aphrodisiensis appears in it as Aleskander, the form used in some Hebrew translations from the Arabic.

Third, the Hebrew term *ḥidah* "riddle" appears in it as a translation of *μῦθος* in *De Anima* I, 3, 407b, 22, for which the Arabic translation of *De Anima* has *ḥurāfah*, "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22) and the Latin translation from the Arabic in Averroes' Long Commentary has *apologus* (I, 53, ll. 3, 12). It seems that some student of this Hebrew translation, who may have known either the original Greek term or the Latin term, was puzzled by the use of the Hebrew term for "riddle" here, and so he put down between the lines of the manuscript, above the Hebrew word *ḥidah*, the word *apologo*, as if to warn the next user of the manuscript that *ḥidah* here is used in the special sense of the Latinized Greek word *apologus*.

With these peculiarities of the translator to go by, I began to look for some Hebrew translator from the Latin whose translations might show the same or similar peculiarities. Inasmuch as, according to the colophon, the manuscript was written in Italy during the fifteenth century, in order to shorten the search, I began to look for a possible translator of this work among Hebrew translators from the Latin who lived in Italy during the fifteenth century and who translated philosophic works. Baruch ben Isaac Ibn Ya'ish seemed to be the most likely candidate, for among the works which he translated from the Latin into Hebrew there was a Hebrew translation from the Latin of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (MSS.

Bodleian, 1366; Leyden, 33; Bibliothèque Nationale, 891). Further information about him is as follows. In a manuscript of a Hebrew translation of Thomas Aquinas' commentary on the *Metaphysics*, Ibn Ya'ish is referred to by its translator Abrarāham Naḥmias as still living in 1490 (cf. *Hebr. Uebers.*, p. 158, n. 31b), that is, fifteen years after the date of the manuscript of the Hebrew Long *De Anima*. Then, in a manuscript of a Hebrew translation of a Latin commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Bibliothèque Nationale, 1001), there is a colophon which reads as follows: "I, Samuel b. Solomon Atortos, have translated it and written it down out of what as I have heard it from the mouth of my teacher, the accomplished and all-around scholar, the divine philosopher, Baruch ben Ya'ish, and finished it in the city of Benevento in the year 5245 (1485)."¹ The meaning of the colophon is not quite clear. It may mean that Ibn Ya'ish was merely helping his student to translate the work from the Latin into Hebrew or it may mean that he orally dictated to his student his own Hebrew translation of the Latin work. But it is quite clear that in 1485, ten years after the manuscript of the Hebrew Long *De Anima* was written by one who describes himself as "the youngest of the scribes" for a certain "Abraham di Benevento," Ibn Ya'ish lived in Benevento. This creates a strong probability that already in 1475 he was there, that "the youngest of the scribes" was a student of his, and that this student of his was commissioned by a patron of learning in Benevento, named Abraham, to copy, or perhaps to take down from oral dictation, his master's translation from the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima*.

This tentative identification of Ibn Ya'ish as the translator in question was finally clinched by finding that his Hebrew translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* contains the three peculiarities we have noticed in the anonymous Hebrew translation of Averroes' Long *De Anima*. First, as in the anonymous Hebrew translation of the Long *De Anima* so also in his translation of the *Metaphysics*, each book is broken up into smaller divisions, in this case only into chapters, and this division of each book into chapters is described by him as an innovation which he himself has introduced (see quotation of his statement in Neubauer's catalogue of the Bodleian Hebrew Manuscripts 1366). Second, as in the Long *De Anima* so also in his *Metaphysics*, the name Empedocles appears as Ibn Doḳles. Third, once more, as in the anonymous Long *De Anima* so in his *Metaphysics*, the Greek *μῦθος* in XII, 8, 1074b, 1 and 4, for which the Latin translation has *fabula*, is translated by him from the Latin by the Hebrew *ḥidah* "riddle."⁴

⁴ It is to be added that the Greek *μῦθος* is variously translated into Arabic. Though this term in *De Anima* I, 3, 207b, 22, is in the Arabic translation of *De Anima* translated by *ḥurāfah* "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22), in Averroes' Middle Commentary on *De Anima* it is translated by the Arabic *luḡz* "riddle" (MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Heb. 1009.3) and hence *ḥidah* in Moses Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of it (MS. Jewish Theological Seminary). In Averroes' Middle Commentary on the *Poetics*, however, in a passage corresponding to *Poetics* 6, 1450a, 4 *μῦθος* is translated by the Arabic *ḥurāfah*, "fanciful tale," "fable," "superstition" (ed. Lasinio, p. 9, l. 5) and hence *sippur tefelut* "superstitious tale" in Todros Todrosi's Hebrew translation of it (ed. Lasinio, p. 7, l. 24) and hence *fabula* in Mantinus' and Balmes' Latin translations

Baruch ben Isaac Ibn Ya'ish is thus the Hebrew translator from the Latin of Averroes' Long Commentary on *De Anima*.

Though this Hebrew Long *De Anima* is undoubtedly a translation from the Latin, some of its readings, rejected for good reasons in the Crawford edition, may represent the original Arabic text.

