

#### Zitierhinweis

Grau Torras, Sergi: Rezension über: Pieter De Leemans (ed.),  
Aristoteles Latinus. 17,1,3: Aristoteles Latinus. De motu animalium.  
Fragmenta translationis anonymae, Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, in:  
Medievalia. Revista d'Estudis Medievals, 15 (2012), S. 353-357,  
DOI: 10.15463/rec.1189736935



#### copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

diese Lücken sich sachlich gewiss rechtfertigen lassen, verwundert eine weitere *lacuna*: wieso fehlt in der Auswahl Alberts Kommentar zu den *Zweiten Analytiken* des Aristoteles, der gerade für eine an der Wissenschaftssystematik orientierte Dokumentation seines Denkens fundamental zu sein scheint? Ohne Kenntnis der dort verhandelten Problematik des spezifischen Gegenstandsbereiches der einzelnen Wissenschaften, der sowohl ihre Differenz als auch ihren Zusammenhang begründet, sind viele Erörterungen der in diesem Band gebotenen Texte nur schwer zu verorten.

Vermutlich —und durchaus verständlich— haben hier wohl kontingente Faktoren eine Rolle gespielt; die allgemeine Erschließung und Übersetzung der Werke Alberts kann freilich nicht schneller voranschreiten als die Editions- und Forschungsarbeit selbst; immerhin liefert *De V universalibus* zumindest einige Überlegungen, die diese *lacuna* füllen. Auch sollte nicht das Verdienst übersehen werden, das in der kollektiven Arbeit steckt, die —und das spürt der Leser auf jeder Seite— Frucht eines intensiven gedanklichen Austausches zwischen den Mitarbeitern des Albertus-Magnus-Instituts ist. Denn der Band präsentiert sich trotz der Vielheit der Themen und ihrer unterschiedlichen Bearbeiter terminologisch und gedanklich in höchst konsistenter Form. Ferner gilt es die gute Verarbeitung seitens des Verlages zu betonen, ebenso wie das ausgezeichnete Preisleistungsverhältnis.

Zuletzt bleibt noch darauf hinzuweisen, dass dieses Buch Ludger Honnefelder anlässlich seines 75. Geburtstages gewidmet ist. Und ohne Zweifel: das Ergebnis ehrt den langjährigen Direktor des Albertus-Magnus-Instituts, wie auch seine Mitarbeiter!

Alexander Fidora

ICREA / Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

alexander.fidora@icrea.cat



*Aristoteles Latinus (ALPE XVII 1.III) Aristoteles, De motu animalium. Fragmenta Translationis anonymae*, PIETER DE LEEMANS (ed.), Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, XCII+69 pp., ISBN: 978-2-503-54094-8.

*Aristoteles Latinus (ALPE XVII 2.II-III) Aristoteles, Guillelmus de Morbeka, De progressu animalium. De motu animalium. Translatio Guillelmi de Morbeka*, PIETER DE LEEMANS (ed.), Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, CCLX+118 pp., ISBN: 978-2-503-54093-1.

These two volumes of the Aristoteles Latinus series provide the critical edition of the Medieval Latin translations of Aristotle's *De motu animalium* (On the movement of animals) and *De progressu animalium* (On the progression of animals) by Pieter De Leemans. The first volume contains the reconstruction of the anonymous Latin text of *De motu animalium*, only known in fragmentary form through Albert the Great's *De principiis motus processivi*. The second volume contains William of Moerbeke's translation of *De progressu animalium* and *De motu animalium* along with a complete study and analysis of the manuscript families.

Both treatises were among the least well-known Aristotelian writings in the medieval world but that did not prevent their being mentioned by Averroes, paraphrased by Albert the Great, commented on by Peter of Auvergne or translated into Latin by more than one translator. They were spread throughout the Latin world in the early sixties of the thirteenth century when William of Moerbeke made his translation of both treatises directly from the Greek. Neither treatise was circulated in Arabic-into-Latin translations and they were not included in Aristotle's *De animalibus* translated by Michael Scot (c. 1220) directly from the Arabic in Toledo (edited by Aafke M.I. van Oppenraaij in the Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus series, Brill).

The first book (ALPE xvii 1.iii) includes the reconstruction of the anonymous Latin text *De motu animalium* along with the study of its possible model. This edition has a peculiarity because this is a hypothetical reconstruction of the Latin text based upon Albert's *De principiis motus processivi* where the *De motu animalium* is paraphrased. The anonymous Latin translation has been lost and the reconstruction is based on a comparison of Albert's text with the Greek tradition. This kind of edition is not exempt of problems. The editor explains the methodological difficulties: the text's structure has been altered by Albert, grammatical forms are adapted, words are omitted or replaced by others, etc. It is not easy to evaluate the task of the translator because Albert writes an original treatise rather than a real commentary. Here we can find the work of not only the translator but also Albert's. In addition, there are other problems concerning the methodology of reconstruction because, among other things, there is the possibility to translate a Greek term into Latin in different ways.

Since no manuscript of the translation is extant, the basis for a reconstruction must be the Greek text. This is the next step. As we do not know the exact Greek *Vorlage*, the editor's task is focused on recovering the Greek text used by the translator; a task which is not easy, for there is no complete study of the Greek tradition taking into account all the manuscripts. Particular readings are reflected in the paraphrase and many of them stem from the translator, characterized by the use of a vocabulary that is not always common, something that led in some

cases to misinterpretation by Albert. The study seems to confirm the existence of a translation which predates Moerbeke's rendering, and depends on a different tradition of manuscripts which is linked to the Southern Italy translations in the mid thirteen-century, revealing some coincidences between the translator's Greek manuscript and the commentary on *De motu animalium* written by Michael of Ephesos in the twelfth century. In addition, the comparison sheds some light on certain particularities in the text, which make it possible to establish the Firenze manuscript from Biblioteca Mediceo Laurenziana 87.21 as the Greek text which comes closest to the model of the anonymous translator. This is the most important manuscript used for the reconstruction of the translation.

In order to indicate the traces of the anonymous translation in Albert's work, the reconstructed edition of the *De motu animalium* uses five different kinds of marks for typographical distinctions; yet, every part of the reconstruction, which covers an important portion of the text, remains hypothetical. The edition of Albert's text is based on the edition by Bernhard Geyer (Köln, 1955) with some differences in the text, accompanied with a comparative critical apparatus, a Greek-Latin index and a Reversed index which analyze the vocabulary used by the translator.

The second book (ALPE xvii 2.ii-iii) contains the study and the critical edition of Aristotle's *De motu animalium* and *De progressu animalium* done by William of Moerbeke who provided important translations of Aristotle's works. The book offers an extensive introduction divided into three chapters. In the first, the editor discusses the Latin manuscript tradition of William's translation with a detailed study of the Latin textual tradition of both of Aristotle's treatises considering their influences or contaminations. Moerbeke's translations were used as an official *exemplarium* text by the University of Paris, so they had an outstanding impact; the list of manuscripts for *De motu animalium* amounts to 170 while *De progressu animalium* is preserved in about 100 manuscripts.

Regarding these translations, we encounter specific difficulties because in the Parisian bookseller's taxation lists from 1304 we can find two different exemplars in circulation with show distinctive features. One exemplar was included in Aristotle's *Books on Animals* (Book xi and xii) and the other one figured in a collection of Aristotle's *Parva naturalia*. This is not very common with other Latin treatises of Aristotle and this situation gives a specific peculiarity to the study of the manuscript tradition. For the first corpus, which is related to the work on Animals, the study of the manuscript tradition sheds light on eventual changes of the exemplar focused on the transition of *pecia* 19 to 20. At this point it seems that there was a gradual deterioration of the text which was emended by the correct reading, while both exemplars remained in circulation. The second corpus links

*De motu animalium* to the *Parva naturalia*, this being a collection of various short Aristotelian (and pseudo-Aristotelian) physiological treatises concerning activities common to the soul and the body. In this corpus, many manuscripts include *De motu animalium* but not *De progressu animalium*. This was because the order was not fixed and scribes could select which treatise to copy. This situation was more positive for the first one which became philosophically more relevant. It was mentioned in the title as *De motibus animalium* with *aliorum parvorum* as a result of the commentary tradition by Albert the Great or Peter of Auvergne.

The relation between the two different exemplars allows the editor to clarify the possible common model that is related to the Paris tradition; *De progressu animalium* indeed had a common source but in *De motu animalium* the evidence is more limited. However, the editor puts emphasis on the independent manuscripts from Italy that show variants, readings, omissions and transpositions of manuscripts, which imply another reading independent from the Paris tradition. The example of the manuscript from Ravenna of Moerbeke's translation offers a text that belongs to a tradition independent of Paris with some corrections included, probably due to the later revision by Moerbeke. In this case, *De motu animalium* differs from the Paris tradition in only a few passages but *De progressu animalium* has more prominent changes concerning words and punctuation in the text itself and in the margins, bottom and top, which makes this alternative tradition clearer.

The second chapter focuses on the relation between Moerbeke's Latin translations and their Greek model with the objective to identify the lost Greek manuscript used for the translation. It appears that Moerbeke revised his initial translations in several cases. In *De progressu animalium*, he must have made some changes but they are not distinguished with clarity, whereas in *De motu animalium* three different stages are identified which could be made on the basis of another Greek manuscript. The Greek *Vorlage* of Moerbeke's translation is not preserved and this makes identification more complicated. The present work shows that Moerbeke seems to revise both translations. In the case of *De progressu animalium*, he made some revision of his original text. To explain the changes, it seems more feasible that he used one copy which contained all variants of different families of manuscripts that were reflected in his translation, than that he used an incomplete manuscript or two Greek models. This would explain a few variants in the Latin tradition that have a parallel in Greek. The case of *De motu animalium* goes one step further, because the analysis includes a more thorough description of manuscripts: the editor lists 44 Greek manuscripts against the lower number of his predecessors' studies, taking especially into account the Greek text of Aristotle's *De motu animalium* edited by Martha Nussbaum in 1978 and her analysis.

Finally, the editor selects 23 passages to conclude that his translation is among the texts that were revised by Moerbeke although he never made a thorough revision of the whole text.

The third chapter presents the editorial principles that are characterized by the rigorous standard of the Aristoteles Latinus series. The work also includes the Latin apparatus with some specifications, the Greek-Latin comparative apparatus, the Index verborum comparing Moerbeke's translation with his supposed Greek model and, of course, an Index locorum, codicum (latini et graeci) and nominum complemented with bibliography and the analysis of the different families of manuscripts including the *stemma* not only of the Latin tradition but also of the Greek manuscript families.

In fact, there are two different yet related translations, the one that comes from Moerbeke and the other, anonymous one, but both work independently which means that Moerbeke made a new translation rather than a revision. The study seems to clarify that Moerbeke used the same Greek manuscript twice for his original translation, first to translate the text into Latin and then to revise his own translation on the basis of the same Greek manuscript, a methodology used in other translations done by William of Morbeke. Pieter De Leemans provides in these two volumes not only the Latin edition of both of Aristotle's treatises focused on the locomotion and progression of the animals, but also the most preeminent study of the Latin manuscript tradition, including the Greek tradition with all its representatives as well.

Sergi Grau Torras  
*Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*  
sergigrautorras@gmail.com



XAVIER BARRAL I ALTET, *L'art romànic català a debat*, Barcelona: Edicions 62, 2009, 248 pp., ISBN: 978-84-297-6044-6.

Casi como una aporía se presenta el título del último libro de Xavier Barral: *El arte románico catalán a debate*, por cuanto que una de las premisas defendidas en sus páginas es la inconveniencia de apellidar al Románico con un gentilicio, habida cuenta de la unidad de estilo que implica en todo el territorio europeo donde se desarrolla esta estética. El corolario de esta hipótesis es que las adscripciones románicas regionales o nacionales remiten más a interpretaciones que a descripciones, más a categorías de oportunidad que a criterios formales. No hay,