

CONCLUSIONS

At the beginning of this study it was noted that Maimonides grants decisive importance to the role of faith for his readers' comprehension of the issues treated in the *Guide*. He asserts that he wrote the *Guide* to remove the confusion of the learned Jew regarding the Holy Scripture, which seems to contradict with its language what one can rationally know about God. His leading concern is to define an appropriate language about God, and to explain how it is possible for a created intellect to conceive a notion of God while preserving the divine Unity, Simplicity, and Transcendence. It was also observed that his explanations are intentionally given in an enigmatic way that leaves his personal position open to different interpretations, thus empowering his interpreters with a fundamental task regarding the future of his philosophy.

I have focused on Aquinas' interpretation of the passages of the *Guide* that he considered particularly important, i.e., passages quoted frequently and in contexts of particular doctrinal importance. Special attention was paid to the chronology of these Maimonidean quotations in Aquinas' writings, with the aim of detecting a possible evolution in Aquinas' interpretation of the *Guide*. Systematic examination of the texts highlighted in this fashion has led in an unexpected direction, whose conclusions complement the existing literature. This research yielded the following conclusions:

Among all the issues in which Aquinas quotes Maimonides, the problem of the knowledge of God occupies the central place. In this framework, the problem of the divine attributes is the milieu of Aquinas' dialogue with Maimonides. The collation of the parallel references showed that this issue facilitates the understanding of Aquinas' use of the *Guide* and also that of its place in Aquinas' thought. Their examination, taking into account their chronology, discloses that Aquinas had an early interest in Maimonides' answer to the problem of the possibility and extent of the knowledge of God, and that this interest was renewed due to historical and doctrinal factors after 1265.

In particular, Aquinas' *Quaestio de attributis*, composed between 1265 and 1266, has proved to be a most useful text in helping us

achieve a comprehensive understanding of his reading of the *Guide*. This has been demonstrated through an examination of the historical circumstances of its composition and its doctrinal contents, which provide valuable connections with other locations in Aquinas' works.

The first part of the *Quaestio de attributis* relates to the problem of the divine attributes and Aquinas' answer to it, with his evaluation of Maimonides' position. According to Aquinas, the key for explaining the human capacity for the knowledge of God is the ability of the intellect to develop *rationes*, namely, the intellectual contents of different notions of perfections apprehended without the limitations inherent to a concept. His assumption is that, if the rational creature is capable of producing the *rationes* of created perfections, it is also capable of grasping the nature of their universal Cause. The notion of *ratio* explains the "articulation" or "hinge" between reality and knowledge, which enables the passage to be made from the ontological level (reality) to the gnoseological (knowledge) and back (knowledge *of that reality*). At the linguistic level, Aquinas explains the "hinge" between reality and knowledge with the distinction between the two meanings of the word "being": being as real (ontological being), and being as truth (veritative or gnoseological being). According to Aquinas, only a satisfactory explanation of this articulation of reality, knowledge, and language can solve the question of the knowledge of God.

In Aquinas' view, Maimonides sets for this knowledge such tight conditions that, in fact, some of his statements could imply the impossibility of any rational knowledge of God or at least make it problematic. In this context, Aquinas objects to two aspects of Maimonides' position that lead to this conclusion: his interpretation of the nature of causality and the doctrine of equivocality. These two aspects remain Aquinas' constant objection to Maimonides from the beginning of his academic life until his last works.

The second part of the *Quaestio de attributis* cites the biblical verse of *Zechariah*, 14, 9, which Maimonides quotes in *Guide*, I, 61. Aquinas had used this chapter of the *Guide* earlier, in order to point to the word "Being" as the most proper name of God. At the time of the composition of the *Quaestio*, he observes that Maimonides also writes in this chapter about a time when creatures

will be able to know and name God with one single name. Both philosophers note that Scripture suggests a stage in which it will be *natural* for man to know the proper name of God and His essence. Aquinas looks for a comprehensive definition of what is natural to man in terms of knowledge, a definition that also includes that suggested possibility of a direct contemplation of God.

This common biblical source brings their discourse into the problem of the knowledge of God in the afterlife and also into that of the extent of human knowledge in absolute terms, an issue in which Aquinas' explanation draws inspiration from *Guide I*, 34, where Maimonides outlines five causes that prevent the instruction of the multitude. Aquinas emphasizes through a recurring quotation of this text the importance of faith for the knowledge of God, as long as the intellect is compelled to know by means of the five senses.

Maimonides defines "faith" as the human act of the will that asserts God's existence and perfection. According to him, this act is that of the common people, who are not able to free themselves from the imagination in their representation of God. He states that faith teaches the existence, unity, and incorporeality of God to the multitude. The perfect individuals, however, achieve true intellectual knowledge of the divinity, devoid of imagination. As he puts it, the act of faith is an assertion of the will that overrides the process of apprehension of a defective intellectual faculty. Faith would be a flawed, though necessary, substitute for an apprehension of God because of the inability of many to achieve true intellectual knowledge. This means that the attainment of a perfect apprehension of God implies overcoming the stage of "believer", who is the one who relies on traditional authority. Maimonides considers this stage necessary or obligatory for all temporarily, because of the length and hardship of the intellectual training that enables individuals to formulate correctly the concepts taught by divine science.

For Aquinas, instead, faith would be a supernatural intellectual light, instrumental for man to apprehend and make his own what he can still not know about God with his natural strength alone. He acknowledges two existential states of the intellect within the boundaries of human nature: the intellect operating in this life (*in statu viae*) and after it has left the body (*in statu*

patriae). As long as human beings are in this life they need to believe things about God that they are not able to yet grasp directly, but that they will grasp directly *in patria*.

For Maimonides, the knowledge of God is also a process that lasts the whole life, but his references to *Zechariah* 14, 9 seem to apply to a future earthly state, the Days of the Messiah, when the apprehension of God will be superior to that possible today.

However, if related only to the knowledge of God in this life, the causes enumerated in *Guide* I, 34 do not provide a complete answer for Aquinas, because the divine essence is still beyond the most perfect created intellect, only knowing God's nature as universal cause but not what He is in Himself, unrelated to the Creation. His definition of two states is therefore completed with yet another passage from the *Guide* II, 17. Maimonides argues there that some questions, like the eternity or temporality of the world, cannot be answered because human beings do not have an experience of circumstances other than the current ones. Aquinas concludes that it is not possible to explain now the "how" of the direct contemplation of God in the afterlife because the human intellect is still in a developing stage.

Finally, despite the similarities between Maimonides' Philosophical Speculations on the apprehension of the existence of God and Aquinas' Five Ways, Aquinas' omission of the name of Maimonides in the relevant texts, together with the above conclusions regarding his understanding of Maimonides' opinion about the possibility of the knowledge of God, lead to the conclusion that Aquinas did not consider Maimonides a precedent for his own view on the subject.

APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGY OF THE THOMISTIC WORKS EXAMINED¹

- Commentum in quattuor libris Sententiarum* (except *In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3): 1252-1256.
Commentum in IV Sententiarum, (final redaction): 1256-1259.
Quaestiones disputatae de Veritate: 1256-1259.
Super Boetium de Trinitate: 1257-1259.
Summa contra Gentiles: 1259-1264.
Quaestiones disputatae de Potentia: 1265-1266.
Quaestio de attributis (*In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3): 1265-1266.
Roman Commentary on the Sentences: 1265-1268.
Summa Theologiae, Prima Pars: 1266-1268.
Responsio de 108 articulis: 1268.
Reportatio super Epistolam ad Ephesios: c. 1270.
Commentarium super Epistolam ad Romanos: c. 1273.
Compendium theologiae: 1269-1273.

¹ I follow the chronology proposed by E. Alarcón, *Evolución léxica y cronología del Corpus Thomista*. Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad de Navarra (Pamplona, 1998).

APPENDIX II

QUAESTIO DE ATTRIBUTIS

(In I Sent., d. 2, q. 1, a. 3)

Utrum pluralitas rationum, quibus attributa differunt, sit tantum in intellectu, vel etiam in Deo. Circa tertium sic proceditur:

Arg. 1 Videtur quod pluralitas rationum secundum quas attributa differunt, nullo modo sit in Deo, sed tantum in intellectu ratiocinantis. Dicit enim Dionysius: omnem sanctorum theologorum hymnum invenies ad bonos thearchiae processus, manifestative, et laudative Dei nominationes dividentes. Et est sensus, quod nomina quae in laudem divinam sancti assumunt, secundum diversos divinitatis processus, quibus ipse Deus manifestatur, dividuntur. Ergo ista pluralitas non est ex parte Dei, sed ex parte diversorum effectuum, ex quibus intellectus noster Deum diversimode cognoscit et nominat.¹

Arg. 2 Praeterea, Dionysius dicit: si aliquis videns Deum, intellexerit quod vidit, non ipsum vidit sed aliquid eorum quae sunt ejus. Si ergo praedicta nomina differunt secundum diversas rationes quas de eis intelleximus, istis rationibus nihil respondet quod in Deo sit, sed in his quae Dei sunt, scilicet creaturis.²

Arg. 3 Praeterea, Commentator dicit, loquens de hujusmodi nominibus, quod multiplicitas, quam ista nomina praetendunt,

¹ Whether the diversity of *rationes*, by which attributes differ, is only in the intellect or also in God. Article 3 is as follows:

Arg. 1: It seems that the plurality of *rationes* according to which attributes differ is absolutely not in God, but only in the intellect of the one who apprehends. Thus says Dionysius: "You will find that all the utterances of the holy theologians articulate the names of God in a revealing and praising way related to the Divine Majesty's blessed outpourings." It means that the names that the saints use in praising God are distinguished according to the diverse outpourings of God that issue from His divinity. Consequently, this diversity is not on the part of God, but on the part of the diverse effects by which our intellect diversely apprehends and names God.

² Arg. 2: Besides, Dionysius says: if anyone while seeing God were to understand what he sees, he would not see Him but some of the things that are His. Consequently, if the said names differ according to the diverse *rationes* that we understand regarding them, there is nothing in God that corresponds to these *rationes*, but only in the things that are God's, namely, creatures.

est in Deo secundum intellectum, et nullo modo secundum rem. Ergo videtur quod pluralitas harum rationum sit secundum intellectum nostrum tantum.³

Arg. 4 Praeterea, quidquid est in Deo, Deus est. Si ergo istae rationes secundum quas attributa differunt, sunt in Deo, ipsae sunt Deus. Sed Deus est unus et simplex. Ergo istae rationes, secundum quod in Deo sunt, non sunt plures.⁴

Arg. 5 Praeterea, illud quod in se est unum omnibus modis, non est radix alicujus multitudinis in eo existentis. Sed essentia divina est una omnibus modis, quia est summe una. Ergo non potest esse radix alicujus multitudinis in ea existentis. Pluralitas ergo dictarum rationum non radicatur in essentia divina sed in intellectu tantum.⁵

Arg. 6 Praeterea, Damascenus dicit, quod in Deo omnia sunt unum praeter ingenerationem et generationem et processionem. Si ergo sapientia et bonitas et hujusmodi attributa sunt in Deo, secundum quod in ipso sunt, non habent aliquam pluralitatem. Ergo pluralitas rationum quam nomina significant, non est in Deo, sed in intellectu nostro tantum.⁶

SC 1 Sed contra, Dionysius dicit, quod Deus dicitur perfectus sicut omnia in seipso comprehendens; et hoc est etiam quod Philosophus et Commentator dicit, quod Deus dicitur perfectus, quia omnes perfectiones quae sunt in omnibus generibus rerum

³ Arg. 3: Besides, the Commentator says about names of this kind that the multiplicity that these names suggest exists in God according to the intellect and absolutely not according to reality. Therefore it seems that these *rationes*' plurality exists only according to our intellect.

⁴ Arg. 4: Besides, whatever exists in God, is God. Consequently, if these *rationes* according to which attributes differ exist in God, they are God. Now God is one and simple. Therefore these *rationes*, in so far as they are in God, are not manifold.

⁵ Arg. 5: Besides, that which is one in itself in every possible way cannot be the root of any multiplicity existing within itself. But the divine essence is one in every possible way because it is supremely one. Therefore it cannot be root of any multiplicity existing within itself. Consequently, the plurality of the aforementioned *rationes* is not rooted in the divine essence but only in our intellect.

⁶ Arg. 6: Besides, the Damascene says that everything is one in God except the nonbegottenness, the begottenness, and the procession. Therefore, if attributes of wisdom, goodness, and the like exist in God, they do not introduce any plurality in so far as they are in Him. Consequently, the multiplicity of *rationes* that the names signify is not in God but only in our intellect.

in ipso sunt. Haec autem perfectio, qua Deus perfectus est, est secundum rem, et non secundum intellectum tantum. Ergo ista attributa quae perfectionem demonstrant, non sunt tantum in intellectu, sed in re, quae Deus est.⁷

SC 2 Praeterea, Dionysius dicit, quod creaturae dicuntur Deo similes, inquantum imitantur Deum, qui perfecte imitabilis non est a creatura. Ista autem imitatio est secundum participationem attributorum. Ergo creaturae sunt Deo similes, secundum sapientiam, bonitatem et huiusmodi. Sed hoc non posset esse, nisi praedicta essent in Deo secundum proprias rationes. Ergo ratio sapientiae et bonitatis proprie in Deo est; et ita huiusmodi rationes non sunt tantum ex parte intellectus.⁸

SC 3 Praeterea, sapientia non dicitur aequivoce de Deo et creatura; alias sapientia creata non duceret in cognitionem sapientiae increatae; et similiter est de potentia et bonitate et de aliis huiusmodi. Sed ea quae praedicantur de pluribus secundum rationes omnino diversas, aequivoce praedicantur. Ergo aliquo modo ratio sapientiae, secundum quod de Deo dicitur et de creaturis, est una, non quidem per univocationem, sed per analogiam: et similiter est de aliis. Sed ratio sapientiae, secundum quod de creaturis dicitur non est eadem ratio cum ratione bonitatis et potentiae. Ergo etiam secundum quod ista de Deo dicuntur, non sunt eadem rationes sed diversae.⁹

⁷ Against it: Dionysius says that God is called perfect, as He comprehends everything in Himself. This is also what the Philosopher and the Commentator say, that God is called perfect because all perfections found in all the genera of things exist in Him. Now this perfection, according to which God is perfect, is real and not only in the intellect. Consequently, these attributes that display perfection are not purely in the intellect, but in the real thing which is God.

⁸ Besides, Dionysius says that creatures are said to be similar to God in so far as they imitate God, who is not imitable perfectly by any creature. Now this imitation is according to participation in the attributes. Consequently, creatures are similar to God according to wisdom, goodness, and the like. But this could not be so if the aforementioned [perfections] were not in God according to their own *rationes*. Therefore the *ratio* of wisdom and goodness are properly in God; and so *rationes* of this kind do not exist only on the part of the intellect.

⁹ Besides, wisdom is not said equivocally of God and creatures; otherwise created wisdom would not lead to the knowledge of uncreated wisdom, and the same with power, goodness, and other examples of this kind. But attributes that are predicated of many according to completely diverse *rationes* are predicated equivocally. Thus in some way the *ratio* of wisdom, being said of God and of creatures, is one, though not by univocality but by analogy, and the same with

SC 4 Praeterea, sicut Deus vere est pater, ita etiam vere est sapiens. Sed ex hoc quod vere Deus est pater, non potest dici quod ratio paternitatis sit in intellectu tantum. Ergo nec ex hoc quod Deus vere est sapiens, potest dici quod ratio sapientiae sit in intellectu tantum. Sed ratio paternitatis, quae realiter in Deo est, non est eadem cum ratione divinitatis. Unde nec paternitate est Deus, nec divinitate est pater: et tamen ista pluralitas rationum non tollit simplicitatem divinam, propter hoc quod essentia et paternitas idem sunt in re. Ergo similiter si ponamus sapientiam et essentiam esse idem re omnino, et rationes eorum diversas, non tolletur simplicitas divinae essentiae. Sed divinae essentiae simplicitas est tota causa quare ista attributa in Deo non differunt. Ergo non est inconveniens ponere, quod sapientiae et bonitatis ratio in Deo est, et tamen una non est altera, si res omnino una ponatur.¹⁰

SC 5 Si dicatur quod non est simile de relationibus personalibus et de attributis essentialibus, quia in Deo non sunt nisi duo praedicamenta, scilicet substantia et relatio, unde ratio relationis est alia a ratione substantiae, non tamen ratio sapientiae et aliorum absolutorum est alia a substantia: contra. Relatio in divinis habet duplicem comparisonem: unam ad suum correlativum, secundum quam ad aliquid dicitur; aliam ad essentiam, secundum quam est idem re cum ea. Sed secundum id quod aliquid est idem alteri, non facit numerum cum eo. Ergo quod relationes ad aliud praedicamentum pertineant quam ad praedicamentum

the others. Now the *ratio* of wisdom, when it is said of creatures, differs from the *rationes* of goodness and power. Consequently, even when these are said of God they are not the same *rationes* but diverse.

¹⁰ Besides, in the same way that God is truly Father He is also truly wise. But because God is truly Father, one cannot say that the *ratio* of fatherhood is only in the intellect; and so, because God is truly wise, one cannot say either that the *ratio* of wisdom is only in the intellect. But the *ratio* of fatherhood, which exists really in God, is not the same as the *ratio* of divinity. That is why He is neither God by his fatherhood nor Father by His divinity, and yet this plurality of *rationes* does not eliminate the divine simplicity, because essence and fatherhood are the same in reality. Likewise, if we assert that wisdom and essence are absolutely the same thing in reality and their *rationes* diverse, the simplicity of the divine essence is not eliminated. On the contrary, the simplicity of the divine essence is the whole reason for these attributes not being diverse in God. Consequently, it is not awkward to assert that the *ratio* of wisdom and [that of] goodness are in God, yet one is not the other, although the reality is assumed to be absolutely one.

substantiae, est per comparationem ad suum relativum. Ergo adhuc manet eadem comparatio sapientiae et paternitatis ad essentiam.¹¹

RESPONDEO Dicendum, quod, sicut supra dictum est, art. praeced., in corp., Sapientia et bonitas et omnia hujusmodi sunt omnino unum re in Deo, sed differunt ratione: et haec ratio non est tantum ex parte ipsius ratiocinantis, sed ex proprietate ipsius rei. Ad cujus rei evidentiam, ut diligenter explicetur, quia ex hoc pendet totus intellectus eorum quae in I Libro dicuntur, quatuor oportet videre. Primo quid sit ratio secundum quam dicimus attributa ratione differre. Secundo quomodo dicatur aliqua ratio in aliqua re esse vel non esse. Tertio utrum istae rationes diversae attributorum sint in Deo vel non. Quarto utrum pluralitas istarum rationum sit tantum ex parte intellectus nostri vel aliquo modo ex parte rei.¹²

Quantum ad primum pertinet, sciendum est, quod ratio, prout hic sumitur, nihil aliud est quam id quod apprehendit intellectus de significatione alicujus nominis: et hoc in his quae habent definitionem, est ipsa rei definitio, secundum quod Philosophus dicit [in IV Metaph., 11]: ratio quam significat

¹¹ If it is said that what happens with the personal relations is not the same as what happens with the essential attributes because in God there are only two predicaments, namely substance and relation, and therefore the *ratio* of relation is diverse from the *ratio* of substance, nevertheless the *ratio* of wisdom and of the other absolutes is not other than the substance; against it: relation in the divinity has a twofold reference: in one sense it is [referred] to its correlative, according to which it is said in relation 'to something', and in another sense it is compared 'to the essence', according to which it [the relation] is the same as it [the essence] in reality. Yet according to that which is the same as something else, it is not the same numerically. The fact that relations belong to a predicament other than to that of substance is by reference to their correlative. Therefore, the reference of wisdom and fatherhood to the essence remains the same up to this point.

¹² SOLUTION: I answer saying that, as it has been said in the preceding article, wisdom, goodness, and all suchlike are absolutely one and the same thing in God but differ according to their *ratio*, and this *ratio* is not only on the part of the one apprehending but also due to the quality of the thing itself. To make this clear and so that it will be carefully explained, since the whole understanding of what is said in the First Book depends on this, it is necessary to examine four [questions]. First, what this *ratio* is according to which we say that attributes differ. Second, in which sense it is said that the *ratio* is or is not in something. Third, whether the diverse *rationes* of the attributes are in God or not. Fourth, whether the multiplicity of these *rationes* is only on the part of our intellect or is in some way also on the part of the thing [God himself].

nomen est definitio. Sed quaedam dicuntur habere rationem sic dictam, quae non definiuntur, sicut quantitas et qualitas et hujusmodi, quae non definiuntur, quia sunt genera generalissima. Et tamen ratio qualitatis est id quod significatur nomine qualitatis; et hoc est illud ex quo qualitas habet quod sit qualitas. Unde non refert, utrum illa quae dicuntur habere rationem, habeant vel non habeant definitionem. Et sic patet quod ratio sapientiae quae de Deo dicitur, est id quod concipitur de significatione hujus nominis, quamvis ipsa sapientia divina definiri non possit. Nec tamen hoc nomen ratio significat ipsam conceptionem, quia hoc significatur per nomen sapientiae vel per aliud nomen rei; sed significat intentionem hujus conceptionis, sicut et hoc nomen definitio, et alia nomina secundae impositionis.¹³

Et ex hoc patet secundum, scilicet qualiter ratio dicatur esse in re. Non enim hoc dicitur, quasi ipsa intentio quam significat nomen rationis, sit in re; aut etiam ipsa conceptio, cui convenit talis intentio, sit in re extra animam, cum sit in anima sicut in subjecto: sed dicitur esse in re, inquantum in re extra animam est aliquid quod respondet conceptioni animae, sicut significatum signo. Unde sciendum, quod ipsa conceptio intellectus tripliciter se habet ad rem quae est extra animam.¹⁴ Aliquando enim hoc quod intellectus concipit, est similitudo rei existentis extra animam, sicut hoc quod concipitur de hoc nomine homo; et talis

¹³ Regarding the first [question] it is necessary to know that *ratio*, as it is understood here, means nothing other than what the intellect apprehends from the meaning of any name. And this, in the things that have a definition, is the thing's definition itself, according to what the Philosopher says: 'The *ratio* that the name signifies is the definition.' But there are some things that are said to have such a *ratio*, yet they have no definition, like quantity, quality, and the like, which cannot be defined because they are most general categories of being [genera], and nevertheless the *ratio* of quality is that which is meant by the name 'quality', this being what makes quality to be quality. Therefore it is not relevant whether the things that are said to have *ratio* can be defined or not. Consequently, it is evident that the *ratio* of wisdom that is said of God is that which is conceived from this name's meaning, even though divine wisdom itself cannot be defined. Nevertheless, the name '*ratio*' does not mean the conception itself, because this is signified by the name 'wisdom' or by any other name of the thing, but it means the conception's intention, like the name 'definition' and other names of second attribution.

¹⁴ And from the above the second [question] becomes evident, namely, in which sense it is said that the *ratio* is in the real thing. It is not said that the very same intention signified by the name '*ratio*' exists in reality, or even that the apprehension itself that such intention matches exists in the real thing outside

conceptio intellectus habet fundamentum in re immediate, inquantum res ipsa, ex sua conformitate ad intellectum, facit quod intellectus sit verus, et quod nomen significans illum intellectum, proprie de re dicatur.¹⁵ Aliquando autem hoc quod significat nomen non est similitudo rei existentis extra animam, sed est aliquid quod consequitur ex modo intelligendi rem quae est extra animam: et hujusmodi sunt intentiones quas intellectus noster adinvenit; sicut significatum hujus nominis genus non est similitudo alicujus rei extra animam existentis; sed ex hoc quod intellectus intelligit animal ut in pluribus speciebus, attribuit ei intentionem generis; et hujusmodi intentionis licet proximum fundamentum non sit in re sed in intellectu, tamen remotum fundamentum est res ipsa. Unde intellectus non est falsus, qui has intentiones adinvenit. Et simile est de omnibus aliis qui consequuntur ex modo intelligendi, sicut est abstractio mathematicorum et hujusmodi.¹⁶ Aliquando vero id quod significatur per nomen, non habet fundamentum in re, neque proximum neque remotum, sicut conceptio chimerae: quia neque est similitudo alicujus rei extra animam, neque consequitur ex modo intelligendi rem aliquam naturae: et ideo ista conceptio est falsa.¹⁷ Unde patet secundum, scilicet quod ratio dicitur esse in re,

the mind, since it is in the mind as in its subject. It is said to be in the real thing inasmuch as there is something in the real thing outside the mind that corresponds to the mind's conception, like the meaning to the sign. Therefore it must be known that the above said conception of the intellect can relate to the thing outside the mind in a threefold way.

¹⁵ Sometimes what the intellect apprehends is the likeness of the thing existing outside the mind, as that which is apprehended of the name 'man'. This conception of the intellect has an immediate foundation in reality, inasmuch as the thing itself, by its conformity to the intellect, causes the thing understood to be true and the name meaning it to be properly said of that reality.

¹⁶ Sometimes, that which is signified by the name is not the likeness of the thing existing outside the mind, but something which is a consequence of the way of understanding the thing existing outside the mind. Of this nature are the intentions that our intellect devises, like the meaning of the name '*genus*', which is not the likeness of anything outside the mind but proceeds from the fact that the intellect apprehends 'animal' in many species, and attributes to it the intention of '*genus*'. Granted that the proximate foundation of such intentions is not in the real thing but in the intellect, nevertheless the remote foundation is the thing itself, so that the intellect that devises such intentions is not wrong. And the same happens with all the other things that result from the way of understanding, like the mathematical abstractions and so on.

¹⁷ Sometimes, instead, that which is signified by the name does not have foundation in the real thing, either proximate or remote, like the notion of

inquantum significatum nominis, cui accidit esse rationem, est in re: et hoc contingit proprie, quando conceptio intellectus est similitudo rei.¹⁸

Quantum ad tertium, scilicet utrum rationes attributorum in Deo sint, sciendum est, quod circa hoc videtur esse duplex opinio. Quidam enim dicunt, ut Avicenna [Lib. De intelligent., 1] et Rabbi Moyses [Lib. I, 57-58], quod res illa quae Deus est, est quoddam esse subsistens, nec aliquid aliud nisi esse, in Deo est: unde dicunt, quod est esse sine essentia.¹⁹ Omnia autem alia quae Deo attribuuntur, verificantur de Deo dupliciter, secundum eos: vel per modum negationis, vel per modum causalitatis. Per modum negationis dupliciter: vel ad removendum privationem seu defectum oppositum, ut dicimus Deum sapientem, ut removeatur defectus qui est in carentibus sapientia; vel secundum quod aliquid ex negatione consequitur, sicut est de hoc nomine unus, qui ex hoc ipso quod non est divisus, est unus. Similiter ex hoc ipso quod est immaterialis, est intelligens. Unde, secundum eos, omnia ista nomina potius sunt inventa ad removendum, quam ad ponendum aliquid in Deo.²⁰ Item per modum causalitatis dupliciter: vel inquantum producit ista in creaturis, ut dicatur Deus bonus, quia bonitatem creaturis influit et sic de aliis; vel inquantum ad modum creaturae se habet, ut dicatur Deus volens vel pius, inquantum se habet ad modum volentis vel pii in modo producendi effectum, sicut dicitur iratus, quia ad modum irati

‘chimera’, since it is neither a likeness of anything outside the mind nor results from the way of understanding anything in nature. This apprehension is false.

¹⁸ From the above, the second [question] becomes evident, namely, that the *ratio* is said to be in the real thing inasmuch as the name’s meaning, of which it happens to be the *ratio*, is in the real thing: and this is properly the case when the intellect’s conception is the thing’s likeness.

¹⁹ About the third, i. e., whether the attributes’ *rationes* are in God, it should be noted that there seem to be two opinions on this. Some say, like Avicenna and Rabbi Moses, that God’s reality is a kind of subsisting being and that nothing else is in God but being. Therefore they say that He is being without an essence.

²⁰ According to them, any other thing attributed to God can be verified in God in two ways: either by way of negation, or by way of causality. Negation works in two ways: either in order to remove a lack or the opposite defect, as when we say that God is wise in order to remove the defect existing in the ones lacking wisdom, or inasmuch as something is a consequence of negation, as it happens with the name ‘one’, since something is one precisely because it is not divided. Likewise He is an intelligence precisely because He is nonmaterial. Hence, according to them, all these names are provided more for removing than for attributing something to God.

se habet.²¹ Et secundum hanc opinionem sequitur quod omnia nomina quae dicuntur de Deo et creaturis, dicantur aequivoce, et quod nulla similitudo sit creaturae ad creatorem ex hoc quod creatura est bona vel sapiens vel huiusmodi aliquid; et hoc expresse dicit Rabbi Moyses.²² Secundum hoc, illud quod concipitur de nominibus attributorum, non refertur ad Deum, ut sit similitudo alicujus quod in eo est. Unde sequitur quod rationes istorum nominum non sunt in Deo, quasi fundamentum proximum habeant in ipso, sed remotum; sicut nos dicimus de relationibus quae ex tempore de Deo dicuntur; huiusmodi enim relationes in Deo secundum rem non sunt, sed sequuntur modum intelligendi, sicut dictum est de intentionibus. Et sic, secundum hanc opinionem, rationes horum attributorum sunt tantum in intellectu, et non in re, quae Deus est; et intellectus eas adinvenit ex consideratione creaturarum vel per negationem vel per causalitatem, ut dictum est.²³ Alii vero dicunt, ut Dionysius [*De Div. Nom.* I, c. XIII, paragr. 1, col. 978] et Anselmus [*Monol.* I, c. III, col. 147], quod in Deo praeminenter existit quidquid perfectionis in creaturis est. Et haec eminentia attenditur quantum ad tria: scilicet quantum ad universalitatem, quia in Deo sunt omnes perfectiones adunatae, quae non congregantur in aliqua una creatura. Item quantum ad plenitudinem, quia est ibi sapientia sine omni defectu, et similiter de aliis attributis: quod non est in

²¹ Likewise the way of causality is twofold: either inasmuch as He produces these things in creatures, that God may be called good because He instills goodness in creatures, and so on; or inasmuch as He behaves like creatures, that God may be called one who wants or is pious, because He behaves in the way that the one who wants or is pious conducts himself when producing an effect, and as He is said to be enraged because He behaves in the way the angry creature does.

²² And according to this opinion it follows that all names predicated of God and creatures are said equivocally, and saying that creatures are good or wise or anything else of the kind expresses no likeness of creatures to their Creator. Rabbi Moses says this explicitly.

²³ According to this [position], whatever is apprehended of the attributes' names does not refer to God as a kind of likeness of something found in God. It follows that these names' *rationes* are not in God as if their proximate foundation was in Him, but only their remote one, as we say of the relations that are predicated of God *ex tempore*. Relations of such a kind do not exist in God *secundum rem*, but follow a way of understanding, as has been said in regard to the intentions. Therefore, according to this opinion, these attributes' *rationes* are only in the intellect and not in the reality that is God, and the intellect conceives them from the contemplation of creatures by negation or by causality, as has been said.

creaturis. Item quantum ad unitatem; quae enim in creaturis diversa sunt, in Deo sunt unum. Et quia in illo uno habet omnia, ideo secundum illud unum causat omnia, cognoscit omnia et omnia sibi per analogiam simulantur.²⁴ Secundum ergo hanc opinionem, conceptiones quas intellectus noster ex nominibus attributorum concipit, sunt vere similitudines rei, quae Deus est, quamvis deficientes et non plenae, sicut est de aliis rebus quae Deo simulantur. Unde huiusmodi rationes non sunt tantum in intellectu, quia habent proximum fundamentum in re quae Deus est. Et ex hoc contingit quod quidquid sequitur ad sapientiam, in quantum huiusmodi, recte et proprie convenit Deo.²⁵ Hae autem opiniones, quamvis in superficie diversae videantur, tamen non sunt contrariae, si quis dictorum rationes ex causis assumit dicendi. Quia primi consideraverunt ipsas res creatas, quibus imponuntur nomina attributorum, sicut quod hoc nomen sapientia imponitur cuidam qualitati, et hoc nomen essentia cuidam rei quae non subsistit: et haec longe a Deo sunt: et ideo dixerunt, quod Deus est esse sine essentia, et quod non est in eo sapientia secundum se. Alii vero consideraverunt modos perfectionis, ex quibus dicta nomina sumuntur: et, quia Deus secundum unum simplex esse omnibus modis perfectus est, qui importantur per huiusmodi nomina, ideo dixerunt, quod ista nomina positive Deo conveniunt. Sic ergo patet quod quaelibet harum opinionum non negat hoc quod alia dicit: quia nec primi dicunt aliquem modum perfectionis Deo deesse, nec secundi qualitatem, aut res non subsistentes in Deo ponunt. Sic ergo patet tertium, scilicet quod

²⁴ Others, like Dionysius and Anselm, say that whatever perfection exists in creatures exists in God preeminently. And this preeminence is noted in regard to three things: In regard to universality because all perfections, which are not assembled in any one creature, are united in God. In regard to plenitude, because wisdom exists in Him with no defect at all, and the same with the other attributes, and this does not happen in creatures. And in regard to unity, because that which is diverse in creatures is one in God. And because He contains everything in this unity, that is why He causes everything, knows everything, and everything resembles Him by analogy according to this unity.

²⁵ Consequently, according to this opinion, the conceptions that our intellect apprehends from the attributes' names are truly likenesses of the reality that is God, although deficient and not complete, as happens with the other things that are similar to God. Hence such *rationes* are not only in the intellect, because they have a proximate foundation in the reality which is God. And the consequence is that whatever is implied by having wisdom, as an example of such, can be rightly and properly said of God.

rationes attributorum sunt vere in Deo, quia ratio nominis magis se tenet ex parte ejus a quo imponitur nomen, quam ex parte ejus cui imponitur.²⁶

Quantum vero ad quartum, scilicet utrum pluralitas istarum rationum sit tantum ex parte intellectus nostri, vel aliquo modo ex parte rei, sciendum est, quod ista pluralitas rationum contingit ex hoc quod res quae Deus est, superat intellectum nostrum. Intellectus enim noster non potest una conceptione diversos modos perfectionis accipere: tum quia ex creaturis cognitionem accipit, in quibus sunt diversi modi perfectionum secundum diversas formas: tum quia hoc quod in Deo est unum et simplex, plurificatur in intellectu nostro, etiam si immediate a Deo reciperet; sicut multiplicatur processio suae bonitatis in aliis creaturis.²⁷ Unde, cum Deus secundum unam et eandem rem sit omnibus modis perfectus, una conceptione non potest integre perfectionem ejus apprehendere, et per consequens nec nominare; et ideo oportet quod diversas conceptions de eo habeat, quae sunt diversae rationes, et quod diversa nomina imponat

²⁶ These opinions, although they may seem superficially diverse, are nonetheless not opposed to each other, if we base the rationale of their statements on the speakers' positions. Because the former looked at the created things themselves, named after the attributes' names, just as the name 'wisdom' is assigned to a certain quality, and the name 'essence' to a certain thing that is not subsisting, these things being far from God. And for this reason they said that God is being without essence, and that in Him there is no wisdom proper. The latter looked at the modes of perfection from which these names are taken: and since God is perfect in every way implied by such names according to His one simple Being, for this reason they said that these names befit God positively. And therefore it becomes clear that none of these opinions contradicts what the other says, because the former do not say that God lacks any mode of perfection, nor do the latter attribute a quality or a thing to God which is not subsisting. Thus the third [question] becomes clear, namely, that the attributes' *rationes* are truly in God, because the name's *ratio* is more on the part of that from which the name is taken than on the part of that to which it is given.

²⁷ Regarding the fourth [question], namely, whether the plurality of these *rationes* is only on the part of our intellect or in some way also on the part of the real thing, it must be known that this plurality of *rationes* is due to the fact that the reality that is God exceeds our intellect. In fact, our intellect cannot apprehend several modes of perfections in one conception: whether because it obtains its knowledge from creatures, in which there are diverse modes of perfections according to diverse forms; or whether because that which is one and simple in God becomes multiplied in our intellect even if it were to receive it directly from God, just as the issuing of His goodness is multiplied in other creatures.

significantia rationes illas. Unde nomina illa non sunt synonyma, inquantum significant rationes diversas.²⁸

Si autem intellectus noster Deum per seipsum videret, illi rationi posset imponere nomen unum: quod erit in patria; et ideo dicitur Zach. Ult. 9: in illa die erit Dominus unus, et nomen ejus unum. Illud autem nomen unum non significaret bonitatem tantum, nec sapientiam tantum, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed significata omnium istorum includeret.²⁹ Sed tamen si intellectus videns Deum per essentiam imponeret nomen rei quam videret, et nominaret mediante conceptione quam de ea habet, oporteret adhuc quod imponeret plura nomina: quia impossibile est quod conceptio intellectus creati repraesentet totam perfectionem divinae essentiae.³⁰ Unde una re visa diversas conceptiones formaret, et diversa nomina imponeret, sicut etiam Chrysostomus dicit, quod angeli laudant Deum, quidam ut majestatem, quidam ut bonitatem, et sic de aliis, in signum quod ipsum non vident visione comprehendente; sed conceptio perfecte repraesentans eum est verbum increatum; et ideo est unum tantum. Sic ergo patet quod pluralitas nominum venit ex hoc quod ipse Deus nostrum intellectum excedit.³¹ Quod autem Deus excedat intellectum nostrum, est ex parte ipsius Dei, propter plenitudinem perfectionis ejus, et ex parte intellectus nostri, qui deficienter se habet ad eam comprehendendam. Unde patet quod pluralitas istarum rationum non tantum

²⁸ Consequently, since God is perfect in every way according to one and the same thing, the intellect can neither comprehend His perfection completely nor, it would follow, name Him by one single conception, necessitating it to have diverse notions of Him, which are diverse *rationes*, and to adopt diverse names that signify these *rationes*. These names, then, are not synonyms, since they signify different *rationes*.

²⁹ If, however, our intellect were to see God in Himself, it would be able to give one single name to this *ratio*, and that will happen *in patria*. That is why it is said in *Zechariah*, last, 9: *In that Day shall the Lord be one and His name one*. That single name would not mean only goodness or only wisdom or something of the sort, but it would include all these meanings.

³⁰ But if, upon seeing God's essence, the intellect were to give a name to the thing seen and to name it by means of the conception that it [the intellect] had of it [God's essence], it would still have to give Him several names, because it is impossible for a conception of the created intellect to reproduce in full the perfection of the divine essence.

³¹ Hence while seeing one thing it would produce diverse conceptions and assign diverse names, in the way Chrysostom says that angels praise God, some as majesty, some as goodness, and so on, to indicate that they do not see Him

est ex parte intellectus nostri, sed etiam ex parte ipsius Dei, inquantum sua perfectio superat unamquamque conceptionem nostri intellectus. Et ideo pluralitati istarum rationum respondet aliquid in re quae Deus est: non quidem pluralitas rei, sed plena perfectio, ex qua contingit ut omnes istae conceptiones ei aptentur.³² Qui ergo dixerunt, quod pluralitas ista est tantum ex parte intellectus nostri, vel ex parte effectuum, quodammodo verum dixerunt, et quodammodo non.³³ Si enim hoc referatur ad causam multiplicationis, sic verum dicunt, quod est ex parte intellectus nostri, et effectuum quodammodo, ex eo quod intellectus noster non potest concipere divinam perfectionem una conceptione, sed pluribus; cujus una ratio est ex hoc quod est assuefactus ad res creatas.³⁴ Si autem referatur ad modum quo istae rationes attribuuntur Deo, falsum dicunt. Non enim ex hoc quod bona facit, vel quia ad modum bonorum se habet, bonus est; sed quia bonus est, ideo bona facit, et alia participando ejus bonitatem ad modum ejus se habent. Unde si nullam creaturam fecisset nec facturum esset, ipse in se talis esset ut posset vere considerari secundum omnes istas conceptiones, quas habet nunc intellectus noster ipsum considerando.³⁵ Et sic patet quartum, quod pluralitas istorum nominum non tantum est ex parte intellectus nostri formantis

in a comprehensive vision, but the one and only conception that perfectly represents Him is the uncreated Word. Thus it becomes clear that the plurality of names is due to the fact that God Himself exceeds our intellect.

³² That God exceeds our intellect, is on the part of God Himself, due to the plenitude of His perfection, and on the part of our intellect, because it is insufficient to comprehend such perfection. Then, it is clear that the plurality of *rationes* is not only on the part of our intellect but also on the part of God Himself, inasmuch as His perfection surpasses every conception of our intellect. And therefore something in the reality that God is corresponds to the plurality of these *rationes*: not the real plurality but the fullness of perfection that makes all these conceptions benefit Him.

³³ Consequently, the ones who said that this plurality is only on the part of our intellect or on the part of the effects, in a way said something true and in a way not.

³⁴ If this refers to the cause of the multiplication they are right, because it is on the part of our intellect and in a way on the part of the effects, since our intellect cannot apprehend the divine perfection in one conception but only in many. One reason for the above stems from the fact that [our intellect] is used to created things.

³⁵ However, if it refers to the way these *rationes* are attributed to God, they are wrong. It is not that God is good because He does good things or because He behaves like the good, but it is because He is good that He does good, and others

diversas conceptiones de Deo, quae dicuntur diversae rationes, ut ex dictis, art. anteced., patet, sed ex parte ipsius Dei, in quantum scilicet est aliquid in Deo correspondens omnibus istis conceptionibus, scilicet plena et omnimoda ipsius perfectio, secundum quam contingit quod quodlibet nominum significantium istas conceptiones, de Deo vere et proprie dicitur; non autem ita quod aliqua diversitas vel multiplicitas ponatur in re, quae Deus est, ratione istorum attributorum.³⁶

His visis facile est respondere ad objecta.³⁷

Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod intentio Dionysii est dicere, quod secundum diversas bonitates quas creaturis influit Deus nominatur, manifestatur et laudatur; non autem ita quod rationes illarum bonitatum ex hoc verificentur de eo quia creaturis eas influit, sed magis e converso, ut dictum est, in corp. Quamvis enim conditio causae cognoscatur ex conditionibus effectus, non tamen conditio causae verificatur propter conditiones effectus, sed e converso.³⁸

Ad secundum dicendum, quod intellectus noster id quod concipit de bonitate vel de sapientia non refert in Deum quasi in eo sit per modum quo ipse concipit, quia hoc esset comprehendere ejus sapientiam vel bonitatem; sed intelligit ipsam bonitatem divinam, cui aliquantulum simile est quod intellectus noster concipit, esse supra id quod de eo concipitur. Unde per hujusmodi

behave like Him by participating in His goodness. Consequently, even if He had never created or were to create any creature, He would still be intrinsically such that it would be possible to contemplate Him truly according to these conceptions that our intellect has now when contemplating Him.

³⁶ Thus the fourth [question] becomes clear, that the plurality of these names is not only on the part of our intellect that produces diverse conceptions of God, which are called *rationes*, as it is clear from what was said above, but on the part of God Himself, inasmuch as there is something in God that corresponds to all these conceptions, namely, His full and comprehensive perfection according to which each of the names meaning these conceptions is truly and properly said of God, though not in a way that any diversity or multiplicity should be attributed to the real thing that is God, on account of these attributes.

³⁷ After seeing these things it is easy to answer the objections.

³⁸ To the first, it must be said that Dionysius' intention is to say that God is named, revealed, and praised according to the diverse perfections that He pours out in creatures. However, it is not because He pours them out in creatures that the *rationes* of these perfections are truly applied to Him, but rather the opposite, as said above. Although the condition of the cause is apprehended through those of the effects, it [the cause] is not verified by them, but the other way around.

conceptiones non videtur ipse Deus secundum quod in se est, sed intelligitur supra intellectum. Et hoc vult dicere Dionysius in illa auctoritate.³⁹

Ad tertium dicendum, quod multiplicitas ista attributorum nullo modo ponitur in Deo quasi ipse secundum rem sit multiplex; sed tamen ipse secundum suam simplicem perfectionem, multitudini istorum attributorum correspondet, ut vere de Deo dicantur. Et hoc intendit Commentator.⁴⁰

Ad quartum dicendum, quod sicut ratio hominis non dicitur esse in homine quasi res quaedam in ipso, sed est sicut in subjecto in intellectu, et est in homine sicut in eo quod praestat fulcimentum veritati ipsius; ita etiam ratio bonitatis divinae est in intellectu sicut in subjecto, in Deo autem sicut in eo quod correspondet per quamdam similitudinem isti rationi, faciens ejus veritatem. Unde patet quod ratio procedit ex malo intellectu ejus quod dicitur.⁴¹

Ad quintum dicendum, quod aliquid dicitur fundari vel radicari in aliquo metaphorice, ex quo firmitatem habet. Rationes autem intellectae habent duplicem firmitatem: scilicet firmitatem sui esse, et hanc habent ab intellectu, sicut alia accidentia a suis subjectis; et firmitatem suae veritatis, et hanc habent ex re cui conformantur. Ex eo enim quod res est vel non est locutio et intellectus veritatem vel falsitatem habet. Rationes ergo attributorum fundantur vel radicantur in intellectu quantum ad firmitatem sui

³⁹ To the second, it must be said that our intellect does not apprehend what it conceives of goodness and wisdom as existing in God in the way it conceives them, because that would be to apprehend fully His wisdom or goodness, but it [the intellect] understands that the divine goodness itself, to which what our intellect apprehends is in some way similar, is above that which is apprehended about Him. Hence, through such conceptions, God Himself is not seen as He is, but is understood to be beyond understanding. And this is what Dionysius wants to say in that quotation.

⁴⁰ To the third, it must be said that these attributes' multiplicity is in no way assigned to God as if He Himself were really multiple, but that He, according to His simple perfection, matches the multiplicity of these attributes, so that they all can be truly said of God. And this is what the Commentator meant.

⁴¹ To the fourth, it must be said that in the same way that the *ratio* of man is not said to be in man as a thing existing in him, but rather in the intellect as in its subject, and in man as in what provides a foundation for its truth, in the same way as the *ratio* of the divine goodness is in the intellect as in its subject, and in God as in what corresponds by certain likeness to this *ratio*, causing it to be true. Consequently, it becomes clear that this objection proceeds from the faulty understanding of what is being said.

esse, quia, ut dictum est, art. anteced., intellectus est earum subjectum; in essentia autem divina quantum ad firmitatem suae veritatis; et hoc in nullo repugnat divinae simplicitati.⁴²

Ad sextum dicendum, quod in Deo omnia sunt unum re, praeter ingenerationem, generationem, et processionem, quae constituunt personas re distinctas: non autem oportet quod quidquid praeter ista de Deo dicitur, sit unum ratione. Et similiter intelligendum est quod dicit Boetius [*I De Trinitate*, c. VI, col. 1254, t. 2], quod sola relatio multiplicat trinitatem, scilicet pluralitate reali. Tunc enim aliquid est unum re et ratione multiplex, quando una res respondet diversis conceptionibus et nominibus, ut de ea verificentur; sicut punctum, quod cum sit una res, respondet secundum veritatem diversis conceptionibus de eo factis, sive prout cogitatur in se, sive prout cogitatur centrum, sive prout cogitatur principium linearum; et hae rationes sive conceptiones sunt in intellectu sicut in subjecto, et in ipso puncto sicut in fundamento veritatis istarum conceptionum. Quamvis istud exemplum non sit usquequaque conveniens, sicut nec alia quae in divinis inducuntur.⁴³

⁴² To the fifth, it must be said that something is said to be founded on and rooted in something else metaphorically when its strength stems from it. The *rationes* apprehended have a double strength: firmness in their being, and this they have from the intellect in the same way as other accidents have it from their subjects, and firmness from their truthfulness, and this they have from the thing to which they conform. Word and thought are true or false depending on whether a thing is or is not. Consequently, the attributes' *rationes* are founded on or rooted in the intellect regarding the firmness of their being, because, as it has been said above, the intellect is their subject, but [they are founded] on the divine essence regarding the firmness of their truth, and this does not at all oppose the divine simplicity.

⁴³ To the sixth, it must be said that in God everything is one in reality except the nonbegottenness, the begottenness, and the procession, which constitute really distinct divine Persons. But this does not mean that any other thing beside them that is said of God must be one notionally. And what Boethius says should be similarly understood, that only "relation" introduces multiplicity in the Trinity, i.e., real plurality. In fact something is one in reality and multiple notionally when one thing corresponds to diverse conceptions and names, which are verified from it. Like the point, which — being one thing — truly corresponds to diverse conceptions of it, depending on whether it is considered in itself, or as the center, or rather as the beginning of a line. These *rationes* or conceptions are in the intellect as in their subject, and in the point itself as in the foundation of the truth of these conceptions. However this example is not in every respect suitable, as other things that are represented about the divine.

APPENDIX III

THE DUX NEUTRORUM

Introduction

A Latin translation of Maimonides' *Guide* was first published by Augustinus Justinianus, Archbishop of Nebio, in the 16th century.¹ Justinianus suggests in the dedicatory epistle, addressed to the Archbishop of Sena Stephanus Poncherio, that the translation was made from the Hebrew language. He writes, "up until now, most of these works are available only in Hebrew." He has just mentioned the fourteen volumes of the *Yad*, i.e., the *Mishneh Torah*, and "many other works" on Medicine, Philosophy, and Holy Scripture. But, he continues "this book that is called *More hanevochim*, which means *director dubitantium*, has already been translated some time ago by a translator, who accurately — according to those times — expressed the meanings. ... I undertook this task: that this book be published, and dedicated to your most honorable name." Occasionally, scholars were misled by these generic statements and interpreted that Justinianus himself had accomplished the work of translation. In other cases, its authorship was also attributed to the Spanish doctor Jacob Mantino.² Joseph J. Scaliger and Johannes Buxtorf harshly criticized Justinianus' edition due to the poor quality of the manuscript that he used and to his own misreading of the text, which added more mistakes to the original.³ Buxtorf translated the *Guide* into Latin anew using the Hebrew translation of Ibn Tibbon, and published it in Basel in 1629.⁴ More recently, scholars have tried to reconstruct the history of the Latin text. What follows is a summary of the findings so far.

¹ Rabi Mossei Aegyptii, *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum* (Paris, 1520). In his dedicatory epistle, Justinianus recalls the two great "Moses" that are celebrated by the Jewish people: the Egyptian Maimonides and Nahmanides of Gerona.

² Cf. Joseph Perles, *Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen "Führers"*, 2.

³ Cf. J. Perles, *Die in einer ...*, note 23.

⁴ Probably, Buxtorf's critique of the edition of Justinianus is one of the reasons for the small number of copies of this work that have reached us. W. Kluxen published a list of the libraries that have preserved one: Vatican Library (Rome), Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris), Cloister Le Saulchoir, Cambridge University Library,

Joseph Perles studied and partially edited a manuscript from the 14th century that he had found and identified as the same Latin translation of the *Guide* published by Justinianus.⁵ In the introduction to this edition, Perles suggests the possibility that Moses of Salerno, the first author of a Hebrew commentary to the *Guide*, might have been involved in the work of translation, or was at least close to the circle in which the Latin *Guide* was produced. Moses of Salerno belonged to the circle of intellectuals that worked under the auspices of Emperor Frederick II in the south of Italy. He was active in the second half of the 13th century, and acknowledges having collated a Latin translation with the Hebrew one that had been made by Ibn Tibbon, which he used for his commentary.⁶

During the 1950s and 1960s, Wolfgang Kluxen published his studies on the Latin versions of the *Guide*. He produced a catalog of extant manuscripts of the complete *Dux neutrorum*⁷ and another on the partial versions preserved in some European libraries.⁸ He identified three families of manuscripts involved, by which the text was transmitted. These manuscripts are dated between the 13th and 16th centuries, as follows.

and the Jewish Theological Seminary (New York). Cf. “Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides”, 24. The copy in the Jewish National and University Library (Jerusalem) must be added to this list.

⁵ Cf. *Die in einer ...*, note 2. The edition contains the Preface, the Incipit, and three chapters that correspond to *Guide* I, 74; II, 15 and III, 18. In the manuscript they have a different numeration.

⁶ Moses of Salerno inserted several Italian terms in his own commentary. Cf. e.g., in I, 51: סוסטנציעי (sustanziei) אינדיביסי (indivisi) רציונלי (razionali). In the same place he writes: והנצרי העתיק זה שאמר, apparently referring to a Latin translation that he is using. I am grateful to Prof. A. Ravitzky for allowing me to examine a transcription of the manuscript of the Bibliotheca Regia Monacensis n. 60. For more information about this disciple of Maimonides, cf. Stanislaus Simon, *Mose ben Salomo von Salerno und seine philosophischen Auseinandersetzungen mit den Lehren des Christentums*, Doctoral Dissertation. Cf. J. Sermoneta, “The Commentaries of R. Moshe ben Shlomo of Salerno and Nicolas of Giovinazzo to the Guide of the Perplexed,” and C. Rigo, “Per un’ identificazione del ‘sapiente cristiano’ Nicola da Giovinazzo, collaboratore di Rabbi Mosheh ben Shelomoh da Salerno”.

⁷ Cf. “Literargeschichtliches ...”, 26-30.

⁸ *Ibid* 36 and 41. See also: Kluxen, “Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abenland als Beispiel einer Christlich-Jüdischen Begegnung. Rabbi Moyses, Liber de uno deo benedicto (Herausgegeben von W. Kluxen)”, 168-169.

From the 13th century

1st group

- A Rome, Vatican Library, Ottob. Lat. 644
 B Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds Latin 15973 (Sorbonne, 173)
 p (excerpt) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds Latin 16096 (Sorbonne, 941)

2nd group

- E Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 601

From the 14th century

1st group

- C Saint Omer, Bibliothèque Publique, 608
 F Cambridge, University Library Ii. I. 19 (1711)
 H Todi, Biblioteca Comunale, 32 (dated 1316-1334)
 I Oxford, Bodleian Library, 437

2nd group

- D Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7936 b.

3rd group

- G Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, II, 482 (dated c. 1300)

From the 15th century

1st group

- q (excerpt) Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, 347 (1440)

2nd group

- K Rome, Bibliotheca Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 1124

3rd group

- L Rome, Bibliotheca Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 4274

From the 16th century:

1st group

- M Cambridge, Trinity College, 0.8.37

These are the manuscripts of the complete text of the *Guide*.⁹ Besides, Kluxen examined two other partial texts that seem to have

⁹ I have already mentioned Perles' edition of manuscript D; Moritz Steinschneider mentions manuscript F in *Hebraische Bibliographie*, XVII, p. 68, note 1; Charles H. Haskins notes the existence of manuscript E in *Studies in the*

a completely different origin: the *Liber de uno deo benedicto* and the *Liber Maimonidis de parabola*.¹⁰ The first was classified by Joseph Koch as a different translation than the *Dux neutrorum*, and contains the text of *Guide* II, Incipit, and chapter 2, i.e., the 26 Aristotelian propositions and the philosophic speculations on the existence of God.¹¹ The second contains *Guide* III, chapters 29-30 and 32-49, on the reasons for the biblical commandments.

The *Liber de uno deo benedicto* has been preserved in four manuscripts:

- T Erfurt, Stadtbibliothek, Amplonianus F. 335 (13th century)
- V Venice, San Marco, L. VI. LII (54) (14th century)
- X Breslau, Stadtbibliothek, Rehdigeranus 459 (14th century)
- W Venice, San Marco, L. VI. CLXIV (179) (14th century)

The selection of Latin terms by the author of the *Liber de uno deo* points to a better understanding of the philosophical issues dealt with in the *Guide* than that found in the *Dux neutrorum*.¹² Some medieval authors seem to be unaware that it is part of the *Guide*, known to them as *Dux neutrorum*, and of Maimonides' authorship. The *Liber de uno deo* is useful in its clarifying of difficult passages in the complete Latin translation of the *Dux neutrorum* in these first two chapters of Book II.

The *Liber Maimonidis de parabola* (manuscript S) is the earliest fragment of the Latin *Guide of the Perplexed* known to us, according to the date inserted in the dedicatory note. It consists of a compilation of quotations from the *Guide* on the commandments of the Law and on the presence and explanation of some of the metaphors used in the Bible. This compilation is extant in one single manuscript: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Université 601, ff. 1ra-16, which begins with the words:

In octavo anno gubernationis felicis Honorii tertii. Interrogasti me, potens et humilis Romane, prolonget tibi vitam Deus et augmentet statum, quare mel non adolebatur in sacrificiis et sal valde item portabatur in eisdem ...¹³

History of Medieval Science, 282; P. Mandonnet and G. Théry knew manuscript B: See P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant*, 2 and G. Théry, *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 4, 235, note 2; J. Koch used manuscripts A, B, and C for the edition of: *Giles of Rome, Errores philosophorum*. Cf. Riedl's translation, note 1.

¹⁰ Cf. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches ...", 36-46.

¹¹ Cf. Koch, *Giles of Rome ... Intro.*, 48.

¹² Some examples of this will be provided in the next section.

¹³ One of the earliest complete copies of *Dux neutrorum* is preserved in the same manuscript, ff. 21r-102vb.

The date is very precise: July 24th, 1223-1224. The dedication is addressed to a certain Romanus, who Kluxen suggests could be identified as Cardinal Romanus, later appointed Legate of the Pope in France. The terms of the dedicatory note, which refers to the eighth year of the pontificate of Honorius III, indicates that the work was composed in Rome or its surroundings, because this manner of dating documents was not common elsewhere at this date. The compiler explains or clarifies Maimonides' assertions in a way that suggests that his readers are not familiar with his work. Besides, the quotations from the Talmud are omitted. All this could suggest the authorship of a Jew, who may have been helped or corrected by a Christian copyist, both of them working for a Christian reader.¹⁴

Joseph Sermoneta published a study on the Hebrew commentary of R. Moses of Salerno to the *Guide*,¹⁵ which focuses on the Latin sources of Salerno's interpretation of certain Hebrew philosophical terms and his contacts with the Latin scholar Nicholas of Giovinazo. Sermoneta supports the hypothesis — already suggested by Perles — that R. Moses would have been active in the court of Emperor Frederick II and worked on the Latin translation of the *Guide*. A recent study by Caterina Rigo has shown this hypothesis improbable, due to some chronological inconsistencies in relation to the period of activity of Nicholas and Moses of Salerno and the time of the diffusion of the *Dux neutrorum*.¹⁶

According to Jacob Guttman, Christian scholars would have already known of this translation at the beginning of the 13th century.¹⁷ Guttman found in the works of William of Auvergne a number of texts that are parallel to other statements found in the *Guide*. The variety of issues is considered by Guttman as a proof for the existence of an early complete Latin translation of this work.¹⁸ According to Guttman, the work of translation of the *Dux neutrorum* would have been carried out in France, at some time during the 1220s and 1230s.

¹⁴ Cf. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches ...", 43.

¹⁵ Cf. J. Sermoneta, "He'aroteihem ...", note 6.

¹⁶ Cf. C. Rigo, note 6.

¹⁷ Jacob Guttman, "Guillaume d'Auvergne et la littérature juive", and "Alexandre de Hales et le Judaïsme".

¹⁸ Several examples of the parallel texts that can be found in the works of William of Auvergne and Alexander of Hales and in the *Guide* are provided in footnotes in the two articles.

C. Rigo in a recent study rejects this hypothesis, based on her discovery of an early version of Albert the Great's *De quatuor coequaevis* dated in 1241, in which he does not seem to know of the *Dux neutrorum*, whereas he already acknowledges of it in the version previously known and dated in 1246. Albert also refers to the *Dux* in his Commentary to *I Sententiarum* (c. 1244). Rigo, who is currently working on a new book on the issue, has also identified different levels of composition, with an early partial Latin translation based on the Hebrew version of Ibn Tibbon, and a later, complete translation based on the version of Al-Harizi.¹⁹

Kluxen has supported Guttman's conjecture about the place of origin of the Latin *Guide* with some additions and corrections, and has suggested the South of France for the first fragmentary translations. According to him, these fragments would have been produced by some anti-Maimonidean Jews to serve as a proof for the Inquisition to condemn the *Guide*, which was banned by a commission of Inquisitors and publicly burnt in Lyon in 1234. It seems unlikely that by that time it was so well known as to be considered a danger to the Christian faithful. However, in Montpellier two Jewish schools of thought were already engaged in the anti-Maimonidean dispute. R. Solomon and Jonah his disciple could have submitted fragments of the work in Latin to the Inquisitors. One argument in favor of this would be the fact that after that event, no further measures were taken against Maimonides, and he was even held in high esteem by most of the Christian scholars that came to know his work.²⁰

The complete text would have been made later, perhaps in the 1240s, for regular use by Latin scholars.²¹ If William of Auvergne used the *Liber Maimonidis de parabola*, this would explain that he was among the first who quoted the *Guide* in Latin, since both

¹⁹ Cf. C. Rigo, "Zur Rezeption des Moses Maimonides im Werk des Albertus Magnus".

²⁰ Cf. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches ...", 34.

²¹ Moneta of Cremona was born in Italy, but most of his activities took place in France, where he was involved in the struggle against the heresy of the Cathars. He might have had contacts with the authorities involved in the 1234 burning of the *Guide*, and so had knowledge of Maimonides. Monetae Cremonensis *Summa Adversus Catharos et Valdenses*. Book V, ch. 2 (483b): "quidam Judaeus dictus Rabbi Moyses". Cf. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches ...", 33. The quotation seems to refer to the beginning of *Guide* II, because the chapter in Moneta's *Summa* is

William and Cardinal Romanus were in Paris during the decades of the 1230s and 1240s. Given that Romanus had this text, he could have made it available to William.²² That would also explain that in spite of using the *Guide*, William of Auvergne did not know either of the author or of the title, for Maimonides is not mentioned by name in this text. Besides, both in the *Liber Maimonidis de parabola* and in the works of William of Auvergne the quotations of the Bible are given according to the Vulgate version, which does not occur in the *Dux neutrorum*.

David Kaufmann dismisses both the suggestion that the *Guide* was translated in the south of France and the hypothesis about the south of Italy.²³ He proposes instead Spain as the place of completion of the work, though his only reason for this suggestion is the fact that in the Peninsula there was already a long and fruitful tradition of joint work of translation between Christians and Jews.²⁴ In the catalog of the books that belonged to Don Sancho of Aragon, Archbishop of Toledo between 1266-1275, I found a volume entitled *Libro rabi Moyses cuius principium est dixit Moyses egipcius*. This catalog is dated in 1266. His successor, Don Gonzalo García Gudiel (originally Dean in Toledo, then appointed Bishop of Cuenca and later on Archbishop of Toledo during the period 1280-1299) in 1273 possessed a book entitled *Rabi Moysen*.²⁵ But research on the early copies of *Dux neutrorum* that were written or kept in Spanish libraries is still needed. Kluxen's catalog was based on Riedl's information regarding the previous studies published on the *Dux neutrorum*, and therefore it is not exhaustive. Moises Orfali published a catalog of the manuscripts of Spanish Jewish authors on Logic, which includes

entitled: "De novitate mundi et de rationibus quibus philosophi probant mundum esse aeternum". Moneta might be using the *Liber de uno deo*.

²² Cardinal Romanus was already Legate of the Pope in Paris in 1225 or 1226. William of Auvergne taught at the university of Paris until 1228, being appointed Archbishop of the city in May that year. He held that position until his death in 1249. Cf. Amato Masnovo, *Da Guglielmo d'Auvergne a S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, I, 11, 14, and 32.

²³ Cf. David Kaufmann, "Der 'Führer' Maimûni's in der Weltliteratur," 354.

²⁴ Ch. H. Haskins mentions translations being made already in the 12th century in Barcelona, Tarazona, Segovia, León, Pamplona, and, later on, Toledo. Cf. *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, p. 10.

²⁵ J.M. Millás Vallicrosa, *Las traducciones orientales en los manuscritos de la Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo*, 16-17.

the extant manuscripts of Maimonides' *Millot ha-Higgayon*, and the Hebrew and Arabic manuscripts of the *Guide*, but this catalog was not intended for the inclusion of the Latin manuscripts.²⁶

The Critical Edition

The critical edition of *Dux neutrorum*, II, Incipit, and I, which has a particularly complex manuscript tradition, has been made according to manuscripts ABCEKL, which represent the three families of the text that have been identified. I have also checked the locations where D, G, F, H, (14th century) render a reading of the text closer to the original when the other manuscripts deviate from it.²⁷ I relied on ABCE for *Dux*, I, 33, and II, 18.

I have included reference to annotations in the manuscripts' margins only when these provide useful information regarding other possible texts collated by the copyist. Manuscripts H and K often have such annotations. I have omitted references to grammatical corrections made by a second hand that do not change the meaning of the sentences, as well as explanations of the contents of the text made by the copyist. The latter appear especially in K.

I collated the Latin translation of II, Incipit, and chapter 2 with the two Hebrew versions, Ibn Tibbon's²⁸ and Al-Ḥarizi's,²⁹ and with the Arabic original, in order to analyze the material that the translator used for the production of the text and the nature of the translation.³⁰

The Latin translator used the Hebrew version of Al-Ḥarizi and this is the text that he generally follows. We have several examples of this: For instance, at the beginning of *Dux* II, Incipit, Al-Ḥarizi changes the Arabic plural מטאלבנא that was translated by Ibn

²⁶ M. Orfali, *Biblioteca de autores lógicos hispano-judíos de los siglos XII-XIII*.

²⁷ I am grateful to Prof. Kluxen for providing me material that he collected for his edition of the Latin text of *Dux* II, Incipit, and part of chapter 2, included in his Doctoral Dissertation. This material allowed me to select the best manuscripts and to have knowledge of readings of particular interest in the ones that I have not collated systematically, and it is the source of my references to manuscript F in chapter 2.

²⁸ Rabbi Moses ben Maimon (Rambam), *Doctor Perplexorum (Guide of the Perplexed)*. Hebrew version of R. Samuel Ibn Tibbon.

²⁹ Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, *Moreh ha-nebukhim*, Hebrew version of R. Yehudah Al-Ḥarizi ed. by S. Munk.

³⁰ Moses ben Maimon, *Dalālat al-Hā'irīn*, Arabic text ed. by S. Munk.

Tibbon as מבוקשינו, and gives the singular שאלתנו. The Latin keeps the singular of Al-Ḥarizi: “quaestio nostra.”

In the 4th Proposition Al-Ḥarizi deviates from Ibn Tibbon and from the Arabic, which reads:

אן אלתגײר יוגר פי ארבע מקולאת, פי מקולה אלגוהר והוא אלתגײר אלכאין פי אלגוהר
הו אלכון ואלפסאד

And renders a shorter sentence:

הוא השינוי ימצא בארבע מאמרות, במאמר העצם, וזה ההוה וההפסד.

The Latin text reads: “Quatuor sunt mutationes: secundum substantiam, quae dicitur generatio et corruptio.”³¹

Al-Ḥarizi omits the last two words of the 13th Proposition ואלדוריה מנהא, which had been translated by Ibn Tibbon והסבובית ממנה, and so does the Latin.³²

At the beginning of chapter 2, the Latin clearly follows Al-Ḥarizi when it renders הקדמונית והראשונית as: “est antiquus et primus”, instead of the Arabic אקדם אלחרכאת which had been correctly translated by Ibn Tibbon הקודמת שבתנועות.³³

The Latin translator has a tendency to shorten the sentences by omitting repetitions or examples that support what has been explained, which occur in the original text. In the 3rd Proposition he omits the last words, which appear in the Al-Ḥarizi version and in that of Ibn Tibbon, because the expression “vanum est” has already been used in the same sentence.³⁴ The last phrase of the 4th Proposition is omitted: ועלי הוא אלתגײר פי אלאיו תקאל אלחרכה בכצוץ. A shorter version of the 10th Proposition is also provided.³⁵ In the 15th Proposition, the sentence לא תוגד חרכה אלא פי זמאן is omitted in Latin, although it is rendered by both Hebrew translations.³⁶

Nevertheless, the Latin sometimes corrects deviations that occur in Al-Ḥarizi’s text, getting thus closer than the latter to the Arabic original:

³¹ Cf. incipit, ll. 13-14.

³² Cf. *ibid.* l. 34.

³³ Cf. ch. 2, l. 8.

³⁴ Cf. incipit, l. 12.

³⁵ Cf. *ibid.* ll. 28-29. Other places with missing explanatory words or sentences are: 17th Proposition, l. 49; ch. 2, l. 4; ll. 27-28; l. 40.

³⁶ Cf. incipit, l. 40.

- In the 17th Proposition Al-Ḥarizi had introduced a foreign element by writing *יחשבו כי החי והאדם מתנועע* for the Arabic *سَنُّ بِالْحَيَوَانَاتِ أَنَّهُ يَتَحَرَّجُ دُونَ مَحَرَّجٍ*. The Latin translates “putant homines quod animal movetur. ...” An even closer translation of the Arabic would have been achieved by rendering the verb impersonally as: “putatur”. The presence of the word “homines” seems a concession to Al-Ḥarizi.
- In the 3rd Proposition Al-Ḥarizi had rendered the plural Arabic noun *עלל* as the singular Hebrew *עלה*. The Latin reads in all the manuscripts “causas”.
- In the 14th Proposition the Arabic gives *ואולאהא באלטבע* and is closely followed by Ibn Tibbon who translates *והראשונה שבהם בטבע*. Al-Ḥarizi simply renders: *והיא המוקדמת*, but the Latin reads “et prior naturaliter”.³⁷
- In the 21st Proposition, where Al-Ḥarizi had changed the philosophical meaning of the sentence by omitting the preposition “in”, the Latin brings it back to the text: “quia sua essentia est **in** essentia partium suarum et **in** earum compositione”.³⁸ The Arabic reads:

לאן וגודה בוגוד גזאיה ובתרכיבהא.

And this sentence is translated by Ibn Tibbon thus:

כי מציאותו במציאות שני חלקיו ובהרכבתם.

- Towards the end of the Incipit, the Latin introduces “desiderium” for the Arabic *שהוה*, a word that had been missed by Al-Ḥarizi. However, it retains the shorter version of Al-Ḥarizi’s text, which is also missing a previous part of the same sentence.³⁹
- In the *Consideratio IIIa per viam philosophie*, Al-Ḥarizi had inverted the order of two sentences,⁴⁰ thus rendering the continuation of the argument unintelligible. The Latin again follows the Arabic and Ibn Tibbon bringing the original order back to the text.⁴¹

³⁷ Cf. *ibid.* I. 35.

³⁸ Cf. *ibid.* I. 65.

³⁹ Cf. *ibid.* II. 99-100: The word was translated by Ibn Tibbon as *תאוה*. The Arabic reads:

לאן אלסבב פי חרכתה בעד אלסכוו [ינתהי אלי אמור דאעייה לתלד אלחרכה] והי אמא

⁴⁰ Cf. ch. 2, ll. 87-88.

⁴¹ Other places with corrections to Al-Ḥarizi by the Latin version are: Incipit, I. 96, where the Arabic *ענדה* which had been omitted by the Hebrew translator is brought back as “secundum ipsum”. In ch. 2, ll. 11-12, the Latin reads “moti a calore naturali”, which is more literal to the Arabic *אלחר אלגריזי*

In all the places that I have checked where the Latin translator deviates from Al-Ḥarizi, this deviation can be explained only if the translator collated the Hebrew text with the Arabic original. In all these places, the Latin text also agrees with the Hebrew version of Ibn Tibbon, but I did not find any proof to support the hypothesis that the translator would have collated this other Hebrew version with Al-Ḥarizi's instead of the Arabic. Rather, the fact that the author of the Latin text knows where that of Al-Ḥarizi should be corrected indicates that he did have the original Arabic at hand. Had he only known the two Hebrew translations, he would have had no idea which one of them was closer to the original in these places.⁴²

The *Dux neutrorum* does not seem to have been produced by a philosopher. Although the translator shows interest in producing an accurate version, this interest is from time to time replaced by a more practical motive: whenever Al-Ḥarizi's version is shorter than the original, it is followed by the Latin, despite the philosophical contradictions that may ensue.

A good example of this can be found towards the end of the Incipit, where Al-Ḥarizi had translated:

אלא לבאר ההקדמות הרחוקות והקרובות שאנו צריכים לפי ענינו

For the Arabic:

ותביין אבעד אלמקדמאת בל זכר אלמקדמאת אלקריבה אלמחתאג אליהא בחסב גרצנא

Ibn Tibbon had correctly translated:

ולבאר הרחוקות שבהקדמות, אבל לזכור ההקדמות הקרובות, הצריך אליהם לפי ענינו

The Latin text here follows Al-Ḥarizi: "sed ostendere propositiones propinquas **et remotas**, scilicet quibus indigemus ..."⁴³

than Al-Ḥarizi's **היסודי החום**. Ibn Tibbon had given a better translation: **החום הטבעי**. In ch. 2, l. 61 the Latin translator quotes the Fifth and the Seventh propositions following the Arabic and Ibn Tibbon, whereas Al-Ḥarizi had only mentioned the Seventh. In ch. 2, ll. 119-120, the Latin reads "species necessitatis" where Al-Ḥarizi had written **היוב** but omitted the word **מין**; again in l. 121, the Latin reads "non habet secundum" where the Arabic read **לא יצא פיה** **אלתנויה בוגה**. Al-Ḥarizi had omitted it.

⁴² Perles had already suggested that the text seemed to be based on Al-Ḥarizi and checked with the Arabic. Cf. Perles, *Die in einer.*, 8. See also: W.Z. Harvey, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Interpreting the Bible", note 10.

⁴³ Cf. incipit, ll. 85-86. See also ch. 2, ll. 87-88.

Besides, the translator does not seem to be familiar with the philosophical terminology. He systematically renders an awkward translation of the Arabic *באעתבאר זאת*, which is given by both Hebrew versions as *בבחינת עצמו* thus: “cum intelligimus eius substantiam”⁴⁴; “in probatione nostra suae substantiae.”⁴⁵ In chapter 2, ll. 102-104, each manuscript gives a different reading, all of them imprecise. Here my edition follows manuscript L, which is the one closest to Maimonides’ original text. Manuscript F substitutes the whole sentence (ll. 99-104) with the better reading of this passage in *De uno deo benedicto*. Manuscripts KLGp insert a sentence in l. 99 clarifying the philosophical meaning of the paragraph, which is obscure in the lines that follow.

The author of *De uno deo* was in fact much more familiar with the philosophical contents of the Incipit and chapter 2 of the *Guide*, and renders an extremely faithful translation of the Maimonidean arguments.⁴⁶ It is difficult to determine whether the source that he used was Ibn Tibbon’s version or the Arabic original, but it is certainly not Al-Harizi’s because, unlike the case of *Dux neutrorum*, this translator’s peculiarities are absent from this text. However, there is an element that might indicate the proximity of *De uno deo* to the Arabic text. At the beginning of the Incipit, the word “massabini” stands for either the Hebrew *משאיים* or the Arabic *المشائيين*. The presence of the “b” could be explained if the text that was being translated was written in Arabic alphabet, where “b” and the long “i” can be easily confused.⁴⁷

The *Dux neutrorum* introduces another feature that should be mentioned. The author systematically translates the word *האלוה* or *האל* by “Creator.” In the present edition, the term “Deus” is only used seven times. In at least four cases, this term is used in the context of the question over the possibility of the existence of more than one God. Maimonides elaborates on what would happen if there were two gods, and concludes with the impossibility of such a hypothesis. The Latin translator seems to prefer not to

⁴⁴ Cf. *ibid.* ll. 58-59 (19th Proposition).

⁴⁵ Cf. *ibid.* l. 60 (20th Proposition). Other places with the same or similar readings are: ch. 2, l. 101; l. 109; l. 114; ll. 116-117; l. 137: “in substantia eius”; l. 140: “ens in sua substantia”; l. 150; l. 152.

⁴⁶ He correctly translates the above mentioned places as “in seipso” or “ipsum esse”, and uses technical terms like “predicamentum” and “peripatetici”.

⁴⁷ I am grateful to Prof. Z. Harvey for directing my attention to this.

use the term “Deus” whenever he is entailed to name the true God, but uses instead “Creator”⁴⁸, which does not appear in the original text. This can only be explained if the translator was a Jew, because a Christian translator would not have been reluctant to write the name of God. The author of *De uno deo* uses the word “Deus” in all the cases.

Key of Abbreviations

add. additum
al. man. alia manus
cancell. cancellatum, cancellavit
cf. confer
cod. codex; *codd.* codices
col. columna
conf. confusum
corr. correxit, correctio
f. folium; *ff.* folia
inv. invertit (ordo verborum)
inser. inseruit
om. omissio, omittit
rep. repetivit, repetitio
suppl. Supplevit

Key of Manuscripts

A Vat. Ottob. Lat. 644 (13th century)
 B Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Lat. 15973 (Sorbonne 173) (13th century)
 C Saint Omer, Bibliothèque Publique, 608 (14th century)
 E Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Université 601 (13th century)
 F Cambridge 1711 (14th century)
 H Todi, Biblioteca Comunale 32 (14th century)
 L Vat. Lat. 4274 (15th century)
 K Vat. Lat. 1124 (15th century)
 G Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, II, 482 (14th century)
 D München, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7936 b (14th century)

⁴⁸ Cf. Ch. 2, ll. 146, 142, 147, and 156.

DIXIT RABBI MOYSES (DUX NEUTRORUM)

Liber I, 33

1. Scias quod quinque sunt causae quae prohibent vel impediunt
2. incipere addiscere sapientiam spiritualem, et innuere vel significare
3. quae expedit innui super illa et detegere quae sunt in ipsa, genti.
4. Prima causa est profunditas et subtilitas, et clausura rationum, sicut
5. dixit Salomon, ‘alta profunditas, quis inveniet?’ Et dixit, ‘sapientia
6. unde inventa est?’ et idcirco non oportet incipere a sapientia
7. profunda et occulta. Et scias quod de similitudinibus notis gentis
8. nostrae una est quod assimilaverunt sapientiam aquae, quam
9. similitudinem exposuerunt multipliciter sapientes. Uno modo sic,
10. qui scit natare ille potest extrahere gemmas de profundo maris, et
11. qui nescit natare submergitur, et idcirco non expedit ut quis mittat
12. se in periculum et natet, nisi exercitaverit animam suam
13. addiscendo.
14. Secunda causa est, brevitatis intellectus humani in initio suo;
15. quoniam homo non acquirit ultimam perfectionem in initio, sed
16. perfectio est in eo in potentia, et est in initio suo diminuta. Sicut
17. dictum est, ‘pullus onagri homo natus est’. Et non sequitur de
18. necessitate ut omne quod est in potentia in aliquo, exeat de
19. potentia ad actum, sed possibile est ut remaneat in imperfectione
20. sua vel propter impedimenta extrinseca, vel propter defectum
21. disciplinae et exercitii, per quae procedat de potentia ad actum. Et
22. propter hoc dictum est: non multi sapientes, quoniam ea quae
23. impediunt acquirere perfectionem sunt multa, et quae inducunt
24. dubitationes, innumerabiles. Et ex quo sic est: quando poterit homo
25. esse paratus praeparatione completa et vacavit ei addiscere et

| 1 quae: vel *add.* E | prohibent vel impediunt: *inv.* AKL | 3 illa: ista C | detegere: de generante? C | 4 subtilitas: sublimitas C | 5 alta: longe quod fuit B | inveniet: eam *add.* A | 6 unde: nominum K | a: o B | 7 quod: una *add.* B | notis: vocis E | 8 quod: et A | aquae: a quae E | 9 sapientes: *om.* L | 10 gemmas de profundo: ex profundo gemmas L | 12 suam: in *add.* AE | 14 initio: inicio C | 15 homo non acquirit: non acquirit homo AC | initio: inicio C | 16 in (2): *om.* KL | est (2): etiam C | initio: inicio C | 17 est (1): *om.* BEKL | natus: factus KL | 18 omne: cause E | exeat: ex ea E | 19 ad: in C | remaneat: remaneant E | imperfectione: perfectione C | 20 extrinseca: intrinseca C | 21 exercitii: exercet E | 22 est: quod *add.* KL | 23 impediunt: expediunt KL | 24 quando: qui K; quomodo L | poterit homo: *inv.* K | 25 esse: est B | praeparatione: et *add.* L |

26. exercere animam suam, donec quod est in eo in potentia exeat de
27. potentia ad actum?
28. Causa tertia est multitudo stramentorum et antecedentium:
29. quoniam habet homo in natura sua desiderium et amorem
30. quaerendi finitates vel fines, et vellet pervenire ad finem cuiuslibet
31. rei. Quandoque vero anxiatur et abhorret stramenta, scias autem
32. quod si posses acquirere finitates absque stramentis quae praemitti
33. debent, non essent illa stramenta, sed adiectiones laboriosae.
34. Quilibet autem homo etiam stultus et fatuus cum perciperes eum
35. ad intelligendum sicut expergefaciunt dormientem, et diceres ei
36. 'nonne desiderat anima tua intelligere modum spherarum
37. coelorum quot sunt et quae figura ipsorum et quid est in eis, et
38. quid sunt angeli, et quomodo creatus fuit mundus in suo universo,
39. vel quis fuit finis intentionis creationis ipsorum, secundum ordinem
40. partium ipsarum, et quid est anima, et quomodo fuit creata in
41. corpore, et si anima hominis separabitur a corpore, et si separetur,
42. cuiusmodi erit illa separatio, et ad quid revertetur, et similia istis
43. super veritate sua? procul dubio invenies animam ipsius cupientem
44. scire ista cupiditate naturali, sed volet ut quiescat amor iste et
45. perveniat ad desiderium suum in uno verbo vel in duobus.
46. Quod si imposueris ei ut omittat negotia sua in spatium unius
47. hebdomade ut sciat ista, non faciet. Videbitur autem ei quod
48. habundat cogitationibus vanis et falsis, et placebunt animae suae, et
49. abhorret cum dicitur ei quod quaedam sunt in sapientia quae
50. indigent multis antecedentibus, et longo tempore ad
51. investigandum et intelligendum. Tu vero scis quod quaedam
52. istorum sunt aliis connexa, quoniam in entibus non est nisi Creator
53. et creatura, et ipsa creata sunt quae communicant in ente praeter

| 28 stramentorum: instrumentorum A | 29 quoniam: quando A | 30 vel: et C
 | finem: fines L | cuiuslibet: cuiusdam A | 31 quandoque: quando etiam C |
 vero: *om.* L | 33 essent: erunt C | illa: ista B; *om.* C | adiectiones: abiectiones B;
 addiectiones L | 34 perciperes: percipies E; expergefaciens A | 35 dormientem:
 dormientes E | diceres: dicens BC; dicens E; dicitis KL | 36 spherarum: sper-
 arum A | 39 vel: et AKL | intentionis: intentio B | creationis: creatoris L | cre-
 ationis ipsorum: *inv.* C | 40 partium: parcium B | ipsarum: suarum BE | quid:
 quidquid KL | quomodo: anima *add.* B | 41 si: utrum B | separetur: separatur
 C; a corpore *add.* A | 42 cuiusmodi: eius E | illa: ista C | 44 sed: si A | quiescat:
 quiescet K | 45 perveniat: perveniet A | 46 negotia: negocia E | spatium:
 spacium E | 47 hebdomade: ebdomade ACEL | sciat: sciet A | ei: eis C | 48
 habundat: habundet C | falsis: similibus E | 49 cum: si L | 50 tempore: *om.* KL
 | 52 istorum: eorum E | sunt: *om.* A | 53 creatura: creata AE | creata sunt: *inv.*
 A | communicant: comunicerat C; committant E |

54. ipsum. Nec est via ad inveniendum ipsum, nisi per creata sua, et
55. ipsa probant ipsum esse, et ea quae necesse est credi de Deo
56. attribuendo ei vel removendo ab eo.
57. Et debemus de necessitate intendere in creata secundum quod
58. sunt, donec accipiamus de qualibet ratione antecedentia vera et
59. fidelia quae proderunt nobis in investigatione nostrarum
60. spiritualium rationum. Omnia vero antecedentia accepta de
61. scientia geometriae et de potentiis figurarum arithmetice ad
62. inducendum demonstrationem ex eis super his quae debent
63. removeri Deo, et demonstrant hoc multiplici ratione super
64. firmamento coeli et scientia naturali, non videtur quod dubites
65. quin sint necessaria ad acquirendum comparisonem mundi
66. respectu regiminis Dei, sicut est per viam veritatis, non secundum
67. ymaginationes. Sunt etiam multa speculativa de quibus licet non
68. accipiantur antecedentia ad cognoscendum mundum istum, tamen
69. acuunt et exercent intellectum ad intelligendum demonstrationem
70. et scientiam veritatis in illis quae demonstrant super substantia
71. Creatoris, et tollunt laborem qui invenitur in pluribus
72. cogitationibus speculatorum in mixtione modorum per accidens
73. cum eis quae per se. Tollunt etiam quod renovatur per laborem
74. illum de corruptione scientiarum et opinionum, et adiungitur
75. etiam istis ut res intelligantur secundum quod sunt, licet non sint
76. radices in scientia spirituali. Similiter etiam non deficiunt in eis alia
77. iuvamenta, in rebus quae ducunt hominem ad illam sapientiam.
78. Quicumque vero voluerit acquirere perfectionem humanam, nullo
79. modo potest hoc facere nisi prius exercent animam suam in
80. doctrina dialectice, postea in disciplinalibus secundum ordinem

| 54 nec: sed E | nec est via ad inveniendum ipsum: *om.* C | 55 et: ea C | Deo: eo ABE | 56 ei: *om.* KL | 57 necessitate: cessitate B | intendere: attendere C | in creata: increata L | creata: causata B | secundum: vel L | 58 ratione: intentione KL | antecedentia: accidentia C | 59 nobis: *om.* KL | in: *om.* BCEKL | nostrarum: naturalium C | 60 vero: *om.* C | antecedentia: accidentia C | 61 geometriae: geometrice E | potentiis figurarum: scientiis potentiarum L; scientia potentiarum K | arithmetice: arismetice AEKL | 62 his: hiis AKL | 62-63 his ... super: *om.* BCE | 63 removeri: a *add.* KL | 65 acquirendum: *om.* A | 67 etiam: autem C | licet: *om.* L | 68 cognoscendum: cognoscendi E | mundum: multum A | istum: *om.* E | 69 intellectum: et *ad.* E | intelligendum: intelligere E | 70 demonstrant: demonstrantur L | substantia: substantiam A | 71 qui: que E | 72 modorum: morum E | 73 per se tollunt: tollunt per se L | etiam: et L | 76 deficiunt: definant K | 77 iuvamenta: iuramenta: C | in: *om.* C | illam: aliam K | 78 voluerit acquirere: *inv.* E | nullo: ullo L | 80 dialectice: dyalectice K | disciplinalibus: disciplinabilibus AE | secundum: per K |

81. suum, deinde in naturalibus, postea in spiritualibus.
82. Nos autem invenimus plures homines quorum intellectus attingit
83. partem istarum scientiarum, et ibi stat, et licet fatigata est anima
84. ipsorum, mors separat inter ipsos et desiderium ipsorum eisdem
85. etiam studentibus adhuc in parte stramentorum, et si non fuisset
86. nobis consultum per viam receptionis, et non duceremur ad
87. rationem per similitudines, et si non sequeremur disciplinam
88. perfectam in rebus veris, et non crederemus in hiis quae necesse est
89. credi nisi per probationes, quod non sequitur nisi post stramenta
90. longa, perveniret ex hoc, quod morerentur omnes homines
91. antequam scirent an mundus habeat Creatorem vel non, nedum ut
92. attribueres ei aliquid vel removeres ab ipso defectum, nec evaderet
93. aliquis periculum istud, 'nisi unus de civitate, duo de generatione.'
94. Singulares vero, 'quos dominus vocat residuos' non acquirunt
95. perfectionem quae est finis nisi post stramenta et antecedentia.
96. Salomon autem exposuit quod necessitas compellit addiscere
97. stramenta, et quod non potest perveniri ad sapientiam veram nisi
98. post laborem disciplinae in discendo. 'Si retusum fuerit ferrum et
99. fuerit politum multo labore exacuetur, et post industriam sequitur
100. sapientia'. Et dixit, 'audi consilium et addisce disciplinam, ut sis
101. sapiens in novissimis tuis'. Est alia necessitas quae compellit
102. addiscere antecedentia, quoniam multae dubitationes nascuntur
103. in corde hominis in discendo, et similiter intelliget contraria cito,
104. scilicet destructionem alicuius verbi quae est similis destructioni
105. fabricae. Sed non provenit firmitas verborum, et solutio
106. dubitationum, nisi cum multis antecedentibus sumptis de
107. stramentis ipsis. Speculator vero sine stramento similis est
108. currenti ut perveniat ad locum aliquem, et incidit in currendo in

| 81 deinde: *om.* E | 82 nos: non C | attingit: attingunt E | 83 istarum: ipsarum A | 84 separat: seperat L | ipsorum: eorum K | 85 etiam: et EKL | adhuc: *om.* KL | 87 rationem: rationes KL | 88 veris: *om.* K | crederemus: crederemur C; credemus E; crederimus L | 89 credi: credere B; concedi L | probationes: et *add.* E | post: per C | 90 ex: ad C | 91 scirent: scit verus C | an: si ABL; nisi K; secundum E | 92 attribueres: attribuens E | defectum: defertum L | nec: ut L; ne CK | 93 istud: illud E | civitate: et *add.* AE | 95 post: per L | 97 sapientiam veram: *inv.* C | 98 discendo: dicendo EK | et: non AC; non *add.* KL | 98-99 et fuerit politum: *om.* BE | politum: pollitum L | 100 addisce: id est suscipe *inser.* A; antecedentia *add.* B | sis: sit E | 103 discendo: dicendo E | intelliget: intelligit A | 104 destructioni: alicuius *add.* KL | 105 fabricae: fabrifice BE | 106 dubitationum: dubiorum E | 108 currenti: ocurrenti L | in (2): *om.* KL |

109. foveam profundam, et nescit quomodo exeat inde, donec
 110. moritur. Et si stetisset in loco suo melius fuisset ei. Salomon
 111. multa dicit numerando diversitates pigrorum, et totum hoc est
 112. similitudo ad illum qui non laborat ut acquirat scientiam.
 113. Dixit autem in desiderio cupientis acquirere intelligentiam, et
 114. non laborantis, ut addiscat stramenta quae perducerent ipsum
 115. usque ad fines illos, sed tantummodo desiderat, ‘desideria
 116. occidunt pigrum, quia manus suae noluerunt operari; tota die
 117. desiderans desiderat. Iustus autem dat et non prohibet’.
 118. Causa ergo quare desideria pigrum occidunt est, secundum
 119. Salomonem, quia non laborat et quaerit aliquid cum quo
 120. extinguat desiderium illud, sed desiderat solummodo et
 121. suspendit spem suam in eo quod naturaliter non potest
 122. apprehendere. Et si recederet ab illo desiderio et dimitteret
 123. ipsum, tunc evasisset. Et intellige finem huius similitudinis
 124. qualiter explanat quod primo dixit, in dicendo, ‘iustus dat et non
 125. prohibet’. Iustus enim non est contrarius pigro, nisi sicut
 126. praediximus quia ipse dixit quod iustus est qui dat unicuique
 127. quod suum est, idest totum tempus suum dat ut acquirat
 128. sapientiam, et nichil prohibet de tempore suo ab addiscendo, ac
 129. si diceret, ‘iustus dat tempus suum sapientiae et non prohibet’, et
 130. hoc est simile illi quod dixit, ‘non des mulieri fortitudine tuam’.
 131. Multi vero sapientium qui famosi fuerunt in scientiis,
 132. laboraverunt hoc vitio, scilicet investigando finitates, et loquendo
 133. in ipsis sine speculatione stramentorum suorum. Et sunt quidam
 134. illorum quos stultitia ducit vel inquisitio rerum grandium ad
 135. repudiandum stramenta ipsa, quia potentia ipsorum breviatur
 136. investigatione stramentorum, vel cessat ab inquisitione
 137. stramentorum et laborat probare quia dampnosa sunt, vel quia

| 110 moritur: moriatur L | 111 numerando: dinumerando L | numerando
 diversitates: diversitates minando A | 112 acquirat: quirat B | 113 acquirere:
 acquiescere C | 114 ut: si LK | perducerent: producerent L | 115 usque: *om.* K
 | 116 noluerunt: nolunt A | 118 ergo: vero L | pigrum occidunt: *inv.* C | 119
 aliquid: aliud L | 120 extinguat: extinguitur L | 121 spem: speciem E | 123 intel-
 lige: intelligere L | 124 in dicendo: *om.* KL | 126 quia ipse dixit: *om.* LK | dixit:
 dicit BC | 127 tempus suum: *inv.* KL | dat: *om.* C | 128 ab: *om.* L | addiscendo:
 abdiscendo K | 129 sapientiae: *om.* E | 130 dixit: Salomon *add.* L | 132 vitio: vicio
 CE | finitates: infirmitates: KL | loquendo: loquendi B | 133 sine: in *add.* B | suo-
 rum: *om.* KL | 134 stultitia: stulticia ACE | 135 repudiandum: reputandum E |
 quia: et L | 137 quia (1): quod E; quae L |

138. non est utilitas in ipsis, et veritas nota est intelligenti.
 139. Causa quarta est aptitudo naturalis. Probatum enim est quoniam
 140. complexio corporis est stramentum morum animae et in nullo
 141. homine possunt esse mores animae intelligibiles et perfecti nisi in
 142. illo qui eligit mores bonos, et exercet illos, et habet sensum
 143. quietum et pacatum. Sunt autem multi in quibus est complexio
 144. naturalis cum qua nullomodo convenit perfectio intellectus, sicut
 145. est aliquis cuius cordis natura est calidissima, et est fortis robore,
 146. quam duo comitatur iracundia, licet ille exercet animam suam in
 147. fine exercitii et disciplinae. Et sicut ille cuius ovorum natura est
 148. calida et humida et ipse est fortis robore. Dico quoniam iste vix
 149. potest consequi sanctitatem, licet exerceret animam suam in fine
 150. exercitii et disciplinae.
 151. Similiter etiam invenies aliquos qui sunt fortes et leves, et habent
 152. motus inordinatos et laboriosos, per quod probatur malicia
 153. compositionis et complexionis eorum, et in talibus numquam
 154. invenitur intellectus perfectus, et laborare cum eis ut addiscant
 155. istam disciplinam est stulticia doctoris, quoniam ista sapientia
 156. sicut tu scis non est sicut aritmetica vel phisica, et non est quilibet
 157. homo aptus et paratus ut illam percipiat propter rationes
 158. supradictas. Et idcirco non potest hoc esse nisi praemittatur
 159. stramentum aptitudinis morum, donec homo sit in fine
 160. rectitudinis, et perfectionis, sicut dictum est, ‘abominatio domini
 161. stolidus, et cum recto secretum eius’. Et ideo non expedit, ut
 162. doceamus illam adolescentes, nec ipsi possunt eam recipere,
 163. propter inconstantiam naturae suae, et quia cogitationes suae
 164. ardent in igne adolescentiae, donec extingatur flamma motiva
 165. ipsorum, et attingant gradum sapientiae et intellectus, et frangant

| 139 Causa quarta: *inv.* BL | aptitudo: altitudo ABKL | enim est: *inv.* CK | quoniam: quod C | 140 animae: *om.* KL | 142 mores bonos: *inv.* C | 143 pacatum: paccatum B | est: *om.* C | 144 nullomodo: ullo modo C | 145 est (3): *om.* B | 146 quam: quae CEL | duo: *om.* KL | comitatur: committatur K | iracundia: iracundi B | ille: *om.* B | exercet: exerceret B; exercent CL; exercerit K | 147 ille: iste C | ovorum: honorum KL | est: et seminis multiplicativa *add.* B | 148 iste: ipse E | iste vix: *inv.* K | 149 exerceret: exercent L | 152 motus: *om.* E; modos KL | 155 istam: illam E | est: et C | 156 sicut (2): *om.* K | aritmetica: arismeticalis C; arismetica AE | vel: *om.* C | phisica: fisica B | 157 illam: illa A | percipiat: recipiat EL | 158 idcirco: ideo L | hoc: *om.* C | nisi: ut C | praemittatur: praemittitur E | 160 est: Proverb. III *add.* E | abominatio: abhominatio AKL; habominatio B | 161 recto: *om.* K | eius: est K | et (2): etiam B | 163 cogitationes: cogitationis B | 164 motiva: *om.* K | 165 ipsorum: eorum E | gradum: gradus E | et (2): *om.* KL | et (3): in K | frangant: frangat KL |

166. corda sua, et complexio conquiescat, et tunc regent et ducent
 167. animas suas ad gradum istum qui est appraehensio Creatoris, hoc
 168. est ad gradum sapientiae spiritualis, quae vocatur opus de
 169. Mercana. Et propter hoc dictum est, ‘prope est dominus contritis
 170. corde’, et iterum. Altus et sanctus quiescam super humilem et
 171. quietum, et propter hoc dictum est in Talmud, ‘non dabuntur
 172. initia rationum, nisi domino scolae qui vocatur dominus iudicii’,
 173. et quod cor eius sit triste intra ipsum, et premat cor suum, et
 174. humiliet se cum humilitate addita et adiuncta sapientiae, et
 175. propter hoc dixerunt, ‘non dabunt occulta legis nisi consiliario et
 176. sapienti magistrorum, et intelligenti incantationem’.
 177. Ista vero indigent natura parata et apta ad recipiendum
 178. sapientiam. Nonne scis quod est aliquis inter homines qui est
 179. debilis in consiliis, et tamen est multum intelligens, et est alius
 180. cuius consilia recta sunt in agendis, et talis vocatur consiliarius, et
 181. tamen nullius est intellectus? Et si applicaretur ad intelligibilia
 182. prima quae etiam pueri intelligunt, inveniretur ignorans, et
 183. multum nescius, et non potest aptari? Est alius intelligens et
 184. purus in natura qui potest intelligere de facili rationes cum levi
 185. explanatione, et talis vocatur intelligens incantationem, sed non
 186. laborat in sapientia nec acquirit eam. Qui vero habet scientias in
 187. actu vocatur sapiens magistrorum, et pro ipso dictum est quod
 188. cum loquitur, omnes obsurdescunt. Pone cor tuum et vide
 189. quomodo induxerunt condiciones hominis perfecti ex verbis
 190. scripturae in regimine civitatis, et in scientiis speculativis cum
 191. natura munda, et intelligentia et solutione verbi ad sciendas
 192. rationes in summis, et tunc dabunt ei occulta legis, sic etiam

| 166 conquiescat: conquiescit L | 167 suas: *om.* A | appraehensio: Salvatoris
add. A | 168 quae: qui E | 170 altus: *om.* K | 171 hoc: *om.* C | Talmud: Thalamut
 A; Talmut BCKL | non: quam A | dabuntur: dabunt E | 172 initia: inicia BCE |
 scolae: stolae L | qui: quam A; que C | 173 cor (1): *om.* C; quam *add.* B | intra:
 infra ABCK | 174 adiuncta: adiuncta B | 175 consiliario: consiliari B | 176 incan-
 tationem: in creatorem C; incantatorem K | 177 indigent: indignanter C | 178
 est aliquis: *inv.* A; aliquid B | 180 consilia recta: *inv.* C | sunt: sibi K | in: *om.* E
 | 181 nullius: ullius C | intellectus: intellectos E | 182 intelligunt: et *add.* C |
 183 est: et A | 184 purus: puros E | levi explanatione: *inv.* KL | 185 sed: set E |
 nec: et non L | 188 loquitur: loquor E | obsurdescunt: absconde sunt L | 189
 induxerunt: dixerunt A | condiciones: rationes C; cogitationes E | 189-190 con-
 ditiones ... scripturae: ex verbis scripturae condiciones hominis perfecti B | 190
 regimine: regione E | speculativis: speculationis L | 191 munda: mundi E |
 intelligentia: intelligenda C | solutione: solutio C; est *add.* C | verbi: *om.* L | 192
 sic: sicut A |

193. dixerunt. Dixit Rabi Channa a rabi Alazar, 'Veni et docebo te
 194. opus de Mercana', qui respondit, 'nondum incanui' idest
 195. nondum senui, et adhuc invenio in me fervorem corporis et
 196. naturae et levitatem iuvenilem invenio. Appone cor tuum et vide
 197. quomodo coniunxerunt conditiones annorum conditionibus
 198. morum. Et ex quo sic est, quomodo ergo expedit loqui et
 199. revelare secreta huius sapientiae universitati populi in quo sunt
 200. per maiori parte familiae et mulieres?
 201. Causa quinta est negotia hominum et necessitates corporum
 202. quae sunt in prima perfectione; quanto magis si coniungantur
 203. istis necessitates uxorum et filiorum, et quanto magis si
 204. coniungantur istis persecutio super adiectione victus in quo
 205. laborat efficaciter homo secundum usum et maliciam
 206. consuetudinum. Quoniam homo etiam perfectus sicut diximus, si
 207. voluerit laborare in talibus quae sunt multum necessaria, quanto
 208. magis in hiis quae non sunt adeo necessaria, et creverit cupiditas
 209. eius, in illis debilitabitur desiderium animae in appraehensione
 210. sapientiae, submergetur in mari cupiditatum, et amor eius ad
 211. sapientiam erit cum debilitate voluntatis et cordis. Et ideo non
 212. acquireret quod habet in potentia ut appraehendat, vel possibile est
 213. quod acquireret appraehensione laboriosa et mixta inter
 214. appraehensionem et defectum. Igitur secundum has omnes
 215. opiniones fuerunt secreta ista necessaria solis et singularibus qui
 216. sunt paucissimi, non universitati gentium. Et ideo celant illa
 217. incipientem addiscere, et prohibent ipsum attingere illa, sicut
 218. prohibetur puer parvulus ne comedat cibos duros et ne portet
 219. onus grave.

| 193 Channa: Ohanna A | Alazar: Alataz A | 194 Mercana: Merchana C |
 respondit: verbum vel nondum (?) *inser.* A | nondum: *om.* BKL | idest: et E |
 195 senui: senus L | invenio: *om.* CL | fervorem: terrorem L; est *add.* C | 196 et
 (1): *om.* CKL | invenio: *om.* AE | 197 coniunxerunt: vel conveniunt *corr. et inser.*
 A | 198 sic: *om.* E | 200 per: pro L | 201 negotia: negocia CE | hominum: *om.*
 B | et: *om.* L | 202 sunt: *om.* L | in: *om.* EK | | 203 et (1): *om.* A | et (2): *om.* CKL
 | 204 coniungantur: coniungatur AC; coniungitur E | adiectione: addicione B
 | victus: iudicis C; motus E | 206 si: sicut A | 207 necessaria: necessarii C | 207-
 208 quanto ... necessaria: *om.* K | 208 necessaria: necessarii C | 209 eius: *om.* KL
 | in (2): etiam C; et E | 210 sapientiae: et *add.* ACKL | 211 cum: si L | volun-
 tatis: notis L | 213 appraehensione: reprehensione C | 214 secundum: *om.* A |
 215 solis: solum A | qui: que K | 217 incipientem: insipientem A | 218 prohi-
 betur: *om.* KL | comedat: comedas E | duros: *om.* L | 219 onus: honus E |

Liber II, Incipit

1. Propositiones quae sunt necessariae in assertione essentiae
2. Creatoris et in propositionibus per quas demonstrabimus quod
3. Creator non est corpus nec potentia in corpore, et quod est unus,
4. sunt XXV, quarum quaelibet nullam habet dubitationem, de
5. quibus disputavit Aristoteles et qui secuti sunt eum probando
6. quamlibet illarum. Est autem una propositio, in qua conveniemus
7. cum eis, quia per ipsam demonstratur quaestio nostra, sicut
8. explanabo: et ipsa est antiquitas mundi.
9. Prima propositio. Ponere ens infinitae quantitatis est vanitas.
10. Secunda propositio. Ponere corpora certae quantitatis infinita
11. numero in uno tempore vanum est.
12. Propositio III. Ponere causas et causata infinita, licet non habeant
13. magnitudinem, vanum est; verbi gratia, si dicatur quod unus
14. intellectus sit causa alterius et alter sit causa illius, et sic in
15. infinitum.
16. Propositio IV. Quatuor sunt mutationes: secundum substantiam,
17. quae dicitur generatio et corruptio; secundum quantitatem, scilicet
18. augmentum et diminutio; secundum qualitatem, scilicet alteratio;
19. secundum locum, loci mutatio.
20. Quinta propositio. Omnis motus est mutatio, scilicet exitus de
21. potentia ad actum.
22. Sexta propositio. Motuum alius substantialis, alius accidentalis;
23. iterum alius naturalis, alius violentus; iterum motus qui est in parte
24. est species motus accidentalis. Substantialis sive per se, sicut cum
25. corpus movetur de uno loco ad alium. Accidentalibus vero, sicut
26. nigredinis quae est in corpore quod movetur de loco ad locum;
27. violentus, sicut lapidis proiecti sursum; partis vero, sicut clavi in navi
28. mota.
29. Propositio VII. Omne mobile est partibile et est corpus; et quod
30. non est divisibile non est mobile, et idcirco non est corpus.
31. Propositio VIII. Omne quod movetur secundum accidens quiescit

| 2 propositionibus: probationibus KL | demonstrabimus: demonstravimus B |
 3 unus: et *add.* A | 6 illarum: *om.* A | una: *om.* C; via XXVIa, scilicet *add.* LK |
 conveniemus: convenimus A | 7 ipsam: ipsum A | 8 et: in *add.* L | 10 infinita:
 vero *add.* C et *cancell.* | 12 causata: creata B | 14 sit (1): est E | sit (2): *om.* A |
 17 et: vel CELK | scilicet: sed E | 18 augmentum: augmentatio L | scilicet: *om.*
 EKL | 19 loci: *cancell.* A | mutatio: mutacio L | 20 mutatio: mutacio L | 23
 iterum (1): item EK | iterum (2): item AEK | parte: tempore LK | 24 sive: sine
 LK | sicut: sive AB | sicut cum: nunc est L | 26 quod: quae AB | 27 sursum: rur-
 sum KL | navi: nave EKL; naves B | 29 partibile: parcibile L | quod: quando K
 | 31 propositio VIII: octava propositio C | secundum: vel L |

32. aliquando, quia non movetur ex se. Et ideo non potest esse ut
33. semper moveatur illo motu secundum accidens.
34. Nona propositio. Omne corpus quod movet aliud corpus non
35. movet illud nisi ipsum moveatur.
36. Propositio Xa. Omne quod est in corpore vel est accidens vel eius
37. forma substantialis et dividitur secundum divisionem corporis.
38. Propositio XIa. Quae sunt in corpore dividuntur secundum
39. divisionem corporis, sed per accidens, sicut colores et aliae
40. dispositiones quae sunt in corporibus; sed intellectus non
41. dividuntur.
42. Propositio XIIa. Omnis potentia quae est in corpore finita est, quia
43. corpus est finitum.
44. Propositio XIIIa. Nulla species mutationum est continua praeter
45. motum localem.
46. Propositio XIVa. Motus localis est antiquior omni alia mutatione et
47. prior naturaliter. Nam generationem et corruptionem praecedit
48. mutatio alterationis quam praecedit appropinquatio alteratoris ad
49. alteratum; augmentum vero et diminutionem praecedit generatio
50. et corruptio.
51. Propositio XVa. Tempus est accidens motus et comitatur ipsum, et
52. neutrum eorum invenitur sine reliquo, nec intellectus apprehendit
53. tempus sine motu. Et quod non movetur non cadit sub tempore.
54. Propositio XVIa. Omne quod non habet corpus non
55. comprehenditur ab intellectu multiplicari numero nisi sit potentia
56. in corpore. Tunc etenim singularia potentiarum possunt numerari
57. secundum numerum materierum et subiectorum in quibus sunt. Et
58. idcirco separata quae non sunt corpora nec potentiae in corporibus
59. non comprehenduntur ab intellectu multa nisi fuerint causae et
60. causata.

| 32 quia: quod E | et ideo: idcirco E | 33 motu: actu KL | secundum: sed E | 34
nona propositio: propositio IXa C | aliud: alius B | non: nisi L | 36 in corpore:
corpus A; corpore E | 38 quae: quod B | dividuntur: dividantur C | 39 colores: -
is L | 40 dispositiones: -ibus L; formae *De uno deo* | sed: secundum animam *add.*
AB | intellectus: intellectos A | 44 nulla: si ulla L | 46 mutatione: mutacione L |
48 mutatio ... praecedit *om.* KL | praecedit: praecedet B | alteratoris: alterationis
EKL | 52 neutrum: neuter A | 53 cadit: accidit C | 54 corpus: materiam KL | 55
multiplicari: multipli EL | 56 etenim: et eius E | 57 secundum: per L | 58 non:
nisi K | 59 multa: *om.* A | causae: *om.* C | 60 causata: creato A; creata CEB |

61. Propositio XVIIa. Omne motum habet motorem omnibus modis vel
 62. extra se, sicut lapis quem movet manus, vel intra se, sicut animal
 63. quod componitur ex motore et moto. Et idcirco cum defecerit
 64. motor, scilicet anima, remanebit motum, scilicet corpus, sine motu.
 65. Et quoniam motor talis est latens nec apprehenditur a sensu,
 66. putant homines quod animal movetur sine motore. Omne autem
 67. motum quod habet intra se motorem dicitur moveri per seipsum,
 68. quia virtus motiva in mobili per se est in omnibus partibus eius.
 69. Propositio XVIIIa. Omne quod exit de potentia ad actum exit per
 70. aliud quod est extra ipsum omnibus modis. Nam si esset intra
 71. ipsum et non esset impediens, non esset in potentia in aliqua hora,
 72. sed esset semper in actu. Quod si fuerit intra ipsum qui extrahit
 73. ipsum et habuerit impediens, sine dubio removens impedimentum
 74. dicitur extrahere illud de potentia ad actum. Et tu attende ad ista!
 75. Propositio XIXa. Omne ens quod habet causam eius esse est
 76. possibile, cum intelligimus eius substantiam. Quia si causae ipsius
 77. fuerunt, et ipsum erit, et si non fuerint vel defecerint, vel mutata
 78. fuerit ipsarum comparatio quae facit ipsum esse, illud non erit.
 79. Propositio XXa. Omne necesse esse in probatione nostra suae
 80. substantiae non habet causam sui esse ullo modo.
 81. Propositio XXIa. Omne compositum ex duobus sua compositio erit
 82. causa suae essentiae secundum quod est de necessitate. Quod si ita
 83. est, non est necessarium in esse in sua substantia, quia essentia sua
 84. est in essentia partium suarum et in earum compositione.
 85. Propositio XXIIa. Omne corpus est compositum dupliciter
 86. necessario, et coniunguntur in eo accidentia de necessitate. Duo
 87. autem quae dant ei esse sunt materia et forma. Accidentia vero

| 62 quem: quoniam A; qui L | animal: animalis EL | 63 componitur:
 contempnitur C | cum: si L | defecerit: deffecerit L | 64 anima ... scilicet: *om.*
 A | scilicet: et C | 65 nec: non E | 66 motore: motu L | 68 virtus: *rep.* A | 70
 aliud: aliquid E | ipsum: seipsum E | intra: extra E | 71 in (2): *om.* ACKL | 72
 esset semper: *inv.* A | ipsum: seipsum E | 72-73 qui ... ipsum: *om.* KL | 73
 habuerit: habuit B | 74 illud: ista E | attende: intende CEKL | 75 ens: *om.* A |
 76 eius: esse E | 77 fuerunt: finiunt E; fuerint K | fuerint: finiunt E; fuerunt CB;
 erunt L | defecerint: defuerunt AB | mutata: mutatio A | 78 fuerit: fuerint C |
 79 necesse esse: necessarium est E | 80 non: nec L | 81 ex duobus: duobus
 modis EB | 82 suae essentiae: *rep.* E | secundum: sed E; vel K | ita: ibi B | 83
 essentia sua: *inv.* BEKL | 84 compositione: positione K; potentiae L | 85 omne:
 esse *add. et cancell.* A | dupliciter: duplex E | 86 eo: necessaria: *add.* C |

88. ipsius sunt sicut quantitas et figura et compositio.
 89. Propositio XXIIIa. Omne quod est in potentia et habet in sua
 90. substantia possibilitatem aliquam, potest esse, ut aliqua hora non sit
 91. actu.
 92. Propositio XXIVa. Omne quod est in potentia ad aliquid, attinet
 93. materiae aliquo modo, quia possibilitas semper invenitur in
 94. materia.
 95. Propositio XXVa. Principia substantiae compositae singularis sunt
 96. materia et forma, et eget omnibus modis operatore, scilicet motore,
 97. qui moveat materiam donec sit apta recipere formam, et iste est
 98. motor propinquus qui est praeparator materiae singularis. Et exigit
 99. hoc considerationem circa motum et motorem et rem motam. Iam
 100. ergo demonstratum est in omnibus istis quod erat necessarium
 101. demonstrari. Aristotelis autem verba sunt quod materia non
 102. movet seipsam. Haec autem propositio est fortis quae inducit
 103. nos ad inquisitionem motoris primi.
 104. Istarum ergo XXV propositionum quaedam probantur
 105. consideratione levi et propositionibus probabilibus et
 106. intelligibilibus primis vel talibus quae sunt propinqua illis;
 107. quaedam vero egent probationibus et propositionibus multis.
 108. Omnes tamen iam probatae sunt probationibus in quibus non est
 109. dubitatio, partim in libro de naturali auditu et suis
 110. expositionibus, partim vero in methaphysica et sua expositione.
 111. Sed iam feci te scire quod non est intentio mea in hoc libro
 112. transferre verba philosophorum, sed ostendere propositiones
 113. propinquas et remotas, scilicet quibus indigemus secundum
 114. intentionem rationis in qua sumus.
 115. Aditiam autem super praemissas propositiones unam
 116. propositionem ex qua sequitur antiquitas mundi. Et Aristoteles
 117. credit quod est vera et quod necessarium est ut credatur, et nos
 118. convenimus cum eo in illa, donec perveniamus ad locum ubi

| 88 quantitas: quantitatis L | 90 hora: potentia E | 93 quia: quo E | 95 prin-
 cipia: principalia C | compositae singularis: *inv.* E | 96 modis: materia et forma
add. et cancell. K | 97 iste: ille A | 98 praeparator: operator A | 99 hoc: hanc K |
 100 demonstratum: monstratum C | 102 haec: hoc E | 104 XXV propositionum:
inv. C | 108 omnes: quae E | probationibus: propositionibus E | 109 auditu:
 auditu AE | 111 feci: fecit C | mea: nostra K | 114 intentionem: intentione B |
 116 Aristoteles: ergo *add.* KL | 117 credit: creditur KL | est (2): *om.* EL | 118 eo:
 illo C | illa: via A | perveniamus: perveniemus AKL |

119. exponemus sententiam nostram. Et haec est propositio XXVIa.
 120. Est autem illud quod dicit Aristoteles quod tempus et motus sunt
 121. sempiterni et semper in actu. Et ideo sequitur necessario
 122. secundum sententiam eius et secundum istam propositionem
 123. quod sit corpus motum motu sempiterno et sit aeternum semper
 124. in actu, et hoc est corpus quintum.
 125. Propter hoc etiam dicit quod caeli non sunt generabiles vel
 126. corruptibiles, quia motus secundum ipsum non est generabilis vel
 127. corruptibilis. Dicit enim quod omnem motum necessario
 128. praecedit alius motus suae vel alterius speciei. Quod autem
 129. putamus in animalibus quod motum localem non praecedit
 130. alius motus non est verum secundum ipsum, quoniam causa
 131. motus post eius privationem est vel mutatio sui status quae
 132. inducit desiderium ad quaerendum sibi conveniens, vel
 133. fugiendum eius contrarium vel ymaginatio possibilis vel sensus
 134. renovatus in uno istorum trium motuum, et quilibet illorum
 135. inducit alios motus. Sic etiam dicunt quod omne quod mutatur
 136. praecedit in eo possibilitas mutationem suam secundum tempus;
 137. et ex istis rationibus sequitur assertio praedictae propositionis
 138. suae. Et secundum istam propositionem, erit mobile finitum
 139. quod movetur in spatio finito vicibus infinitis in reversione sua
 140. super idem spatium, quod non convenit nisi in motu circulari,
 141. sicut ostenditur per probationem XIIIae istarum propositionum;
 142. et secundum illos, sequitur ut sint infinita secundum successionem
 143. unius post aliud, non quod sint simul. Haec autem propositio est
 144. quam nititur totis viribus affirmare semper et ostendere quod sit
 145. vera. Quod autem mihi videtur est quod ipse non praecise iudicat
 146. quod probationes suae in hoc sint demonstrationes, sed sunt
 147. convenientes et certae secundum intellectum suum. Posteriores
 148. autem et expositores librorum suorum dixerunt quod ista

| 119 haec: *om.* C | haec est: *inv.* K; est hoc EB | est: *om.* L | 121 sequitur neces-
 sario: *inv.* L | 122 istam propositionem: *inv.* KL | 123 motu: motum B | sit: sic A
 | 125 dicit: dicitur A | 127 enim: etiam B | quod: quia KL | necessario praecedit: *inv.* KL | 128 suae: sui C | 130 secundum: sed B | 131 est vel: *inv.* E | 133
 possibilis: vel transibilis *add.* E | 134 et: vel KL; *om.* E | illorum: istorum KL | 135
 sic: ergo *add.* B | dicunt: dicit EKL | 136 possibilitas: *om.* A; impossibilitas L; in
 potencias K | secundum: vel K; suum *add.* A | 137 rationibus: *om.* C | 139 vicibus:
 iuribus K | 142 sint: sicut E | 143 simul: similes EL | 144 semper: *om.* L | ostendere:
 semper *add.* L | 145 est: esse E | non: *om.* C | 146 sint: sunt KL | sed: *om.* K; quae
add. KL | sunt: fuerunt B | 148 autem: etiam A | ista: una L; illa K |

149. propositio est necessaria, non possibilis, et quod probata est.
 150. Omnes autem loquentes laborant astruere quod est impossibilis.
 151. Dicunt enim quod non ascendit in cor, quomodo renoventur res
 152. infinitae secundum successionem, et de virtute verborum suorum
 153. provenit quod est secundum ipsos intelligibile primum. Quod
 154. autem mihi videtur de ista propositione, dico quod est possibilis,
 155. non necessaria, ut dixerunt expositores verborum Aristotelis, et
 156. non est impossibilis, sicut dixerunt loquentes. Non est autem
 157. intentio mea nunc exponere verba Aristotelis quae sunt dubia,
 158. nec ostendere sententiam meam in novitate mundi, sed intendo
 159. modo adunare propositiones necessarias in istis tribus
 160. quaestionibus. Postquam ergo praemisi praedictas propositiones
 161. et conveni in illas, incipiam exponere quod sequitur ex illis.

| 149 quod: quia B | 151 quomodo: quoniam KL | 152 verborum suorum: *inv.* E |
 153 primum: primam B | 154 dico: dicta B | quod: quia EB | est: *om.* A | 155 ut:
 sicut EB | et: *om.* C | 155-157 et ... Aristotelis: *om.* E | 156 non est (2): *om.* L | 157
 intentio: mententio B | 158 sententiam: *om.* KL | novitate: novitatem K | intendo:
 intentio BC | 159 modo: mea est C | adunare: adiuvaré ACEL; per *add.* A | 160
 praemisi: istas *add.* A; praemissi B |

Liber II, Capitulum 2

1. Ex propositione XXVa sequitur quod motor est qui movet
2. materiam generabilium et corruptibilium donec recipiat formam.
3. Cum vero quaesiverimus de isto motore propinquo quid moverit
4. ipsum sequitur omnibus modis ut habeat motorem suae speciei vel
5. alterius, mutationum siquidem quatuor sunt genera, sicut
6. praemissum est in propositione IVa. Et hoc non procedit in
7. infinitum sicut dicitur in propositione IIIa. Invenimus autem quod
8. omnis motus pervenit usque ad motum quinti corporis et ibi statur,
9. nec proceditur ultra. Et ex illo motu provenit omne mobile et ex
10. eo pendet omnis motor et omnis compositor in mundo inferiori.
11. Caelum vero movetur motu locali qui est antiquus et primus sicut
12. diximus in propositione XIVa.
13. Sic etiam omnis motus localis pervenit usque ad motum caeli, verbi
14. gratia: lapidem motum movit baculus motus a manu quam
15. moverunt cordae brachii, quas moverunt nervi qui sunt in musculis,
16. quos moverunt alii nervi moti a calore naturali, quem movet forma
17. ipsius quae est primus motor. Motorem autem istum ut moveret
18. induxit quasi consilium aliquod, verbi gratia: si videret expedire, ut
19. applicaret lapidem illum cum impulsione baculi ad fenestram
20. aliquam, ut clauderet ipsam ne ventus intraret per eam. Motor
21. autem venti et creator motus eius est motus caeli. Et sic invenies
22. quod omnis causa generationis et corruptionis pervenit usque ad
23. motum caeli. Cum autem perventum fuerit ad caelum quod
24. movetur sequitur ut habeat motorem sicut dictum est in
25. propositione XVIIa. Motor autem ipsius vel est intra ipsum vel
26. extra, necessario. Quod si dixeris quod est extra, vel est corpus vel
27. non corpus; quod si est non corpus non dicitur de eo quod est
28. extra sed dicitur quod est separatum.

| Capitulum 2: BC; Capitulum 1: *alia* | 1 propositione: positione B | XXV: XXXa C | 2 corruptibilium: corruptum L | 3 quaesiverimus: quaesivimus A | 4 omnibus: vel aliud *add.* E | ut: quod K | 5 mutationum: mutuationum A; motuum C | 6 non: *om.* C | 8 quinti corporis: *inv.* CEK | 9 provenit: pervenit B | 10 pendet: pondet K | omnis compositor: *inv.* L | 11 vero: non C | qui: quod A | 12 propositione: positione B | 13 sic etiam: sicut et A; *om.* L | 15 moverunt (1): movetur E | moverunt (2): movent AC | 15-16 qui ... nervi: *om.* C | 16 quem: quoniam AE | movet: movetur E | 17 quae: qui KL | primus motor: *inv.* K | motor: motus C | 18 verbi gratia: sicut *add.* A | ut: ut *rep.* A | 18-19 ut applicaret: *om.* K | 19 cum: *om.* K | 20 clauderet: clauderes C | ipsam: *om.* C | 21 motus (1): est eius *add. et cancell.* K | 22 omnis: communis A | pervenit: *om.* E | 23 caeli: dei A | 24 movetur: intrat L | ut: quod K | 26 quod (2): quia BCL | 27 est (1): *om.* CKL | est non: *om.* E; non est B | 28 sed dicitur: si dicitur C | quod: non *add.* E | sed ... separatum *om.* EB |

29. Si vero fuerit intra ipsum motor, vel erit potentia diffusa per totum
 30. corpus partibilis secundum partitionem ipsius sicut calor in igne,
 31. vel erit potentia impartibilis sicut anima et intellectus, sicut dictum
 32. est in propositione Xa: necesse est ergo ut motor caeli sit aliquo
 33. istorum modorum quos praediximus.
 34. Si enim dixeris quod est corpus aliud extra ipsum: vanum est hoc
 35. quia cum sit corpus necesse est ut moveatur cum moverit aliud,
 36. sicut dictum est in propositione IXa. Cum ergo corpus istud sextum
 37. motum fuerit a septimo, septimum movebitur ab octavo, et sic in
 38. infinitum, et sequitur ex hoc ut sint corpora infinita, et hoc vanum
 39. est sicut dictum est in propositione IIa.
 40. Si vero motor caeli fuerit potentia diffusa per corpus eius hoc
 41. etiam vanum est, cum caelum sit corpus finitum, sicut dictum est in
 42. propositione Ia. Et erit potentia eius finita sicut dicitur in
 43. propositione XIIa. Quae dividitur secundum ipsius divisionem
 44. sicut dicitur in propositione XIa.
 45. Quod si ita est, non est motus sempiternus infinitus sicut positum
 46. est supra. Quod si dicatur quod motor caeli est potentia diffusa in
 47. ipso sed impartibilis sicut anima hominis, et hoc etiam est vanum
 48. quod iste motor solus sit causa motus sempiterni, licet non
 49. dividatur. Cuius expositio est: si iste motor fuerit primus motor
 50. eius idem movetur secundum accidens, sicut dictum est in
 51. propositione VIa.
 52. Adiciam insuper ad hoc expositionem. Dicam ergo gratia exempli:
 53. quod cum homo movetur ab anima sua quae est eius forma ut
 54. ascendat in solium, corpus eius movetur substantialiter, quoniam
 55. anima est motor primus, et movetur secundum accidens in corpore
 56. moto localiter, sicut habetur ex propositione VIa. Quod si quieverit
 57. motus animae quiescet corpus motum ab ea. Cum vero quieverit
 58. corpus cessabit motus animae qui est secundum accidens.

| 29-31 diffusa ... potentia *om.* E | 30-31 secundum ... impartibilis *om.* K | 32 Xa: XIa *De uno deo* | 33 istorum modorum: *inv.* C | ergo: *om.* B | 32-33 necesse... praediximus *om.* KL | 34 aliud: *om.* B; aliquod K | est hoc: *inv.* CKL | 35 est: *om.* K | aliud: aliquod K | 36 sicut: ut C | istud: illud E | 37 movebitur: membrorum K | ab: a K | 38 et (1) *om.* K | vanum: dicitur *cancell.* K | 38-39 vanum est: *inv.* C | 41 cum: ut KL | caelum: corpus L | corpus: caelum L | finitum: infinitum E | 42 propositione: finita *cancell.* L | finita: infinita KL | 43-44 XII ... propositione *om.* A | 43 quae: qui B | 46 quod (1): quia B | quod (2): quia KL | diffusa: et *add.* A | 47 etiam est: *inv.* KL | 48 quod iste: quo ille L | sit: fit B | 49 expositio: propositio L | si iste: set ille E | 50 eius idem: eiusdem C | dictum: *om.* CKL | 52 hoc: hanc L | expositionem: -e E | gratia exempli: *inv.* C | 53 movetur: morietur E | anima: materia K | eius: *om.* E | 54 solium: caelum K | 55 est: eius B | 56 sicut ... VIa *om.* EB | ex: *cancell.* L, *add.* in | 57 animae: et *add.* C |

59. Omne enim quod movetur per accidens de necessitate quiescet,
 60. sicut dicitur in propositione VIIIa, et cum quieverit quiescet
 61. motum ab ipsa, et sequitur quod talis primus motor habeat aliam
 62. causam omnino praeter coniunctum quod componitur ex motore
 63. et moto. Cum autem fuerit illa causa quae est principium motus,
 64. primus motor qui est in coniuncto, movebit motum quod est pars
 65. coniuncti. Si autem non fuerit illa causa, quiescet. Propter hoc ergo
 66. non moventur semper corpora animalium, quamvis in quolibet
 67. illorum sit motor primus qui non dividitur, quoniam motor non est
 68. semper motor in substantia sua nisi propter causas quae accidunt ei
 69. ut moveat quae sunt extra ipsum, vel ut quaerat conveniens sibi, vel
 70. ut fugiat contrarium, vel secundum arbitrium cogitationis in eo qui
 71. utitur intellectu et tunc movebitur. Et cum movetur, est motum
 72. secundum accidens et omnino quiescet sicut praediximus. Si ergo
 73. motor caeli fuerit intra ipsum secundum hunc modum non
 74. semper movebitur. Quod si motus caeli est sempiternus sicut
 75. dictum est supra, et hoc est possibile sicut dictum est in
 76. propositione XIIIa, sequitur omnibus modis secundum istam
 77. sententiam quod prima causa motus caeli sit secundum quod
 78. dictum est scilicet quod sit res separata a caelo, sicut dictum est in
 79. divisione praemissa.
 80. Sic ergo demonstratum est quod primus motor caeli, si motus eius
 81. fuerit sempiternus, de necessitate nec est corpus nec potentia in
 82. corpore ullo modo ut non sit in eo motus substantialis vel
 83. accidentalis et ideo non est partibilis vel mutabilis ullo modo, sicut
 84. dictum est in propositione Va et VIIa. Hic autem motor est creator
 85. benedictus scilicet causa prima motus caeli. Ex hoc etiam colligitur
 86. quod non sint duo vel plures propter destructionem
 87. multiplicationis rerum abstractarum quae non sunt corpora nisi sit
 88. altera causa et altera causatum, sicut dictum est in propositione
 89. XVIa. Ostensum est etiam quod non cadit sub tempore propter
 90. impossibilitatem motus in ipso sicut dictum est in propositione XVa.

[59 enim: vero EB | quiescet: quiescit L; *om.* C | 60 propositione: positione B |
 quiescet: quiescit AE | 61 ab: in B | ipsa: ea A | 62 quod (2): et E | 64 qui est: quod
 A | coniuncto: coniunctione E | 65 ergo: *om.* A | 67 qui: quod A | 68 motor: *om.*
 K | 70 ut: vel C | qui: quod A; quoniam B | 71 tunc: non L | 73 modum: modus
 L | 74 movebitur: movetur E | est: sit A | 75 supra: *om.* C | 76 XIIIa: XXIIIa CEK;
 XXIVa L | 78 scilicet: secundum A | sit res: *inv.* A | 80 sic: si KL | motor: motus
 E | caeli: *om.* A | motus: motor B | 81 est corpus: corpus est E | 82 ut: sicut? E |
 non: *om.* K | ut non: nisi L | in eo motus: motus in eo L | 83 partibilis: parcibilis
 L | vel: nec E | 85 ex: et E | colligitur: tollitur A | 87 rerum abstractarum: *inv.* C
 | 88 altera (1): alterum K; alteram B | causatum: creatum E | dictum: *om.* K | 89
 est etiam: *inv.* A | 89-90 XVIa ... propositione *om.* L |

91. Haec ergo consideratio induxit nos per viam demonstrationis ad
 92. credendum quod caelum non movet seipsum motu sempiterno et
 93. quod causa prima motus eius nec est corpus nec est potentia in
 94. corpore, sed primus motor est unus qui non mutatur, quoniam
 95. essentia eius non est in tempore. Ista sunt tres quaestiones super
 96. quibus induxerunt probationes boni philosophi.
 97. Consideratio IIa apud illos. Proposuit Aristoteles et ostendit quod
 98. cum aliquid componitur ex duobus quorum alterum invenitur
 99. separatum, sequitur necessario quod et reliquum possit inveniri
 100. separatum, quoniam si componentium natura esset ut non
 101. invenirentur separata, sicut materia et forma, neutrum eorum
 102. inveniretur separatum ullo modo. Sic ergo esse unum illorum
 103. separatum erit signum super privatione coniunctionis, et sic
 104. alterum erit de necessitate. Verbi gratia: cum oximel sit
 105. compositum ex aceto et melle et mel invenitur per se, sequitur
 106. necessario ut et acetum inveniatur per se. Postquam ergo exposuit
 107. hanc propositionem, dixit quod nos invenimus res compositas ex
 108. motore et moto, scilicet motore extrinseco, et hoc est
 109. manifestum. Et invenimus motum quod nullo modo movet aliud,
 110. et illud est motum ultimum, et sequitur necessario ut sit motor
 111. qui non moveatur omnino, et ille est motor primus in quo non
 112. potest esse motus. Unde non dividitur nec est corpus nec cadit
 113. sub tempore, sicut ostensum est in probatione quam
 114. praemisimus.
 115. Consideratio IIIa per viam philosophiae in ista materia, sumpta de
 116. verbis Aristotelis, licet induxerit eam propter aliam rationem. Hic
 117. autem est ordo dictionum: non est dubium, quoniam entia sunt, et
 118. sunt sensu comprehensibilia, nec effugiunt quin cadant in
 119. aliquod membrorum trimembris divisionis necessario omnibus

| 91 ergo: autem E | nos: vos E | 93 nec (1): non E | nec (2): est *add.* A | 94
 mutatur: miratur B | 95 sunt: *om.* L | 96 quibus: quas LK | 97 proposuit: autem
add. KL | ostendit: dicit L | 98 cum: si L | aliquid: aliquod E | duobus: *om.* KL
 | 99-100 sequitur ... separatum: *om.* C | 101 invenirentur: inveniatur L; invenire-
 tur B | sicut: *om.* KL | eorum: illorum K | 101-102 sicut ... separatum: *om.* C |
 102 separatum: *om.* A | illorum: eorum K | 102-103 illorum separatum: *inv.* L |
 103 erit: *om.* L | sic: scilicet separatum *add.* E | 105 aceto: acceto E | 106 ut: *om.*
 AEKL | acetum: accetum E | inveniatur: invenitur K | 107 propositionem: com-
 positionem A | invenimus: inveniemus A | 108 moto: motu A | scilicet: sed E |
 109 est manifestum: *inv.* KL | quod: *om.* L | nullo: ullo CL | 111 qui: quod A |
 114 praemisimus: primisimus A | 115 ista: illa K | materia: est *add.* L | 116 eam:
 ea AB | propter: per E | hic: haec C | 117 non: nec L | entia: essentia *cancell.* A
 | 118 sunt: *om.* CKL | cadant: ea dant K | 119 membrorum: membrum A |
 trimembris: ut in membris A | necessario: *om.* A |

120. modis. Hoc est quia omnia nec sunt generabilia nec corruptibilia,
 121. vel omnia sunt generabilia et corruptibilia, vel quaedam sunt
 122. generabilia et corruptibilia, quaedam vero nec generabilia nec
 123. corruptibilia. Ecce prima pars vanitas est manifesta, nos namque
 124. videmus multa generari et corrumpi. Item pars secunda vanitas
 125. est, quoniam si omne ens fuerit generabile et corruptibile,
 126. dicemus quod omnia sunt possibilis corrumpi. Possibile autem
 127. in genere necessario est generabile et corruptibile, sicut scis, et
 128. sequitur necessario quod omnia entia sunt corrupta. Quod si ita
 129. fuerit nihil remanebit, ergo nec dator esse, et sequeretur quod
 130. nihil esset omnino. Nos autem videmus multa esse, et nos etiam
 131. sumus. Sequitur ergo necessario secundum istam
 132. considerationem quod si sunt aliqua generabilia et corruptibilia,
 133. sicut nos videmus, quod sit aliquod ens non generabile nec
 134. corruptibile, in quo non est possibilitas ad corruptionem
 135. omnino, sed est necessarium in esse, non possibile esse. Dixit
 136. etiam quod suum esse necesse esse non effugit hoc, cum
 137. intellexerimus substantiam suam vel cum intellexerimus causam
 138. suae essentiae et suae privationis possibile in probatione nostra
 139. suae substantiae et necessarium in probatione nostra suae causae,
 140. et erit causa sua propter necesse esse, sicut dictum est in
 141. propositione XIXa. Iam ergo demonstratum est quod est omnino
 142. ens quod est necesse esse in nostra probatione.

| 120 hoc: haec K | 122 vero: *om.* E | 123 vanitas: vanitatis K | vanitas est: *inv.* L
 | namque: autem KL | 123-125 manifesta ... est: *om.* E | 124 videmus multa: *inv.*
 K | vanitas: vanitatis K | 126-127 dicemus ... est: *om.* E | 126 quod: quoniam K |
 127 necessario: vel de necessitate erit *add.* K | generabile et corruptibile: *om.*
 CKL | et (2): *om.* A | 128 entia: *om.* KL | sunt: sint EB | 129 sequeretur: sequitur
 KL | 130 esset: esse B | 135 possibile esse: KL *inser.*, sed hoc erit propter suam
 substantiam aut [aut: et sit K; ac L] propter necessitatem suae causae. Si propter
 necessitatem suae causae, esset suum esse possibile in se et necessarium propter
 suam causam, esset ergo causa necessario omnino. *vid. De uno deo* | 136 necesse
 esse: *om.* KL | esse (2): est E; *om.* C | hoc cum: *om.* L | 137 intellexerimus (1):
 intelleximus AKL | intellexerimus (2): intelleximus AKL | causam: causa B | 138
 suae essentiae: *inv.* KL | possibile: possibilem EB | in: *om.* L | nostra: *om.* CKL |
 139 suae substantiae: *inv.* A | nostra: *om.* CKL | 135-142 *suppl.* F *textus libri De uno
 deo.* et cum necesse sit ipsum esse, aut erit necesse propter suam causam, quam
 necesse est esse, aut propter seipsum. Et dico propter suam causam, ita ut illud
 esset in se possibile, quod in comparatione ad suam causam sit necesse; quoniam
 causa eius est principium necessitatis essentiae suae, sicut ostensum est in propo-
 sitione XIXa. Et iam manifestum est quod impossibile est, quin inveniatur omni
 modo unum quod necesse sit esse in seipso ex necessitate propria. |

143. Et si hoc non esset, omnino nihil esset generabile vel
 144. corruptibile, vel non generabile et non corruptibile, nisi sit
 145. aliquod ens, sicut dixit Aristoteles, scilicet quod nec esset
 146. generabile nec corruptibile, quia est causatum causa necessaria in
 147. esse. Haec autem est demonstratio quae non habet repulsam vel
 148. contradictionem nisi apud illum qui ignorat viam
 149. demonstrationis. Post hoc dicimus quod omne necesse esse in
 150. nostra probatione suae substantiae sequitur omnibus modis, ut
 151. non habeat causam suum esse nec erit in eo multitudo, sicut
 152. dictum est in propositione XXIa. Et ideo sequitur quod nec est
 153. corpus nec potentia in corpore, sicut dictum est in propositione
 154. XXII. Iam ergo demonstratum est secundum considerationem
 155. istam quod est ens quod est necesse esse omnibus modis in
 156. probatione nostra suae substantiae. Ipse autem est cuius esse non
 157. habet causam nec est in eo compositio, et idcirco nec est corpus
 158. nec potentia in corpore, qui est creator benedictus. Sic ergo
 159. probatum est levi probatione quod necesse esse in probatione
 160. nostra ipsius substantiae non potest esse in duobus, quoniam erit
 161. species necesse esse res addita super substantiam utriusque, et
 162. neuter eorum est necesse esse in sua substantia solummodo, sed
 163. erit necesse esse in illa manerie quae est species necessitatis esse
 164. quae est in eo et in alio praeter ipsum. Explanatum est autem iam
 165. multipliciter quod necesse esse non habet secundum nec est

| 139-142 causae ... probatione: L; *alia*: causae, et erit causa sui esse necessari in esse, sicut est dictum in propositione XIXa. Iam ergo demonstratum est quod est omnino ens quod (est omnino est quod: omnino ens est quod C) est necesse esse in nostra probatione suae substantiae A; essentiae, et erit causa sui esse necessari in esse, sicut dictum est in propositione XIXa, vel sic et erit sua causa ipsum necesse esse. Iam ergo demonstratum est quod est omnino ens quod est necesse esse in nostra probatione suae substantiae E; causae, vel sic et erit causa sua propter necesse esse, et erit causa sui esse necessari in esse sicut est dictum in propositione XIXa. Iam ergo demonstratum est quod est omnino ens quod est necesse esse in nostra probatione | 143 nihil esset: *inv.* A | 144-146 nisi ... corruptibile: *om.* K | 145 aliquod: aliquid EL | scilicet: secundum A | nec esset: non E | esset: est C | 146-147 quia ... esse: A *in marg. inf. alia manus add.* alias, quia est tantum supra causa necessaria in esse | 147 haec: hoc A | est: *om.* K | vel: *om.* K; seu L | 149 post hoc: autem *add.* B | esse: est K | 150 suae: illae K | 151 nec... multitudo: *om.* B | in eo: *om.* C | 151-153 nec ... corpore: *om.* E | 152 ideo: idcirco B | quod: *om.* L | 152-153 XXIa ... propositione: *om.* C | 153 est: *om.* B | 155 quod (1): quia EB | esse: est B | 156 probatione: propositione L | 157 est (1): *om.* K | nec: non E | 158 qui: quod A | creator: *om.* C | 159 quod: *om.* B | 160 duobus: attende *add. in marg.* A | quoniam: quod E | 161 necesse: est *add.* E | substantiam: substantia K | 162 neuter: neutrum L | est: erit B | 164 alio: propter *cancel.* L | autem: est A | 165 quod: quam B | esse: non est *add.* B |

166. idem nec diversum in potentia secundationis ullo modo nec est
 167. in comparatione nec in diversitate.
 168. Causa vero omnium istorum est simplicitas mera, a qua non
 169. provenit per suam largitatem sibi simile, et privatio causae ex
 170. omni parte. Quod si ita est, non est in eo participatio ullo modo.
 171. Consideratio IVa de via philosophie. Notum est quod nos
 172. videmus semper quaedam quae sunt in potentia et exeunt ad
 173. actum; quicquid autem exit de potentia ad actum eget extractore,
 174. sicut dictum est in propositione XVIIIa. Palam autem est quod
 175. extractor ille fuit extractor in potentia, postea fuit in actu
 176. extractor, causa vero eius esse in potentia fuit propter aliquod
 177. impediens ex parte ipsius vel propter aliquam comparationem
 178. deficientem ante hoc inter ipsum et id quod extraxit. Cum autem
 179. inventa fuit illa comparatio, processit ad actum. Utrumque autem
 180. istorum exigit omnibus modis extractorem vel remotorem
 181. impediens omnibus modis. Idem etiam dicendum est in
 182. extractore secundo vel remotore impediens Hoc autem non
 183. procedit in infinitum et non potest esse, quin perveniatur ad
 184. extractorem de potentia ad actum qui semper sit uno et eodem
 185. modo, et nullo modo sit potentia in eo, scilicet ut non sit aliquid
 186. in substantia eius in potentia; quoniam si fuerit in illius substantia
 187. possibilitas erit deficiens aliquando, sicut dictum est in
 188. propositione XXIIIa. Et vanitas est ut iste attineat materiae, sed
 189. est abstractus, sicut dictum est in propositione XXIV. Abstractus
 190. vero in quo nulla est possibilitas omnino, sed est ens in sua
 191. substantia, ipse est creator. Et demonstratum est quod non est
 192. corpus, quod si ita est, unus est, sicut dictum est in propositione
 193. XVIa. Omnes autem istae viae sunt super quibus venit
 194. demonstratio super essentia creatoris unius qui nec est corpus
 195. nec potentia in corpore cum credulitate antiquitatis mundi. In

| 167 nec: est *add.* C | 168 vero: autem KL | mera: vera K; B *man. sec. mutav.*
 mere *in* naturae | 169 provenit: pervenit AL | sibi: scilicet L | simile: mera *add.*
 B | causae: esse E | ex: in L | 170 si: *om.* E | 172 videmus: viderimus E | quae
 sunt: *inv.* E | 173 quicquid: quiquid B | autem: aut K | ad actum: *om.* L | extrac-
 tore: extractore: C | 175 postea fuit: *om.* E | 175-176 in actu extractor: extractor
 in actu KL; *om.* L | 176 extractor: *om.* E | causa: cum K | in: veri E | propter:
 per E | 177 impediens: impertinens L | propter: per E | comparationem: oper-
 ationem L | 178 ante: *om.* E | 180 istorum: ipsorum B | modis: *om.* A | 183 in:
om. B | 185 scilicet ut: cum E | 186 in potentia *om.* E | quoniam: *om.* K | si: *om.*
 L | 187 est: *om.* C | 188 est: *om.* C | iste: ille K | 189 sicut: ut KL | dictum est:
 dicitur E | 190-191 sua substantia: *inv.* K | 192 sicut: secundum quod C | 193
 istae: ille K | viae: materiae KL | 194 qui: quasi L | 195 in corpore: *om.* C |

196. hoc etiam est via probata super remotione corporeitatis et
 197. assertione unitatis. Si enim essent duo dii, sequeretur necessario
 198. quod haberent aliquid commune in quo participarent, per quod
 199. uterque eorum est deus; haberent etiam alia, propter quae sunt
 200. diversi, et ita duo sunt. Quoniam cum in utroque sit aliquid quod
 201. non est in altero, erit uterque eorum compositus ex duobus.
 202. Quod si ita est, neuter eorum est causa prima nec necesse esse in
 203. probatione nostra suae substantiae, sed uterque illorum habet
 204. causas, sicut ostensum est in propositione XIXa. Si vero causa
 205. diversitatis fuerit in altero illorum, erit ille in quo sunt duo non
 206. necesse esse in sua substantia.
 207. Via altera in ratione unitatis. Demonstratum est autem quod
 208. omnia entia sunt quasi unum corpus cuius pars coniungitur
 209. alteri, et quod virtus caeli diffunditur in materiam istam
 210. inferiorem, et aptat ei virtutes suas. Cum hoc ergo non potest
 211. astrui quod unus deus sit separatus in altera parte entium et quod
 212. deus secundus sit separatus in altera parte, quoniam una pars
 213. colligationem habet cum altera. Quod si ita est, non remanet in
 214. hac participatione nisi ut unus sit operator in una hora reliquus
 215. vero in altera, vel quod ambo operentur simul semper in eadem
 216. hora, ita quod nullum opus perficiatur nisi ab ambobus simul.
 217. Quod autem unus operetur in una hora reliquus in altera, hoc est
 218. vanitas multis de causis. Quoniam si tempus in quo unus eorum
 219. operatur fuerit possibile ut alter operetur in ipso, quae est causa
 220. quare unus operatur et alter quiescit? Quod si fuerit impossibile
 221. ut alter operetur in tempore in quo reliquus operatur, erit alia
 222. causa quae facit alterum operari, et dat alteri impossibilitatem
 223. operandi; tunc, quoniam in tempore non est ista diversitas, res
 224. etiam quae aptae sunt ut operentur in illis, sunt colligate inter se,
 225. sicut exposuimus. Uterque etiam ipsorum erit sub tempore

| 198 aliquid: aliquod EKL | per: propter L | 199 etiam: et C | 200 cum: si L |
 201 erit uterque eorum: *rep. et cancell.* A | 202 quod: et L | causa prima: *inv.* A
 | necesse esse: est C | esse: *om.* A | 203 nostra: nostrae K: *cancell.* L | sed uterque
 illorum: *rep. et cancell.* C | 204 XIXa: XXXa E | 205 duo: duae A | 206 esse: in
 quo sunt duo *add. et cancell.* L | 207 Probatio quod unus sit Deus (via altera)
add. E | autem: *om.* A | 208 sunt: *om.* KL | 209 virtus: videtur AE | 210 hoc: *om.*
 C | hoc ergo: *inv.* L | 211 altera: aliqua EKL | 211-212 entium ... parte: *om.* A |
 213 si: *om.* KL | 215 semper: *om.* C | 217 operetur: operatur A | reliquus: alter
 L; reliquo C | 218 multis: istis L | eorum: illorum L | 219 possibile: impossibile
 E | 219-221 in ... operetur: *om.* A | 220 quare: quaerere EK | operatur: opere-
 tur E | impossibile: possibile L | 221 ut: quod EL | 222 dat alteri: *inv.* AKL |
 223 in tempore non est: non est in tempore A | ista: illa KL | 224 etiam: et A;
 autem E | illis: aliis E | inter: intra E | 225 uterque: *om.* AKL | erit: exit E; de
 potentia ad actum *add. et cancell.* E |

226. quoniam eius operatio adhiberet tempori; praeterea uterque
 227. illorum exit de potentia ad actum in hora in qua operatur, et
 228. uterque indigebit aliquo qui extrahat ipsum de potentia ad
 229. actum, et in substantia utriusque erit possibilitas. Quod autem
 230. ambo sint operatores semper omnium eorum quae sunt, ita quod
 231. neuter sine reliquo aliquid operetur, hoc etiam est vanitas, sicut
 232. dicam: quoniam generaliter nullum opus perficietur nisi ex
 233. coniunctione amborum; quod si ita est, neuter eorum est
 234. operator cum intelleximus substantiam eius, et neuter eorum est
 235. causa prima illi operi, sed causa prima est coniunctio illorum.
 236. Demonstratum est autem iam quod necesse esse necessario non
 237. habet causam. Praeterea, coniunctio amborum ad unum opus est
 238. propter aliam causam quam coniungit ambos, quae si fuerit talis
 239. sine qua non possit perfici opus, est unum, et hoc est creator sine
 240. dubio. Quod si fuerit alia coniunctio causa istius coniunctionis,
 241. erit alius coniunctor, et ita necesse est omnibus modis ut
 242. perveniatur finaliter ad unum quod est causa esse huius mundi
 243. qui est unus, quolibet modo: sive in eo quod incepit esse
 244. postquam non fuit, sive ex parte necessitatis quod unum
 245. perveniat ex alio. Patet igitur iam tibi per viam istam quod unitas
 246. universitatis demonstrat unitatem factoris sui.
 247. Via altera in remotione corporeitatis. Omne corpus est
 248. compositum, sicut demonstratum est in propositione XXIIa, et
 249. omne compositum habet operatorem omnino qui est causa
 250. existentie forme suae in sua materia. Explanatum est etiam bene
 251. quod omne corpus est receptibile divisionis et habet extremitates,
 252. et est locus accidentium sine dubio. Quod si ita est, corpus non
 253. est unus, nec secundum partitionem nec secundum
 254. compositionem et necessario est unum et aliud. Probatum est
 255. autem quod necesse esse nullam habet compositionem omnino.
 256. Postquam autem probationes istas praemisi, incipiam depurare
 257. viam nostram secundum quod promisi.

| 227 illorum: *om.* L | 227-228 potentia ... de: *om.* E | 228 uterque: *om.* KL | 229
 erit: est L | 230 ambo: *om.* A | sint: sunt K | semper: *om.* KL | 231 aliquid: *om.* A
 | aliquid operetur: *inv.* KL | etiam: *om.* AL | 233 quod: et L | 234 cum: si L |
 intelleximus: intellexerimus AEK | eius: ipsius CEKL | 235 causa prima: *inv.* C |
 236 autem: *om.* AL | non: *om.* K | 237 est: *om.* E | 238 aliam: illam C | quam: quae
 CK | quae: quam A; qui E | 239 possit: potest L | creator: omnino *add.* L | 241
 alius: alicuius L | 242 finaliter ad unum: ad unum finaliter L | quod: qui CEKL;
 quae L | est: esset L | esse: essentiae C | 243 incepit: incipit E | 245 perveniat:
 proveniat L | alio: altero L | igitur: ergo EL | iam: *om.* L | quod: quam C | 247-
 248 est compositum: *inv.* K | 250 est etiam: *inv.* E; est autem L | bene: et *add.* C
 | 253 nec (1): neque CE | partitionem: participationem K | nec (2): neque EK |
 255 compositionem: comperationem L | 257 viam: *om.* A |

Liber II, 18

1. Omne novum scito quod est generatum postquam non fuit, licet
2. eius materia fuerit ens, sed spoliatur una forma et induit alteram,
3. natura vero novi post novitatem suam et perfectionem et quietem,
4. est alia quam natura ipsius quae fuit in hora generationis et
5. inceptionis suae ad exeundum de potentia ad actum. Et fuit alia a
6. natura quam habuit antequam moveretur ad exeundum de
7. potentia ad actum. Verbi gratia, natura seminis feminei dum est
8. sanguis in matrice, est alia quam ipsius natura in hora conceptionis
9. cum miscetur cum spermate virili. Cum vero incipit moveri, est
10. ipsius natura alia quam natura animalis perfecti cum nascitur.
11. Nullo autem modo debet sumi probatio de natura rei post esse
12. suum perfectum in fine perfectionis dispositionum suarum ad
13. eandem rem in hora sui motus ad exeundum ad generationem, nec
14. accipietur probatio de modo existentiae suae in hora motus sui
15. super modo existentiae antequam incipiat moveri. Si autem
16. erraveris et volueris accipere probationem de natura rei existentis
17. in actu super eiusdem naturam cum est in potentia, orientur tibi
18. multae dubitationes, et auferentur de sensu tuo quaedam quae
19. necesse est esse, et consequenter quaedam nugatoria.
20. Adhibe consensum in similitudine quam proponemus: Homo
21. quidam valde perfectus in creatione natus est, cuius mater mortua
22. est postquam lactavit eum per aliquot menses. Laboraverunt autem
23. aliqui ut perficerent eius nutrituram in quadam insula, per quam
24. nullus homo transibat, donec crevit et intellexit et scivit. Ipse vero
25. nunquam vidit mulierem nec aliam feminam cuiuscumque generis.
26. Postea vero quaesivit a quodam de assistentibus sibi, quomodo
27. fuimus facti, et qualiter fuimus creati. Responsum est ei ab assistente
28. in hunc modum: singularis homo fit in ventre alterius singularis
29. nostrae speciei quod vocatur femina, et est talis et talis formae, et
30. singulare dum est in ventre parvae quantitatis est, et movetur, et
31. nutrietur, et crescit paulatim, et vivit, donec pervenit ad terminum

| 4 alia: aliam B | 5 suae: *om.* KL | potentia: potencia B | 7 seminis feminei: *inv.* KL | 9 miscetur: *cummiscetur* K; *cummisceretur* L | incipit: *inceptit* KL | 10 natura (2): non K | 11 sumi: *summi* BL | 14-15 in ... existentiae: *om.* C | 17 eiusdem: eius KL | naturam: natura BL | cum: si L | tibi: sibi B | 19 consequenter: *consequuntur* K | 20 similitudine: *similitudinem* C | 22 eum: *om.* B | aliquot: *aliquos* KL | autem: *om.* B | 23 per: post E | 24 crevit: *creavit* L | 25 cuiuscumque: *cuiuscunq* BC; *cuiusque* KL | 26 assistentibus: *asistentibus* L | 27 fuimus (2): *sumus* C | 28 modum: *mundum* L | singularis homo: *singulis* hoc L | 30 parvae: parte C | 31 crescit: *crevit* L |

32. quantitatis diffinitae.
 33. Tunc autem aperitur porta in fine corporis, et exit inde, et crevit
 34. postea donec perficitur, sicut tu vides. Orphanus autem ille quaeret
 35. instanter, sic: Istud singulare nostrae speciei, quando erat in ventre
 36. matris et vivebat, et movebatur, et crescebat, et comedebat, et
 37. bibebat, et inspirabat per os et nares, et egerbat? Responderetur
 38. ei: Non. Ipse vero festinanter contradixit huic responsioni,
 39. inducens probationes super omnia ista quae vera sunt, quod sunt
 40. impossibilia, accipiendo probationem suam de ente perfecto, et
 41. dixit: Video quod omne singulare nostrae speciei cum non inspirat
 42. vel respirat, modico tempore morietur, et destruentur motus eius.
 43. Quomodo ergo ascendit in cor alicuius quod homo singularis sit in
 44. vase undique clauso et duret ibi per aliquot menses vivens et
 45. mobile? Praeterea si fortassis aliquis nostrum transglutiret passerem
 46. vivum, moreretur ipse passer statim cum intraret in stomachum;
 47. quanto magis in matrice, quae est inferior? Item quilibet singularis
 48. homo si non comederit et non biberit ore suo, in modico tempore
 49. morietur. Postquam ergo ita est, quomodo durabit illud singulare
 50. animal multis mensibus, nec manducans nec bibens? Quilibet etiam
 51. singularis homo si cibetur et non egerat, in parvo tempore
 52. morietur, invalescentibus aegritudinibus. Quomodo ergo vivet illud
 53. singulare tot mensibus, si non diverterit ad requisita naturae? Item,
 54. si perforaretur venter alicuius hominis, moreretur in non multis
 55. diebus. Quomodo ergo credit aliquis quod umbilicus istius nati fuit
 56. apertus, quomodo etiam non aperuit oculos suos et non expandit
 57. manus suas, nec extendit pedes membris suis, omnibus existentibus
 58. sanis, sicut dicitur. Haec ergo est opinio illius quam credit quod
 59. non contingit hominem creari secundum istum modum.

| 33 crevit: crescit CKL | 34 quaeret: quaerit K | 35 sic: hoc B | 36 et (4): *om.* BEL | 37 inspirabat: sputabat C; insputabat L | et (2): per *add.* CL | et (3): *om.* E | egerbat: regerebat K | responderetur: responderunt EK | 38 ipse: iste E | contradixit: contradicit CEKL | 39 omnia: eam C | quod: quae EL | 40 impossibilia: impossibilia B; in *add.* B | 41 dixit: dicit CL | cum: si L | 42 vel respirat: *om.* E | morietur: moriatur C; moritur KL | destruentur: destruuntur CK | 44 aliquot: aliquos CK | vivens: movens E | 46 moreretur: moriretur L | stomachum: stomacho BE; stomacho L | 48 non (1): *om.* C | comederit: comederet KL | non (2): *om.* KL | biberit: biberet KL | 49 morietur: moriretur L | ergo: igitur C | 50 nec (1): non | 51 cibetur: cebetur K | egerat: egerit C | 52 morietur: moreretur KL | 53 non: nunc C | 54 perforaretur: perforetur L | in non: *inv.* KL | 55 ergo: *om.* B | 56 non (1): *om.* L | aperuit: aperit CKL | 57 nec: et non CKL | extendit: existendit B | pedes: cum *add.* L | 58 sanis: *om.* E | quam: qui BEL | 59 contingit: convenit L | istum modum: *inv.* KL |

60. Nunc ergo pone cor tuum ad similitudinem istam, et meditare in
 61. ea, et inuenies quod ratio nostra cum Aristotele eodem modo se
 62. habet, quoniam nos qui credimus Moysi magistro nostro, et
 63. Abrahae patri nostro, credimus quod mundus fuit creatus
 64. secundum talem et talem formam, et quiddam fuit factum ex alio,
 65. et quaedam creata post alia. Aristoteles vero volens destruere fidem
 66. nostram, inducit probationes contra nos de natura entis perfecti in
 67. actu, de quo concedimus quod post statum suum ad quod
 68. perfectionem non assimilatur in aliquo ei quod erat in hora
 69. creationis, quia est post privationem absolutam.
 70. Quod autem ratio de universitate rationum suarum firmabitur
 71. contra nos, illa vero sequeretur concedenti, quod natura huius esse
 72. quoddam modo est, demonstrat super esse suae renovationis. Nunc
 73. autem revertar, et dicam radicem viarum suarum, et ostendam tibi
 74. qualiter non obligant nos in aliqua re in eo quod dicimus, quod
 75. mundum universum creavit Deus post privationem, et fecit ipsum
 76. donec perfectus est, sicut vides. Dixit Aristoteles quod materia
 77. prima nec est generabilis nec corruptibilis, et induxit probationem
 78. super hoc de rebus generabilibus et corruptibilibus, et ostendit
 79. impossibilitatem suae generationis, et hoc idem verum est. Non
 80. enim dicimus quod materia prima est facta sicut fit homo ex
 81. spermate, neque corrumpitur sicut homo qui convertitur in
 82. pulverem, sed dicimus quod Creator fecit eam esse de nichilo, et
 83. est sicut eam fecit esse, quoniam ex ipsa facta sunt omnia, et in eam
 84. corrumpitur quicquid est generatum ex ipsa, nec inuenies eam
 85. nudam a forma, et usque ad ipsam pervenit generatio et corruptio.
 86. Ipsa vero non generatur sicut illud quod generatur ex ea neque
 87. corrumpitur sicut illud quod corrumpitur in ipsam, sed est creata et
 88. non de aliqua re, et cum voluerit Creator ipsius faciet ipsam non
 89. esse privatione perfecta et absoluta. Eodem modo dicemus de
 90. motu, quia ipse accepit probationem de natura motus, quod est nec

| 61 ratio nostra: *inv.* E | cum Aristotele: crearet *cancell.* E, causarum E | 63 fuit
 creatus: *inv.* KL | 64 alio: quo K | 67 ad quod: atque CEKL | 68 assimilatur: assim-
 ilata E | 70 quod: quae CL | 71 sequeretur: sequerentur CKL | huius: his L | 72
 quoddam: quod BEKL | 73 et (1): inducam *add.*, *cancell.* E | viarum suarum: *inv.* L
 | 76 sicut: ut L | Aristoteles: supra eodem Liber tertio *inser.* E | 77 nec (1): non C
 | induxit: inducit L | 78 hoc: haec E | generabilibus et corruptibilibus: *inv.* L | 79
 impossibilitatem: impossibilitate K | verum: dictum L | 80 dicimus: nos *add.* BE |
 82 dicemus: dicimus EL | eam: *om.* KL | nichilo: nullo K; nihilo L | 83 eam fecit:
inv. KL | in eam: meam K | 84 quicquid: quidquid K | 86 ea: illa L | neque: nec L
 | 88 re: *om.* KL | 89 privatione: privationem B | 90 quod: qui E | est nec: *inv.* KL |

91. generabilis nec corruptibilis, quod quidem est verum.
92. Nos enim dicimus quod postquam motus est ens huius naturae in
93. qua est, non ascendit in cor quod sit generabilis et corruptibilis
94. generatione et corruptione universali, sicut generatio motuum
95. particularium, et corruptio ipsorum, et haec est opinio in omni eo
96. quod sequitur naturam motus. Eodem modo se habet res in motu
97. circulari qui non habet initium, et hoc est verum post esse corporis
98. sphaerici, quod movetur circulariter, et non ascendit in cor quod
99. similiter in motu eius sit principium. Similiter dicemus in
100. possibilitate quae debet praecedere in omni generato quod non
101. est adiuncta nisi in natura huius entis, in quo quicquid generatur,
102. generatur ex aliquo ente. Quod autem creatur ex privatione non
103. est aliquid nec in sensu, nec in intellectu propter quod sit aliqua
104. possibilitas ante illud. Sic etiam dicimus in generatione
105. coelorum, quod non est in eis contrarietas, et hoc verum est. Sed
106. nos non credimus quod coeli facti sunt sicut homo vel equus, et
107. non credimus quod suam compositionem sequatur corruptio,
108. sicut in plantis et animalibus propter contrarietatem quae in ipsis
109. est. Fundamentum autem rationis est quod diximus quod modus
110. existentiae entis perfecti non demonstrat super modo existentiae
111. suae ante perfectionem eius. Nec est inconueniens aliquid
112. secundum nos in eo quod dicitur quod coeli fuerunt facti
113. antequam terra, vel terra antequam coeli, vel quod coeli fuerunt
114. sine stellis, vel aliqua species animalium sine aliis speciebus,
115. quoniam ista fuerunt in tempore generationis omnium istorum,
116. sicut in omni animali prius generatur cor quam testiculi, sicut
117. oculis contingit videre, et nervi generantur antequam ossa,
118. quamvis post suam perfectionem non invenitur unum membrum
119. sine aliis, sine quibus homo non debet esse. Haec omnia
120. necessaria sunt cum accipitur Scriptura secundum suum planum,

| 91 generabilis: generabile L | corruptibilis: corruptibile L | quod: et E | 92 nos: non BE | enim: *om.* E; vero KL | 94 et: vel BE | 95 haec: *om.* E | 97 initium: initium B | 98 et: *om.* BE | in: super KL | 99 similiter (1): quod *add.* B; *om.* KL | 100 generato: generatio B | 101 quicquid: quidquid K | 103 in (2): *om.* B | 104 possibilitas: potestas B | 105 verum est: *inv.* KL | 106 non: *om.* BE | vel: et EKL | equus: equus B | et: nos *add.* KL | 108 plantis: planetis KL | et: *om.* E; in *add.* EKL | 109 diximus: scilicet in principio huius capituli *inser.* E | modus: motus KL | 111 inconueniens: conueniens C | 113 vel (1): et L | fuerunt: fuerint KL | 115 ista: illa KL | 117 contingit: conuenit K | generantur: generatur B | 118 invenitur: in *add.* E | 119 debet: dicit, *cancel.* L | 120 cum: si L | accipitur: accipiat L | suum planum: *inv.* L |

121. quamvis res ita se non habeat, sicut explanabo in
 122. agnominacionibus. Est autem necessarium tibi ut caveas in hac
 123. ratione, quia murus fortis est quem aedificavi circumcirca legem,
 124. quem munit ipsam ut prohibeat dampnum ab omni eo qui
 125. proiecerit lapidem ad illam.
 126. Si vero disputaverit contra nos Aristoteles ut sequamur
 127. sententiam ipsius, et dixerit ex quo non accipimus probationem
 128. ex hoc ente, quomodo scitis vos quod universum est ens creatum
 129. et generatum, et quod est alia natura quae creavit ipsum?
 130. Dicemus non obligamus nos in hoc secundum nostram
 131. quaestionem, quia non quaerimus modo astruere quod mundus
 132. est novus, sed quod quaerimus est possibilitas suae inceptionis, et
 133. non tollitur ista ratio in eo quod accipimus probationem de
 134. natura entium, cui nos non contradicimus. Cum autem firmata
 135. fuerit possibilitas rationis, sicut ostendimus, revertemur postea ad
 136. ponendam praeminentiam opinioni novitatis mundi.
 137. Nichil autem remansit in hac ratione quae inducit nobis
 138. dubitationem in possibilitate novitatis mundi, et non est de
 139. natura entium, sed de eo quod exigit intellectus in eo quod
 140. convenit Creatori. Ista tria sunt quae praemisimus, et quod ipsi
 141. inducunt probationem in antiquitate mundi, ex parte Creatoris.
 142. Nunc autem ostendam tibi viam dubitationum quae veniunt
 143. super ipsos, donec nulla demonstrationum ipsorum firmetur ullo
 144. modo in capitulo quod inducam.

| 121 ita se: *inv.* E | ita se non: non ita se K; ita non se L | 122 caveas: tibi *add.* CEKL | 124 quem: quae CEKL | ipsam: ipsum L | prohibeat: profugat L | dampnum: damnum L | qui: quod K | 127 accipimus: accepimus KL | 128 hoc ente: *inv.* C, *et corr.* | vos: *om.* E | quod: *om.* KL; hoc *add.* C | est ens: *inv.* BCKL | 133 ista: illa KL | accipimus: accepimus EKL | 136 opinioni: opinionis CK; opinionem E; *om.* L | nichil: nihil L | inducit: inducat BC | 141 Creatoris: creationis C | 142 nunc: sicut KL | autem: etiam L | ostendam: ostendamus C | veniunt: conveniunt B; venit L | 143 demonstrationum: dubiorum *add.* E | ipsorum: ipsarum KL |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Main Sources

- Index Thomisticus, *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis operum omnium indices et concordantiae in quibus verborum omnium et singulorum formae et lemmata cum suis frequentius et contextibus variis modis referuntur*, 56 volumes, R. Busa ed., Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 1974-1980.
- Moses Ben Maimon, *Dalālat al-Hā'irīn — Sefer Moreh Nevukhim*, Arabic original S. Munk, ed., Mossad HaRav Kook, Jerusalem 1929.
- , *Mishneh Torah*, Mossad HaRav Kook, Jerusalem.
- Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, English translation, S. Pines ed., The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1963.
- , *Le Guide des Égarés* ed., S. Munk, Paris 1856-66.
- Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon, *Moreh Ha-Nevukhim*, Hebrew version of R. Yehudah Al-Harizi ed., S. Munk, Mossad HaRav Kook, Jerusalem 1931.
- (Rambam), *Moreh Ha-Nevukhim*, Hebrew version of R. Samuel Ibn Tibbon, Mossad HaRav Kook, new rev. ed., Jerusalem 1987.
- Rabi Mossei Aegyptii, *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum, in tres Libros divisus, et summa accuratione Reuerendi patris Augustini Iustiniani ordinis Praedicatorii Nebiensium Episcopi recognitus*, Paris 1520. reprinted by Minerva GmbH, Frankfurt 1964.
- Sancti Thomae Aquinatis, *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 2: *Commentaria in octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, Romae 1884.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 4-12: *Summa Theologiae*, Romae 1888-89, 1891-92, 1895-99, 1903-06.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 13-15: *Summa contra Gentiles*, Romae 1918, 1926, 1930.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 16: *Indices auctoritatum et rerum occurrentium in Summa Theologiae et Summa contra gentiles*, Romae 1948.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 13: *Appendix ad primum et secundum librum Summae S. Thomae de Aquino contra Gentiles in quo textus autographi Vaticani a prima sua forma usque ad ultimam integre reproducitur (Deleta contra Gentiles, I-II)*, R. Garroni ed., Romae 1918, pp. 3*-61*.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 14: *Appendix ad tertium librum Summae S. Thomae de Aquino contra Gentiles in quo textus autographi Vaticani a prima sua forma usque ad ultimam integre reproducitur (Deleta contra Gentiles, III)*, R. Garroni ed., Romae 1926.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 22: *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, Romae, 1975-1970-1972-1976.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 42: *Compendium theologiae seu Brevis compilatio theologiae ad fratrem Raynaldum*, Romae 1979, pp. 5-191.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 42: *Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 108 articulis*, Romae 1979, pp. 259-294.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 43: *De aeternitate mundi*, Romae 1976, pp. 49-89.
- , *Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, t. 50: *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, Commissio Leonina-Éditions Du Cerf (Roma-Paris 1992), pp. 1-230.

- Sancti Thomae Aquinatis, *Opera omnia*, t. 6: *Commentum in primum librum Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*, P. Fiaccadori ed., Parmae 1856, pp. 1-380.
- , *Opera omnia*, t. 6: *Commentum in secundum librum Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*, P. Fiaccadori ed., Parmae 1856, pp. 381-791.
- , *Scriptum super Sententiis magistri Petri Lombardi*, t. 3, M.F. Moos ed., P. Lethielleux, Parisiis 1956.
- , *Scriptum super Sententiis magistri Petri Lombardi*, t. 4, M.F. Moos ed., P. Lethielleux, Parisiis 1947.
- , *Opera omnia*, t. 7/2: *Commentum in quartum librum Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*, ed. P. Fiaccadori (Parmae 1858), pp. 872-1259.
- , *Opera omnia*, t. 14: *In Psalmos Davidis expositio*, ed. P. Fiaccadori, Parmae 1863, pp. 148-312.
- , *Opuscula theologica*, t. 2: *In Symbolum Apostolorum, scilicet "Credo in Deum" expositio*, ed. R.M. Spiazzi, Marietti-Taurini, Romae 1953, pp. 191-217.
- , *Quaestiones disputatae*, t. 2: *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia*, P.M. Pession ed., Marietti-Taurini, Romae 1970.
- , *In duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis expositio*, M.R. Cathala and R.M. Spiazzi eds., Marietti-Taurini, Romae 1971.
- , *Super Epistolas S. Pauli lectura*, t. 2: *Super Epistolam ad Ephesios lectura*, R. Cai ed., Marietti-Taurini, Romae 1953, pp. 1-87.
- , *Opera omnia*, VII: *Commentum in Lib. I Sententiarum*, S. Fretté et P. Maré ed. Vivès, Parisiis 1882.
- , *Opera omnia cum hypertextibus in CD-ROM auctore Roberto Busa S.J.*, Editoria Elettronica Editel, Milano 1992.

Secondary Sources

- Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum, vol. I, B.M. Reichert ed., *Monumenta ordinis fratrum praedicatorum historica*, 3. Typ. Polyg, S.C. De Propaganda Fide, Romae 1898.
- Acta Capitulum Provincialium Provinciae Romanae (1243-1344), T. Kaepelli and A. Dondaine eds., *Monumenta ordinis fratrum praedicatorum historica*, 20, Apud Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, Romae 1941.
- Alberti Magni, *Super Dionysium De divinis nominibus*, in *Opera omnia* 37/1, P. Simon ed., Aschendorff, Monasterii Westfalorum in Aedibus 1972.
- , *Super Dionysii Epistulas: Epistula septima*, in *Opera omnia*, 37/2, P. Simon ed., Aschendorff, Monasterii Westfalorum in Aedibus 1978.
- Aristotelis *Metaphysica*, Edición Trilingüe por Valentin García-Yebra, Gredos, Madrid 1987.
- Bernardus Guidonis, *Vita sancti Thomae Aquinatis*, D. Prümer ed., *Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, 3, *Revue Thomiste*, Supplement, Toulouse.
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, I, H. Denifle and A. Chatelain eds., Romae 1899. Reprinted in *Culture et Civilisation*, Bruxelles 1964.
- Matthaei Parisiensis, monachi Sancti Albani, *Chronica majora*, vol. 4: A.D. 1240 to A.D. 1247. H.R. Luard ed. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages*, 57. Trübner, London 1877.
- Monetae Cremonensis, *Summa Adversus Catharos et Valdenses*, P. Fr. Thomas and A. Ricchini O.P. eds., Rome 1743.
- Petrus de Tarantasia, *Innocentii quinti pape qui antea Petrus de Tarantasia dicebatur In IV libros Sententiarum Commentaria* (Tolosae 1561-1562). Reprinted by Gregg Press, Ridgewood, New Jersey 1964.

- Ptolemaeus Lucensis, *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, Critical edn. by A. Dondaine, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 31 (1961).
- Stephanus de Salaniaco, Bernardus Guidonis, *De quatuor in quibus Deus Praedicatorum Ordinem insignivit*, Th. Kaeppli ed., *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica*, 22. Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, Romae 1949, p. xlv.
- Talmud Bavli, English translation. The Schottenstein Edition, Mesorah Publications, New York 1990-1994.

Scholarly Literature

- Alarcón Moreno, E., "Una cuestión de método. Consideraciones previas a la interpretación de Santo Tomás de Aquino," in *Estudios en honor del Prof. Jesús Arellano en su LXX Aniversario II. Thémata* 10, Sevilla 1992, pp. 387-401.
- , *Evolución léxica y cronología del Corpus Tomista*. Doctoral Dissertation Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona 1998.
- Altmann, A., "Essence and Existence in Maimonides," in *Maimonides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, J.A. Buijs ed., Notre Dame University Press, Notre Dame 1988, pp. 148-165.
- Bertola, E., "Tommaso d'Aquino e il problema dell'eternità del mondo," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, 66 (1974), pp. 312-355.
- , "Mosè Maimonide e Tommaso d'Aquino di fronte alla prova razionale della esistenza di Dio," in *Aquinas and the Problems of His Day*, G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst eds., Leuven University Press, M. Nijhoff, Leuven, The Hague 1976, pp. 92-100.
- Bogliolo, L., *Essere e conoscere*, Studi Tomistici, 21, Pontificia Accademia di S. Tommaso, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1983.
- Booth, E., *Aristotelian Aporetic Ontology in Islamic and Christian Thinkers*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983.
- Boyle, J.F., "The Ordering of Trinitarian Teaching in Thomas Aquinas' Second Commentary on Lombard's *Sentences*," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, Supplementa, vol. 1: *Thomistica*, E. Manning ed., Leuven 1995, pp. 125-136.
- Boyle, L.E., "Alia lectura fratris Thome," *Mediaeval Studies* 45 (1983), pp. 418-429.
- , "The Setting of the Summa Theologiae of Saint Thomas," in *The Etienne Gilson Series*, Lecture 5, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 1982.
- Brody, H., "Poems of Meshullam b. Solomon Da Pierra" (in Hebrew), *Yedeot ha-Mahon le-Heker ha-Shira ha-Ivrit*, IV, 1938.
- Buijs, J.A., "The Philosophical Character of Maimonides' Guide — A Critique of Strauss' Interpretation," *Judaism* 27 (1978), pp. 448-457. Reprinted in *Maimonides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, J.A. Buijs ed., Notre Dame University Press, Notre Dame 1988, pp. 59-70.
- Burrell, D.B., *On Knowing the Unknowable God: Ibn Sina, Maimonides, Aquinas*, University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana 1986.
- , "Aquinas and Maimonides: A Conversation About Proper Speech," *Immanuel*, 16 (1983), pp. 70-85.
- , "Aquinas' Debt to Maimonides," in *A Straight Path. Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture, Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 1988, pp. 37-48.
- , *Freedom and Creation in Three Traditions*, University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana 1993.

- Busa, R., "Introduzione alla bibliografia, agli indici e lessici tomistici," in *Sussidi lessicali e bibliografici per lo studio di San Tommaso* I, C. Giacon ed., *Seminarium*, 29 (1977), pp. 922-958.
- Casciaro, J.M., "Santo Tomás ante sus fuentes (estudio sobre la II-II, q. 173, a. 3)," *Scripta Theologica*, VI/1, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona 1974, pp. 11-65.
- Chenu, M.-D., "Le dernier avatar de la théologie orientale en Occident au XIII^e siècle," in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer*, Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, Louvain 1947, pp. 159-181.
- , *La Théologie au douzième siècle*. Vrin, Paris 1957.
- , "L'homme, la nature, l'esprit. Un avatar de la philosophie grecque en Occident, au XIII^e siècle," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, vol. 44, 1969, pp. 123-130.
- Clarke, W.N., "The Role of Essence Within St. Thomas' Essence-Existence Doctrine: Positive or Negative Principle? A Dispute Within Thomism," in: *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario. Atti del Congresso Internazionale (Roma-Napoli, 17-24 aprile 1974)*, Studi Tomistici 6. Edizioni Domenicane Italiane, Napoli 1977, pp. 109-115.
- Dahan, G., *Les intellectuels Chrétiens et les Juifs au Moyen Âge*, Du Cerf, Paris 1990.
- De Contenson, P.M., "Avicennisme latin et vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle," *Archives d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Âge*, 34 (1959), pp. 29-97.
- , "La théologie de la vision de Dieu au début du XIII^e siècle. Le 'De retributionibus sanctorum' de Guillaume de Auvergne et la condamnation de 1241," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 46, no. 2 (1962), pp. 409-444.
- Decker, B., "Die Analyse des Offenbarungsvorganges beim hl. Thomas im Licht vorthomistischer Prophetietraktate. Ein historischer Kommentar zu S. Theol., II^a-II^{ae}, q. 173, a. 2 (De Ver., q. 12, a. 7)," in *Angelicum* 16, Romae 1939, pp. 195-244.
- , *Die Entwicklung der Lehre von der prophetischen Offenbarung, von Wilhelm von Auxerre bis zu Thomas von Aquin*. Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie. N.F., 7, Müller-Seifert, Breslau 1940, xv.
- Dienstag, J., "St. Thomas Aquinas in Maimonidian Scholarship," in: *The Monist* 58, La Salle, Illinois, Jan. 1974, 104-118.
- , *Studies in Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas*, Ktav Publishing House, Jerusalem 1975.
- Diesendruck, Z., "On the date of the completion of the Moreh Nebukim," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XII-XIII, Cincinnati 1937-1938, pp. 461-497.
- Dobbs-Weinstein, I., *Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Limits of Reason*, State University of New York Press, New York 1995.
- Dondaine, A., "Hugues de Saint Cher et la condamnation de 1241," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 33 (1949), pp. 170-174.
- , "Saint Thomas a-t-il disputé à Rome la question des Attributs Divins? (I Sent., dist. 2, qu. 1, art. 3)," *Bulletin Thomiste* 3 (Avril-Juin 1933) Notes et communications, pp. 171*-182*.
- , "Saint Thomas et la dispute des Attributs Divins (I Sent., d. 2, a. 3). Authenticité et origine," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 8 (1938), pp. 253-262.
- Dondaine, H.-F., "L'object et le 'medium' de la vision béatifique chez les théologiens du XIII^e siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 19 (1952), pp. 60-99.
- , "Cognoscere de Deo 'quid est'," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 22/1 (1955), pp. 72-78.

- , “Alia lectura fratris Thome? (Super I Sent.),” *Mediaeval Studies*, 42 (1980), pp. 308-339.
- , Preface to *Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 108 articulis*, in *Opera omnia sancti Thomae de Aquino*, 42, Rome 1979, pp. 263-294.
- Dunphy, W., “The Quinque Viae and Some Parisian Professors of Philosophy,” in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274-1974. Commemorative Studies II*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto 1974, pp. 73-104.
- , “Maimonides and Aquinas on Creation: A Critique of Their Historians,” in *Graceful Reason: Essays in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy presented to Joseph Owens*, L. Gerson ed., Toronto 1983, pp. 361-379.
- Elders, L.J., *The Philosophical Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters. Herausgegeben von Dr. Albert Zimmermann, Band XXVI, Brill, Leiden-New York 1990.
- Ewbank, M.B., “Diverse Orderings of Dionysius’s Triplex Via by St. Thomas Aquinas,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 52 (1990), pp. 82-109.
- Fabro, C., *La nozione metafisica di partecipazione secondo S. Tommaso D’Aquino* Milano 1939.
- , *Partecipazione e causalità secondo St. Tommaso d’Aquino*, Roma 1960.
- Fakhry, M., “The ‘Antinomy’ of the Eternity of the World in Averroes, Maimonides and Aquinas,” in: *Studies in Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas I*, Ktav Publishing House 1975, pp. 139-155. Reprinted from *Le Museon* 66 (1953), pp. 139-155.
- Fay, T.A., “The Problem of God-language in Thomas Aquinas: What Can and Cannot be Said,” *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, 69 (1977), pp. 385-391.
- Feldman, S., “A Scholastic Misinterpretation of Maimonides’ Doctrine of Divine Attributes,” *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 19 (1968), pp. 23-39.
- Franck, I., “Maimonides and Aquinas on Man’s Knowledge of God: A Twentieth-Century Perspective,” in *Maimonides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, J.A. Buijs ed., Notre Dame University, Indiana 1988, pp. 284-305.
- Geiger, L.B., *La participation dans la philosophie de St. Thomas d’Aquin*. Bibliothèque Thomiste XXIII, J. Vrin, Paris 1942.
- , “Être et agir dans la philosophie de St. Thomas,” *Philosophie et Spiritualité*, Paris 1963, pp. 159-181.
- Gilson, E., *Le Thomisme. Introduction a la philosophie de Saint Thomas d’Aquin*, 5th edn., Paris 1948. Translated and reprinted as: *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Random House, New York 1956.
- , “Maimonide et la philosophie de l’Exode,” *Mediaeval Studies*, 13 (1951), pp. 223-225.
- , *Being and Some Philosophers*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto 1952.
- , “Trois leçons sur le probleme de l’existence de Dieu,” *Divinitas*, 5 (1961), pp. 23-83.
- , *L’être et l’essence*, 2nd edn., J. Vrin, Paris 1972.
- González García, A.L., *Ser y participación. Estudio sobre la cuarta vía de Tomás de Aquino*, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra-Eunsa, rev. ed., Pamplona 1995.
- Guttman, J., “Guillaume d’Auvergne et la littérature juive,” *Revue des Études Juives* 18 (1889), pp. 243-250.
- , “Alexandre de Hales et le Judaïsme”, *Revue des Études Juives* 19 (1889), pp. 230-234.
- , *Das Verhältniss des Thomas von Aquino zum Judentum und zur jüdischen Literatur*, Gottingen 1891.

- Guttman, J., *Die Scholastik des Dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum*, Breslau 1902. Reprinted in Hildesheim, New York 1970.
- , “Der Einfluss der maimonidischen Philosophie auf das christliche Abendland,” in: *Moses ben Maimon. Sein Leben, seine Werke und sein Einfluss*, Band I, Leipzig 1908.
- Hankey, W.J., “The Place of the Proof for God’s Existence in the Summa Theologiae of Thomas Aquinas,” *The Thomist*, 46, pp. 370-393.
- , “Aquinas’ First Principle: Being or Unity?” *Dionysius*, 4 (1980), pp. 133-172.
- Harvey, W.Z., “How to Begin to Study the Guide of the Perplexed I, 1” (in Hebrew), *Daat* 21 (1988), pp. 5-23.
- , “A Third Approach to Maimonides’ Cosmogony-Prophetology Puzzle,” in: *Maimonides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, J.A. Buijs ed., Notre Dame 1988, pp. 71-88.
- , “Maimonides and Aquinas on Interpreting the Bible,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* LV, Jerusalem, New York 1988, pp. 60-77.
- , (with S. Harvey), “A Note on the Arabic Term ‘Anniyyah/’Aniyyah/’Inniyyah” (in Hebrew), *Iyyun* 38 (April 1989), pp. 167-171.
- , “Why Maimonides was Not a Mutakallim,” in *Perspectives on Maimonides. Philosophical and Historical Studies*, J.L. Kraemer ed., Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 105-114.
- , “Maimonides’ First Commandment, Physics, and Doubt,” in *Hazon Nahum*, J. Almon and G.S. Gorak eds., Yeshiva University, New York 1998, pp. 149-162.
- , “The Knowledge of God in Thomas Aquinas, Yehuda Romano and Hasdai Crescas” (in Hebrew) in *Me-romi le-Yerusalayim. Sefer Zikhron le-Yosef Baruch Sermoneta*, A. Ravitzky eds., Jerusalem 1998, pp. 223-238.
- , *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought, vol. 6, Amsterdam 1998.
- , “How Did Leo Strauss Paralyze the Research on the Guide of the Perplexed in the 20th Century” (in Hebrew) *Iyyun* 50, Jerusalem, October 2001, pp. 387-396.
- , “The Mishneh Torah as a Key to the Secrets of the Guide,” in *Me’ah She’arim. Studies in Medieval Jewish Spiritual Life in Memory of Isadore Twersky*, E. Fleischer et al. eds., The Hebrew University Magnes Press, Jerusalem 2001.
- Haskins, C.H., *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, Frederik Ungar eds., New York 1960.
- Herrera, R.A. “An Episode in Medieval Aristotelianism: Maimonides and St. Thomas on the Active Intellect,” *The Thomist*, 47, pp. 317-338.
- Hyman, A., “Maimonides’ Thirteen Principles,” in: *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, A. Altmann ed., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA 1967, pp. 119-144.
- , “Maimonides on Causality,” in: *Maimonides and Philosophy*, Y. Yovel and S. Pines eds., 1982, pp. 157-172.
- , *Philosophy in the Middle Ages: The Christian, Islamic and Jewish Traditions*, Hackett Publishers, Indianapolis 1983.
- , “Maimonides on Religious Language,” in: *Perspectives on Maimonides: Philosophical and Historical Studies*, J.L. Kraemer ed., Oxford 1991, pp. 175-191.
- Ivry, A.L., “Islamic and Greek Influences on Maimonides Philosophy,” in: *Maimonides and Philosophy*, Y. Yovel and S. Pines eds., 1982, pp. 139-156.
- Jenkins, J.J., *Knowledge and Faith in Thomas Aquinas*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK 1997.

- Joël, M., "Etwas über den Einfluss der jüdischen Philosophie auf die christliche Scholastik," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 9 (1860), pp. 205-217. Reprinted in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, Breslau 1876, pp. 69-83.
- , "Verhältniss Albert des Grossen zu Moses Maimonides," in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, Breslau 1876, pp. 1-48.
- Johnson, M.F., "Alia lectura fratris thome: A List of the New Texts of St. Thomas Aquinas found in Lincoln College, Oxford, ms. Lat 55," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 57 (1990), pp. 34-61.
- Jordan, M., "Modes of Discourse in Aquinas' Metaphysics," *The New Scholasticism*, 54 (1980), pp. 401-446.
- Kaufmann, D., "Der 'Führer' Maimûni's in der Weltliteratur," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, XI (1898), pp. 335-374.
- Kendzierski, L.H., "Maimonides' Interpretation of the 8th Book of Aristotle's Physics," *New Scholasticism*, 30 (1956), pp. 37-48.
- Kluxen, W., *Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte des lateinischen Moses Maimonides*, Köln 1951, Doctoral Dissertation.
- , "Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abenland als Beispiel einer Christlich-Jüdischen Begegnung. Rabbi Moyses, Liber de uno deo benedicto (Herausgegeben von W. Kluxen)," *Miscellanea Medievalia* 4, Berlin 1966, pp. 146-182.
- , "Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides," *Recherches de théol. anc. et méd.*, XXI (1954), pp. 23-50.
- , "Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism," in *Maimonides and Philosophy*, Y. Yovel and S. Pines eds., 1982, pp. 224-232.
- Knasas, J.F.X. "Thomistic Existentialism and the Proofs 'ex motu' at Contra Gentiles I, 13," *The Thomist*, 59, pp. 591-615.
- Koch, J., *Giles of Rome, Errores philosophorum*. Critical text with notes and introduction by J. Koch, English trans. J.O. Riedl, Milwaukee 1944.
- Kravitz, L.S., *The Hidden Doctrine of Maimonides' Guide for the Perplexed: Philosophical and Religious God-Language in Tension*, Lewiston 1988.
- Lachterman, D.R., "Maimonidean Studies 1950-1986: A Bibliography," in *Maimonidean Studies* 1 (1990), pp. 197-216.
- Lemaigre, B.M., "Perfection de Dieu et multiplicité des Attributs Divins. Pourquoi S. Thomas a-t-il inséré la dispute des Attributs Divins (I Sent., d. 2, q. 1, a. 3) dans son Commentaire des Sentences?" *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 50 (1966), pp. 198-227.
- Llano, A., *Metafísica y Lenguaje*, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra — Eunsa, Pamplona 1984.
- Lohr, C.H., *St. Thomas Aquinas' Scriptum super Sententiis: an Index of Authorities Cited*, Avebury Publishing, London 1980.
- Lottin, D.O., "Pierre de Tarentaise a-t-il remanié son Commentaire sur les Sentences?" in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, II (1930), pp. 420-433.
- Mandonnet, P., *Siger de Brabant et l'Averroïsme latin au XIII^{me} siècle*, 2nd ed., Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain 1908.
- , "Thomas d'Aquin, novice prêcheur, IV" *Revue Thomiste*, 30 (1925), pp. 510-515.
- Manekin, C.H., "Belief, Certainty, and Divine Attributes in the Guide of the Perplexed," *Maimonidean Studies*, 1 (1990), pp. 117-141.
- Martin, O.P. "Quelques premiers maîtres dominicains de Paris et d'Oxford," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 9 (1920), pp. 556-580.

- Masnovo, A., *Da Guglielmo d'Avvergne a S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, Milano 1945.
- Maurer, A., "St. Thomas on the Sacred Name 'Tetragrammaton'," *Mediaeval Studies*, 34 (1972), pp. 275-286.
- , "Maimonides and Aquinas on the Study of Metaphysics," in: *A Straight Path. Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture*, Essays in Honor of Arthur Hyman, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 1988, pp. 207-215.
- McInerny, R., *The Logic of Analogy*, Nijhoff, The Hague 1961.
- Millás Vallicrosa, J.M., *Las traducciones orientales en los manuscritos de la Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo*, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid 1942.
- Montagnes, B., *La doctrine de l'analogie et l'être d'après St. Thomas d'Aquin*, Louvain, Paris 1963.
- Orfali, M., *Biblioteca de autores lógicos hispano-judíos de los siglos XII-XIII*, Granada 1997.
- Owens, F., "Analogy as a Thomistic Approach to Being," *Mediaeval Studies*, 24 (1962), pp. 303-322.
- , "Aquinas and the Proof from the 'Physics'," *Mediaeval Studies*, 28 (1966), pp. 119-150.
- , "Actuality in the 'Prima Via' of St. Thomas," *Mediaeval Studies*, 29 (1967), pp. 26-46.
- , "'Cause of Necessity' in Aquinas' Tertia Via," *Mediaeval Studies*, 33 (1971), pp. 21-45.
- , "Aquinas and the Five Ways," *The Monist*, 58, La Salle, Illinois 1974, pp. 16-35.
- Pangallo, M., *Il principio di causalità nella metafisica di S. Tommaso*. Studi Tomistici 46, Città del Vaticano 1991.
- Pasnav, R., "Aquinas on Thought's Linguistic Nature," *The Monist*, 80/4 (1997), pp. 558-575.
- Penido, M.T.L., *Le rôle de l'analogie en théologie dogmatique*, Bibliothèque Thomiste XV, Paris 1931.
- Pera, C., *Le fonti del pensiero di S. Tommaso d'Aquino nella Somma Teologica*, 2nd edn., M.D. Chenu, C. Vansteenkiste. Marietti, 2nd edn., Torino 1979.
- Perles, J., *Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenen erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen "Führers"*, Breslau 1875.
- Pieper, J., *Guide to Thomas Aquinas*. University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana 1987.
- , *Belief and Faith*, Pantheon, New York 1963.
- Pines, S., "The Philosophic Sources of The Guide of the Perplexed," Translator's Introduction in *Moses Maimonides, The Guide of the Perplexed I*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1963, pp. lvii-cxxxvi.
- , "Les textes arabes dits plotiniens," *Le Néoplatonisme*, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 1971, pp. 305-317.
- , "Saint Thomas et la pensée juive Médiévale : quelques notations," in *Aquinas and the Problems of His Time*, G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst eds., Leuven University Press, M. Nijhoff, Leuven, The Hague 1976, pp. 118-129.
- , "Les limites de la métaphysique selon al-Fārābī, Ibn Bājjā et Maimonīde; sources et antithèses de ces doctrines chez Alexandre d'Aphrodise et chez Themistius," *Miscellanea Medievalia* 13/1 (1981), pp. 211-225. Translated and reprinted in *Maimonides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, J.A. Buijs ed., Notre Dame 1988, pp. 91-121.
- , "Dieu et l'être selon Maimonide: Exégèse d'Exode 3, 14 et doctrine connexe," *Celui qui est*, 28 (1986), pp. 15-24. Reprinted in *Studies in the History*

- of *Jewish Thought. The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines*, vol. V, W.Z. Harvey and M. Idel eds., Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1997, pp. 447-456.
- , “Le discours theologico-philosophique dans les oeuvres halachiques de Maimonide comparé avec celui du Guide des Égares,” *Deliverance et fidelité*, 31 (1987), pp. 119-124.
- , “Maïmonide et la philosophie latine,” in *Studies in the History of Jewish Thought. The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines*, vol. V, W.Z. Harvey and M. Idel eds., Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1997, pp. 393-403.
- Polo, L., *Curso de Teoría del Conocimiento*, vols. I-IV. Ediciones Universidad de Navarra — Eunsa-Pamplona. vol. I (1987); vol. II, 3rd edn. (1998); vol. III (1988); vol. IV/1 (1994); vol. IV/2 (1996).
- , *Nominalismo, Idealismo y Realismo*. Ediciones Universidad de Navarra — Eunsa, Pamplona 1997.
- Ravitzky, A., “The Secrets of the *Guide to the Perplexed*: Between the Thirteen and Twentieth Centuries,” *Studies in Maimonides I*, I. Twersky ed., Harvard University Press 1990, pp. 159-207.
- , “On the Study of Medieval Jewish Philosophy,” in *History and Faith. Studies in Jewish Philosophy*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought, Amsterdam 1996, pp. 3-21.
- , “Samuel Ibn Tibbon and the Esoteric Character of the Guide of the Perplexed,” in *History and Faith. Studies in Jewish Philosophy*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought, Amsterdam 1996, pp. 205-245.
- Rawidowicz, S., “Knowledge of God. A Study in Maimonides’ Philosophy of Religion,” School of Oriental Studies, University of London, London, pp. 78-121.
- , “Philosophy as a Duty,” in *Moses Maimonides. VIII Centenary Memorial Volume*, London 1935, pp. 177-188.
- Rigo, C., “Per un’identificazione del ‘sapiente cristiano’ Nicola da Giovinazzo, collaboratore di Rabbi Mosheh ben Shelomoh da Salerno,” *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 59, Roma 1999, pp. 61-146.
- , “Zur Rezeption des Moses Maimonides im Werk des Albertus Magnus,” in *Albertus Magnus, Zum Gedenken nach 800 Jahren: Neue Zugänge, Aspekte und Perspektiven*, H. Anzulewicz, M. Burger, R. Meyer, M. Nauert, P.C. Sicouly, and J. Söder eds., Springer-Verlag, Bonn 2001.
- Rohner, A., *Das Schöpfungsproblem bei Moses Maimonides, Albertus Magnus, und Thomas von Aquin*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Schöpfungsproblems im Mittelalter, Aschendorff, Münster 1913.
- Rubio, M., “‘Ratio’ y ‘lympparditas’ según Alberto Magno. Un análisis de la cuestión VII del manuscrito Vat. Lat. 781,” in: *Actes del Simposi Internacional de Filosofia de l’Edat Mitjana*, Patronat d’Estudis Osonencs, Serie “Actes” 1, Vic 1996, pp. 396-402.
- , *Los límites del conocimiento de Dios según Alberto Magno*. Cuadernos de Anuario Filosófico, 58, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona 1998.
- , “Maimonides’ Proofs for the Existence of God and their Aristotelian Background in the Guide of the Perplexed,” *Miscellanea Medievalia*, 26, Berlin, New York 1998, pp. 914-921.
- Sarachek, J., *Faith and Reason: The Conflict over the Rationalism of Maimonides*, Bayard Press (1935). Reprinted by Hermon Press, New York 1970.
- Saranyana, J.I., “A propósito de la Disputa de Barcelona de 1263 (la razón especulativa versus la fe teologal),” in: *Pensamiento medieval hispano. Homenaje a Horacio Santiago-Otero*, J.M. Soto Rábanos ed., Madrid 1998.

- Saranyana, J.I., *Filosofía y Teología en el Mediterráneo Occidental (1263-1490)*, Colección Historia de la Iglesia, 35. Eunsa, Pamplona 2003.
- Scheeben, H. Chr., "Accessiones ad Historiam Romanae Provinciae Saeculo XIII", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* IV, Romae 1934, pp. 99-144.
- Schwartz, Y., "Between Negation and Silence: Maimonides in the Latin West," (in Hebrew) *Iyyun* 65 (1996), pp. 389-406.
- Sermoneta, J., "The Commentaries of R. Moshe ben Shlomo of Salerno and Nicolas of Giovinazzo to the Guide of the Perplexed" (in Hebrew) *Iyyun* 20 (1969), pp. 212-240.
- , "Pour une histoire du Thomisme juif," in *Aquinas and the Problems of His Time*, G. Verbeke and D. Verhelst eds., Leuven University Press, M. Nijhoff Leuven, The Hague 1976, pp. 130-135.
- Silver, D.J., *Maimonidean Criticism and the Maimonidean Controversy 1180-1240*, Brill, Leiden 1965.
- Simon, S., *Mose ben Salomo von Salerno und seine philosophischen Auseinandersetzungen mit den Lehren des Christentums*, Breslau 1932. Doctoral Dissertation.
- Simonin, H.-D., "Les écrits de Pierre de Tarentaise," in *Beatus Innocentius PP. V (Petrus de Tarantasia O.P.)*, I. Inguanez ed., Studia et documenta. Typ. Polyg. Vaticanis, Roma 1943.
- Steinschneider, M., *Hebraische Bibliographie*, XVII, Berlin 1877.
- , *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher*, Berlin 1893.
- Strauss, L., "The Literary Character of the Guide of the Perplexed," in *Essays on Maimonides*. S. Wittmayer Baron ed., Columbia University Press, New York 1941, pp. 37-91.
- , "How to Begin to Study The Guide of the Perplexed," *Moses Maimonides, The Guide of The Perplexed I*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1963, pp. xi-lvi.
- Stubbens, N.A., "Naming God: Moses Maimonides and Thomas Aquinas," *The Thomist*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 229-267.
- Synave, P., "La révélation des vérités divines naturelles d'après Saint Thomas d'Aquin," in *Mélanges Mandonnet I, Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Âge*, Paris 1930, pp. 327-365.
- Théry, G., "Le Commentaire de Maître Eckhart sur le Livre de la Sagesse," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, vol. 3 (1928), pp. 321-443; vol. 4 (1929), pp. 233-394.
- Torrell, J.-P., *L'initiation à saint Thomas d'Aquin: sa personne et son oeuvre. Vestigia* 13, Éditions Universitaires de Fribourg – Du Cerf, Fribourg-Paris 1993. Translated and reprinted in: *Saint Thomas Aquinas*. The Catholic University of America, Washington DC 1996.
- , "La vision de Dieu per essentiam selon Saint Thomas D'Aquin," *Micrologus* 5 (1997), pp. 43-68.
- Vajda, G., *Introduction à la pensée juive du Moyen Âge*, J. Vrin, Paris 1947.
- Van Steenberghen, F., "Saint Thomas D'Aquin contre l'évidence de l'existence de Dieu," *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, 69 (1977), pp. 671-781.
- , *Le problème de l'existence de Dieu dans les écrits de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. Philosophes Médiévaux, 23. Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, Louvain-la-Neuve 1980.
- , *Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 1980.
- Vansteenkiste, P.C., "Autori arabi e giudei nell'opera di San Tommaso," *Angelicum*, 37 (1969), pp. 336-401.

- Weisheipl, J.A., *Friar Thomas D'Aquino: His Life, Thought, and Work*, New York 1974.
- , "Thomas d'Aquino and Albert his Teacher," in *The Etienne Gilson Series* 2, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 1980, pp. 1-21.
- Wicki, N., *Die Lehre von der himmlischen Seligkeit in der mittelalterliche Scholastik von Petrus Lombardus bis Thomas von Aquin*, *Studia Friburgensia* N.F. 9, Fribourg 1954.
- Wielockx, R., *Aegidii Romani Opera Omnia* III.1, Apologia. Leo S. Olschki ed., Firenze 1985.
- Wippel, J.F., "The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris," *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 7 (1977), pp. 169-201.
- , *The Metaphysical Thought of Godfrey of Fontaines: A Study in Late Thirteenth-Century Philosophy*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 1981.
- , "Thomas Aquinas on What Philosophers can Know about God," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 66 (1992), pp. 279-297.
- , "Thomas Aquinas and the Condemnation of 1277," *The Modern Schoolman* 72 (Jan.–March 1995), pp. 233-272.
- , "Mediaeval Reactions to the Encounter between Faith and Reason," Aquinas Lecture, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee 1995.
- , *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas. From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC 2000.
- Wohlman, A., *Thomas d'Aquin et Maimonide, un dialogue exemplaire*, Du Cerf, Paris 1988.
- , *Maimonide et Thomas d'Aquin, un dialogue impossible*. Freiburguer Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie, Band 16, Fribourg 1995.
- Wolfson, H.A., "Notes on Proofs of the Existence of God in Jewish Philosophy," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, I, Cincinnati 1924, pp. 575-596.
- , "The Amphibolous Terms in Aristotle, Arabic Philosophy and Maimonides," *Harvard Theological Review*, 31 (1938), pp. 173-151. Reprinted in *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, I. Twersky and G.H. Williams eds., Harvard University Press, Harvard, MA 1979, pp. 455-477.
- , "The Aristotelian Predicables and Maimonides' Division of the Attributes," in: *Essays and Studies in Memory of L.R. Miller*, New York 1938, pp. 201-234.
- , "The Kalam Arguments for Creation in Saadia, Averroes, Maimonides and St. Thomas," in: *Saadia Anniversary Volume*, The American Academy for Jewish Research, New York 1943, pp. 197-245.
- , "Maimonides on Negative Attributes," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume*, New York 1945, pp. 195-230. Reprinted in: *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, I. Twersky and G.H. Williams eds., Harvard University Press, Harvard, MA 1979, pp. 411-446.
- , "Maimonides and Gersonides on Divine Attributes as Ambiguous Terms," in *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume* (1953), pp. 515-530.
- , "St. Thomas on Divine Attributes," in: *Studies in Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas*, J. Dienstag ed., New York 1975. Reprinted from *Mélanges Offerts à Etienne Gilson*, J. Vrin, Paris 1959, pp. 673-700.
- , "Maimonides on Modes and Universals," in: *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, I. Twersky and G.H. Williams eds., Harvard University Press, Harvard, MA 1979, pp. 311-321.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abraham, 214
Alarcón, E., 9 10 13 19 22 25
 196 249
Albert the Great, 10 13 23 25 68
 98 121 271
Alexander of Hales, 24 270
Alfarabi, 3 122
Al-Harizi, Y., 12 111 122 271
 273-277
Anselm of Canterbury, 15 50 51
 52 240 241
Aquinas, Thomas, *passim*
Aristotle, *passim*
Augustine, St., 10 144 149 179
 185 197 200 202-205
Avempace: see Ibn Bajja
Averroes, 3 10 37 46 56 89 207
 223
Avicenna, 3 4 15 50 51 68 103
 111 120 123 223 240 241 242

Boethius, 183 171 242
Bombolognus of Bologna, 18
Boyle, J. F., 5 20 21 26 66
Boyle, L. E., 5 13 20
Brito, Bonhomme, 23
Brody, H., 1
Buijs, J. A. 2
Burrell, D., 4 8
Busa, R., 10
Buxtorf, J., 266

Chatelain, E., 23
Chenu, M.-D., 127
Commentator, the: see Averroes
Crescas, H., 3 130

D'Alverny, M., 122
Daniel, 199
David, 233
De Contenson, P. M., 26
Denifle, H., 23
Dionysius Areopagita, 15 25
 29 31 45 46 50 52 68 70
 74 83 89 95 96 200 218 229
 230
Dobbs-Weinstein, I., 4
Dondaine, A., 5 17 18 19 21
Dondaine, H.-F., 5 20, 21 22 24
 26 35 55
Dubois, M., 13

Eliezer, Rabbi, 114

Feldman, S., 4 5 66
Fiaccadori, P., 17
Florent of Hesdin, 23
Frederik II, Emperor, 270
Fretté, S. E., 17

García Gudiel, G., 272
Gilles of Rome, 18
Gilson, E., 3 8
González, A. L., 13
Gregory the Great, St., 203
Guttman, J., 270

Hannibald of Hannibaldis, 18
Harvey, S., 121
Harvey, W. Z., 2 3 13 121 130
 195 276 277
Haskins, C. H., 268 272
Honorius III, Pope, 269 270

- Hugh of St. Victor, 185
Hyman, A., 13
- Ibn Bajja, 3 207 267 273-277
Ibn Tibbon, S., 3 12 122 266
Innocent V, Pope : see Peter of
 Tarantasia
Isaiah, 82 196
- Jacob, 196 201
Jerome, St., 68
Job, 196 202
John Damascene, St., 47 67 68
 121 70 83 227
John of Verceil, 22
Jonathan Ben Uziel, 156
Justinianus, A., 266 267
- Kaufmann, D., 272
Kluxen, W., 266, 267 268 270,
 271 272 273
Koch, J., 269
- Leibowitz, I., 208
Lemaigre, B. M., 5 18 24 26
 35 42
Leucippus, 236
Llano, A., 13 71 106
Lohr, C. H., 17
Lombard, Peter, 17 26 66 123
Lottin, D. O., 26
- Maimonides, Moses, *passim*
Mandonnet, P., 17 25 269
Mantino, J., 266
Maré, P., 17
Martin, O. P., 22
Masnovi, A., 272
Matthew of Paris, 24 26
Meshullam ben Solomon, 1
Millás Vallicrosa, J. M., 272
Moneta of Cremona, 271
Moos, M. F., 17
- Moses, 67 116-118 130
 153-155 159 196 200 202-204
 213
Moses of Salerno, 267 270
Munk, S., 122 273
- Nahmanides of Gerona, 266
Nicolas of Giovinazzo, 267
- Orfali, M., 272 273
- Paul, St., 176 196 204
Perles, J., 266 267 268
 270 276
Peter, St., 217
Peter of Bergamo, 22
Peter of Tarantasia, 8 22 23-29
 35-37 39 40 42 46 49
Philosopher, the: see Aristotle
Pines, S., 1 3 14 121 122
 162 227
Poncherio, S., 266
Pseudo-Dionysius: cf. Dionysius
 Areopagita
Ptolemaeus of Lucca, 19 20
Pythagoras, 236
- Ravitzky, A., 2 3 267
Riedl, O. J., 269 272
Rigo, C., 13 68 267 270 271
Romanus, Cardinal, 270 272
- Sancho of Aragon, 272
Scaliger, J. J., 266
Sermoneta, J., 267 270
Siger of Brabant, 25
Simon, S., 267
Simonin. H.-D., 26
Solomon, 164
Steinschneider, M., 268
Strauss, L., 2
Stubbens, N., 5
Synave, P., 162

- Tempier, S., 25 26
Théry, G., 269
Torrell, J.-P., 7 26 127
- Vanning, S., 14
Van Steenberghen, F., 25
- Weisheipl, J. A., 10 23
Wielockx, R., 25 26
William of Auvergne, 270 271 272
- William of La Mare, 18
Wippel, J. F., 25 66
Wohlman, A., 3 8 13 208 218
Wolfson, H. A., 4 5 66 86 224
- Yehuda Romano, 130
- Zechariah, 115 127-131 133-141
156 158 160 161

INDEX OF TEXTS CITED

- Thomas Aquinas:*
 C.G. I 22: 120
 C.G. I 31: 135
 C.G. II 92: 11
 C.G. III 97: 11
 Compendium Theologiae c.1,
 24: 136
 De 108 articulis a. 1: 28 40 41
 De 108 articulis a. 2: 28 42 43
 De 108 articulis a. 3: 28 43
 De 108 articulis a.16: 22
 De 108 articulis, a. 18: 22
 De 108 articulis, a. 51: 23 43
 De Divinis Nominibus c. 1,
 3: 120
 De Pot. q. 2 a. 1: 120
 De Pot. q. 4 a. 1: 11
 De Pot. q. 5, a. 7: 11
 De Pot. q. 6, a. 7: 11
 De Pot. q. 7: 90
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 1: 237
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 2: 7 70 71 120
 121 234
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 4: 84
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 5: 85
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 6: 135
 De Pot. q. 7 a. 7: 86 112
 De Pot. q. 9: 90
 De Pot. q. 9 a. 2: 73
 De Pot. q. 9 a. 7: 83 227
 De Pot. q. 10 a. 1: 120
 De Substantiis Separatis
 c. 18: 120
 De Spiritualibus Creaturis
 a. 8: 11
 De Trinitate q. 1 a. 2: 148 149
 150
 De Trinitate q. 3 a. 4: 169
 183-191
 De Ver. q. 2 a. 3: 234
 De Ver. q. 5 a. 9: 11
 De Ver. q. 10 a. 12: 240 241 242
 De Ver. q. 12 a. 2: 12
 De Ver. q. 12 a. 5: 12
 De Ver. q. 12 a. 12: 12
 De Ver. q. 13 a. 1: 144 145 163
 168 193
 De Ver. q. 14 a. 1: 146
 De Ver. q. 14 a. 10: 141 169
 172-183
 De Ver. q. 18 a. 1: 147 148
 In I Sent. Prol. q. 1 a. 1:
 140 161
 In I Sent. d. 1 q. 1 a. 5: 214 215
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1: 27 28 44
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 1: 27 28
 29 65
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 2: 7 27-30
 32 35-37 66 107
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 3: *passim*
 In I Sent. d. 8 q. 1 a. 1: 67 73 74
 120 121 141 142
 In I Sent. d. 8 q. 1 a. 2 : 94 229
 230
 In I Sent. d. 8 q. 1 a. 3: 94
 In I Sent. d. 8 q. 4 a. 2: 95
 In I Sent. d. 8 q. 4 a. 3: 91 95 96
 In I Sent. d. 17 q. 1 a. 4: 142
 In I Sent. d. 22 q. 1 a. 1: 69 70
 120
 In I Sent. d. 33 q. 1 a. 1: 72 80
 In I Sent. d. 35 q. 1: 230 231 232
 In I Sent. d. 35 q. 1 a. 1: 67 76 77
 79 80

- In I Sent. d. 35 q. 1 a. 2: 11 67
234
- In I Sent. d. 35 q. 2: 232 233
- In I Sent. d. 36 q. 1 a. 1: 82
- In I Sent. d. 39 q. 2 a. 2: 11
- In I Sent. d. 48 q. 1 a. 4: 142
- In II Sent. d. 1 q. 1 a. 5: 11
- In II Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 3: 238 239
- In II Sent. d. 2 q. 2 a. 3: 11
- In II Sent. d. 3 q. 1 a. 1: 11
- In II Sent. d. 3 q. 1 a. 3: 11
- In II Sent. d. 14 q. 1 a. 1: 11
- In II Sent. d. 14 q. 1 a. 2: 11
- In II Sent. d. 14 q. 1 a. 5: 11
- In II Sent. d. 15 q. 3 a. 3: 142
239 240
- In III Sent. d. 12 q. 2 a. 1: 11
- In III Sent. d. 13 q. 1 a. 2: 142
- In III Sent. d. 24 q. 1 a. 2: 143
- In III Sent. d. 24 q. 1 a. 3: 169
170 171 172
- In III Sent. d. 27 q. 3 a. 1: 143
- In III Sent. d. 37 q. 1 a. 5: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 1 q. 2 a. 3: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 1 q. 2 a. 5: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 33 q. 1 a. 3: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 40 q. 1 a. 4: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 42 q. 2 a. 2: 12
- In IV Sent. d. 48 q. 2 a. 3: 12 11
- In IV Sent. d. 49 q. 2 a. 7: 12
196-208
- In Psalmos 18: 11
- In Symbolum Apostolorum a.
1: 214 216 217
- In Threnos Hier. 3, 13: 11
- Q. Disp. De Anima, a. 3: 11
- Q. Disp. De Anima a. 8: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 2 a. 2: 236
- S. Theol. I^a q. 2 a. 3: 120
- S. Theol. I^a q. 12: 123 127
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13: 7 66 123
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 1: 124
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 2: 124
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 3: 124
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 4: 125
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 5: 125
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 6: 125
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 7-11: 126
- S. Theol. I^a q. 13 a. 9: 120
- S. Theol. I^a q. 22 a. 2: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 50 a. 3: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 66 a. 1: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 68 q. 1: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 69 a. 1: 11
- S. Theol. I^a q. 74 a. 3: 11
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 101 a. 1: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 101 a. 3: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 102 a. 3: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 102 a. 4: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 102 a. 5: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 102 a. 6: 12
- S. Theol. I^a-II^{ae} q. 105 a. 2: 12
- S. Theol. II^a-II^{ae} q. 174
a. 3: 195
- S. Theol. II^a-II^{ae} q. 174
a. 6: 120
- Super ad Eph. c. 4 lc. 2: 136
- Super ad Rom. c. 1 lc. 6: 137
- Super Decretales 1: 120
- Moses Maimonides:*
- Guide Intro: 1 2 65
- Guide Intro-31: 219
- Guide I Intro: 2
- Guide I: 2
- Guide I 3: 152
- Guide I 4: 152
- Guide I 5: 154 155 167
- Guide I 10: 153
- Guide I 19: 152
- Guide I 21: 153 154
- Guide I 26: 65 75 155
- Guide I 30: 156
- Guide I 31: 157
- Guide I 32: 157 163
- Guide I 33: 145 163 164 168

- Guide I 34: 12 65 160-162
 164-169 176 183 186 191 192
 194 195 208 247 248
 Guide I 35: 104
 Guide I 37: 87
 Guide I 46: 65 75
 Guide I 52: 75 88 91 92 98
 Guide I 53: 32 46 75 99 103 104
 Guide I 54: 99
 Guide I 55: 101
 Guide I 56: 86 88 101 105
 Guide I 57: 70 72 76 84 94 99
 101 110 120
 Guide I 58: 77 79 83 102 110 111
 121 122 124
 Guide I 59: 103
 Guide I 60: 100
 Guide I 61: 68 113 114 128 129
 139 246
 Guide I 62: 68 115 131 132
 Guide I 63: 116
 Guide I 64: 129
 Guide I 68-69: 219
 Guide I 71: 219 220
 Guide I 71-76: 212 219
 Guide I 72: 221
 Guide II Intro: 2 12 65 220 224
 Guide II Intro-5: 212
 Guide II 1: 12 65 218 224 227
 Guide II 13-16: 212
 Guide II 16: 212
 Guide II 17: 12 160 161 162 209
 212 213 214 217 218
 238 248
 Guide II 45: 195
 Guide III 11: 156
 Guide III 19: 233
 Guide III 20: 82
 Guide III 43: 239
 Mishneh Torah, Sefer ha-Madda,
 Hilkhot Teshuva 9, 2: 132
 Mishneh Torah, Sefer Shoftim,
 Hilkhot Malakhim 12, 4: 133
 Mishneh Torah, Sefer Shoftim,
 Hilkhot Malakhim 12, 5: 156

Peter of Tarantasia:
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1: 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 1: 27 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 2: 27 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 1 a. 3: 27 34-39
 56
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 2: 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 2 a. 1: 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 2 a. 2: 34
 In I Sent. d. 2 q. 2 a. 3: 34

Aristotle:
 Physica I: 222 223
 Metaphysica I: 221
 Metaphysica IV: 121 125
 Metaphysica IV 2:77
 Metaphysica V: 89 106 227
 Metaphysica V 7: 90
 Metaphysica VI 4: 90
 Perihermeneias 1 c. 1 n. 2: 123

Albert the Great:
 Super de Divinis Nominibus
 13: 68
 Super Dionysii Epist. VII: 25

Avicenna:
 Metaphysica tract. II c. 1: 68

Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought

PUBLISHED VOLUMES

[Vols. 1–6 published by J.C. Gieben, Amsterdam]

1. Rotenstreich, Nathan: *Essays in Jewish Philosophy in the Modern Era*. With an introduction by Paul Mendes-Flohr. Edited by Reinier Munk. 1996. ISBN 90-5063-587-3
2. Ravitzky, Aviezer: *History and Faith. Studies in Jewish Philosophy*. 1996. ISBN 90-5063-597-0
3. Munk, Reinier: *The Rationale of Halakhic Man. Joseph B. Soloveitchik's Conception of Jewish Thought*. 1996. ISBN 90-5063-607-1
4. Boer, Theodore de: *The Rationality of Transcendence. Studies in the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas*. 1997. ISBN 90-5063-217-3
5. Zwiep, Irene E.: *Mother of Reason and Revelation. A Short History of Medieval Jewish Linguistic Thought*. 1997. ISBN 90-5063-207-6
6. Harvey, Warren Zev: *Physics and Metaphysics in Ḥasdai Crescas*. 1998. ISBN 90-5063-347-1

[from Volume 7 published by Springer]

7. Harvey, Steven (ed.): *The Medieval Hebrew Encyclopedias of Science and Philosophy*. 2000. ISBN 0-7923-6242-X
8. Kreisel, Howard: *Prophecy. The History of an Idea in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. 2001. ISBN 0-7923-7124-0
9. Zonta, Mauro: *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century. A History and Source Book*. 2006. ISBN 1-4020-3715-5
10. Munk, Reinier (ed.): *Hermann Cohen's Critical Idealism*. 2005. ISBN 1-4020-4046-6
11. Rubio, Mercedes: *Aquinas and Maimonides on the Possibility of the Knowledge of God. An Examination of the Quaestio de Attributis*. 2006. ISBN 1-4020-4720-7