Here are a few examples:

In I 23, 15 (ed. Crawford), Averroes uses in his comment, according to the Latin reading, the expression "Homerus versificator," whereas according to the Hebrew reading he uses an expression which means "Homerus verifactor." The Greek text upon which Averroes comment rests reads: διὸ καλῶς ποιῆσαι τὸν Ὅμηρον (*De Anima* I, 2, 404a, 29), for which the Arabic translation of *De Anima*, if translated into Latin, would read: "et ideo bene fecit Homerus in suis versibus (*aḥsan fī shi'rihi*) cum dixit" (ed. Badawi, p. 9, l. 6). But it will be noticed that the Arabic text used here by Averroes, as translated into Latin, reads: "et ideo dixit Homerus, et verum dixit" (I 23, 6–7). This shows that the text of the Arabic translation used here by Averroes, unlike the text of the extant Arabic translation of *De Anima*, did not take the term ποιῆσαι in the underlying Greek text in the sense of saying in verse. Consequently the reading *verifactor* in Averroes' comment on it is more likely to represent the original Arabic here than the reading *versificator*.

It is to be noted that in his Long Commentary on the *Metaphysics* IV, Comm. 21 (ed. Bouyges, p. 419, ll. 9 and 14), where Averroes definitely uses an Arabic expression meaning "Homerus versificator (*al-shā'ir*)", the term ἐροίῃσε applied to Homer in *Metaphysics* IV, 5, 1009b, 28–29, upon which Averroes's comment rests, is translated in the Arabic text used by Averroes by *dhakar fī shi' rihi* (ed. Bouyges, IV, Text. 21, p. 413, l. 11), for which the Latin translation from the Arabic reads: "dixit enim in suis versibus."

In I 29, 5 (ed. Crawford) the Hebrew and the printed editions and manuscripts read: "ignis enim est primorum partium inter elementa." The corresponding Greek reads: πῦρ . . . καὶ γὰρ . . . λεπτομερέστατον (405a, 5–6), for which the Arabic translation of *De Anima*, if translated into Latin, would read: ". . . ignis, quia est *subtilissimarum* (*daḥḥah*) partium" (ed. Badawi, p. 10, l. 17). On the basis of the Greek, Crawford emended the text to read: "parviorum partium." It is quite possible, however, that the text used by Averroes had the reading *primorum*

from the Hebrew. In Averroes' Long Commentary on the *Metaphysics*, in a passage corresponding to XII, 8, 1074b, 1 and 4, *mūthos* is translated by the Arabic *ḥādīth*, "tale" (ed. Bouyges, p. 1687, ll. 3 and 4), for which the Latin translation from the Arabic has *fabula* (ed. 1574, p. 333 KM) and the Hebrew translation from the Arabic has *sippur*, "tale" (MS. Ebr. Vat. Urb. 46.1). Averroes in his comment on this text (Comm. 50, p. 334 AC) uses, as the equivalents of the Arabic *ḥādīth* of the text, two other Arabic terms: (1) *luḡz*, "riddle" (p. 1688, ll. 5, 7, 11, 16; p. 1689, l. 4), Latin: *apologus*, but (p. 1688, l. 12), *fabula*, Hebrew: *ḥidah*; (2) *ramz*, "hint" (p. 1688, l. 11), Latin: *sermo*, Hebrew: *remez*, "hint." Ibn Ya'ish's translation of both the Latin *apologus* in *De Anima* and the Latin *fabula* in *Metaphysics* by the Hebrew *ḥidah* reflects the influence of the Latin and Hebrew translations of Averroes' Long Commentary on *Metaphysics*, reference to the Hebrew translation of which is made by him in his Introduction to his Hebrew translation of the Latin *Metaphysics*.

partium inter elementa, for it will be noticed that in his Comment on this text Averroes paraphrases it to read “quia reputabant ignem esse elementum ceterorum elementorum,” and this is followed by “et simplicorum partium” (I 29, 16–18), which seems to be an explanation of the preceding statement. Now the expression “elementum ceterorum elementorum” quite evidently implies the reading of “primorum partium inter elementa” in the underlying text. Such a reading of the text and its explanation as added by Averroes in his comment would reflect Aristotle’s statement in *Metaphysics* I, 8, 988b, 35–989a, 2, that fire is held by some to be “the most elementary of all” (στοιχειωδέστατον πάντων) and hence the “most minute in its parts” (μικρομέεστατον) and the “most subtle” (λεπτότατον).

In I 53, 3 (ed. Crawford) after “Apologus quo utitur Pitagoras,” the Hebrew and some Latin manuscripts add: “scilicet apologo quem posuit ad corrigendum animas civium.” Though in the Arabic translation of *De Anima* this additional statement does not occur (ed. Badawi, p. 17, l. 22), it is not necessarily an interpolation from Averroes’ comment on this text (I 53, 13). It is quite possible that the text used by Averroes contained this additional statement, where it was introduced from Themistius’ commentary on *De Anima*, for Themistius, right after quoting Aristotle’s κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορικοὺς μύθους, comments: οἷς ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἐχρήτο πολιτικῶς (ed. R. Heinze, p. 23, l. 33). The term *utitur* in Averroes *Apologus quo utitur*, which has nothing to correspond to it either in the Greek text of Aristotle or in its Arabic translation, shows the influence of the term ἐχρήτο in Themistius’ comment.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY