Yod
Revue des études hébraïques et juives

Literal and Non-Literal Translation in Maimonides' *Dux neutrorum*

Traduction littérale et non littérale dans le Dux neutrorum de Maïmonide

גירסה הלטינית של המורה (דוקס נטרורום) – תרגום מילולי או עיבוד?

Diana Di Segni

Literal and Non-Literal Translation in Maimonides' *Dux neutrorum*

Traduction littérale et non littérale dans le Dux neutrorum *de Maïmonide*

גירסה הלטינית של המורה *(דוקס נטרורום)*
– תרגום מילולי או עיבוד?

Diana Di Segni
Universität zu Köln

Introduction[1]

No other Jewish work had such a wide influence on the Latin Middle Ages as the *Dux neutrorum*, the Latin translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*. Despite its importance—and the relevance of the Latin authors who quoted from it, such as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas[2]—little information is known about the *Dux neutrorum*, especially its origin. Scholars have been relying on the pioneering work of Wolfgang Kluxen;[3] more recently Görge Hasselhoff dedicated a monograph to the reception of the different genres of Maimonides' production

---

2. For the reception of Maimonides in Albert the Great, *cf.* Joël, 1863; Rigo, 2001. Bibliography on Maimonides and Thomas Aquinas being too ample, for our purpose only few major studies will be mentioned: Dienstag, 1975; Wohlman, 1988, 1995; Imbach, 1990, 1995; Wohlman, 1995; Rubio, 2006.

3. *Cf.* Kluxen, 1954, 1955, 1966, 1986 and 2004.

14 REVUE DES ÉTUDES HÉBRAÏQUES ET JUIVES
Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides'
Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

among Latin authors.[4] However, no close examination of the text of the *Dux neutrorum* has been conducted after Wolfgang Kluxen's fundamental work, while the *Dux* itself still needs a critical edition.[5] Today the Latin version is transmitted by thirteen manuscripts and by Giustiniani's early printing from 1520.[6] The Latin translation of the *Guide* appeared sometime between 1235 to the 1240s[7] and was mainly conducted on the basis of Al-Ḥarizi's Hebrew text.[8] However recent research revealed that another source was involved; whether the second

---

4. *Cf.* Hasselhoff, 2004. This book had the merit of having brought again the question of the Latin Maimonides to the attention of scholars, however its reception has been controversial; see the review of Anzulewicz, 2007.

5. The critical edition of *Dux neutrorum* I, 1-59 was provided in my doctoral dissertation: Di Segni, 2016a. The critical edition of *Dux neutrorum* II is part of the GIF Project No-1332-116.4/2016 held at the *Universität zu Köln* and *Tel Aviv University*.

6. For the manuscript tradition, see: [A] Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. Lat. Ms. 644; [B] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Latin 15973 (Sorbonne 173); [E] Paris, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire de la Sorbonne, Ms. 601, ff. 21ra-103vb; [C] Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque de l'agglomération, Ms. 608; [D] München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7936b; [F] Cambridge, University Library, Ms. Ii.I.19, ff. 1-183r; [G] Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 482, ff. 16va-98rb; [H] Todi, Biblioteca comunale "Lorenzo Leonj", Ms. 32; [I] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodl. 437; [K] Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat., Ms. 1124; [L] Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat., 4274; [N] Kassel, Landes- und Murhardsche Bibliothek, 2 Ms. theol. 67; [M] Cambridge, Trinity College, Ms. O.8.37, ff. 1r-229v. The manuscripts will be referred to henceforth with letters between brackets. For the printed edition, see Rabi Moses Aegyptius, 1520.

7. The first quotations from the *Dux neutrorum* are attested in Paris in the years around 1240s. Albert the Great was among the first authors who quoted from the *Dux neutrorum*, *cf.* Rigo, 2001, pp. 31-35. Other early quotations in Paris are found in the *Summa Theologica* of Alexander of Hales, *cf.* Alexander de Hales, 1924, tom. I, pars I, inq. I, tract. IV, quaest. IV, 162, p. 242 and 1948, tom. IV, pars II, inq. III, tract. I, quest. I, 263 B 3, p. 377. *Cf.* also quotations found in Moneta da Cremona's *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses* (1241-1244), *cf.* Moneta Cremonensis, 1743. Whether William of Auvergne had access to the *Dux neutrorum* or only to the *Liber de parabola* is still not clear. In his *De legibus* (1230-1235) he quotes from the *Liber de parabola*, while in *De universo* (1231-1236) an interpretation ascribed to a "*quidam ex aliis eorum philosophus*" follows closely *Guide* II, 26, *cf.* Guilelmus de Alvernia, 1674, I, pars 1, c. 36, p. 631, col. 2. Secondly, in another passage from the *De universo*, the same interpretation of *Guide*, II, 22 is found, *cf.* Guilelmus de Alvernia, 1674, II, pars 2, c. 150, p. 998, c. 2. *Cf.* the discussion by Kluxen, 1954, pp. 44-45.

8. *Cf.* Perles, 1875.

source had been Ibn Tibbon's translation or the Arabic original is still not clear.[9] No information regarding the identity of the translator nor the date and place of *Dux neutrorum*'s composition is known. Suggested origins include the court of Frederick II,[10] Provence[11] and Paris.[12] Recently, I showed that the manuscript tradition bears some traces of a vernacular language that was used in the translation process, which most probably involved two scholars working together in the tradition of the *a quattro mani* translations.[13] The first scholar would have been in charge for orally translating from Hebrew into vernacular, while the second would have redacted the written Latin version. The geographical origin of these linguistic traces is difficult to identify with certainty, but some elements seem to be connected to Spanish.[14] Naturally, this would only be the mark of the language spoken by the translators (or by one of the two scholars), which does not necessarily correspond to the place where the translation was actually made.

Besides the philological questions raised by the manuscript tradition and the problem of identifying its source, the *Dux neutrorum* raises some historical questions. The long debated problem concerning its geographical origin is first and foremost a question about the cultural project behind such an enterprise. Why was this text translated and who was the public addressed? Was the translation's commissioner interested in its philosophical content—the synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Biblical law—, or in its religious content—namely, in getting access to new information about Judaism? If, on the one hand, *Dux neutrorum*'s later reception seems to underline Maimonides' religious authority—the epithet for him among Latin authors being "Rabbi Moyses"—on the other, his authority was in most of the cases quoted in philosophical contexts.

A clue to disclose part of the "mystery" around the *Dux neutrorum* could be to understand the genre to which this text should be ascribed. Medieval translations

---

9. Some incongruities with Al-Ḥarizi's text have been pointed out by Rubio, 2006. Moreover, a collation of *loci critici* between Al-Ḥarizi's, Ibn Tibbon's, the Arabic and the Latin texts is provided in Di Segni, 2016a. This point will need further attention in the future, since no conclusive proof has been found yet.

10. *Cf.* Steinschneider, 1864, p. 65. For the Jewish sources on Frederick II, see Sirat, 1989. *Cf.* also Sermoneta, 1969, pp. 40-42 and 1980, p. 197; Freudenthal, 1988.

11. Kluxen, 1954, pp. 32-33.

12. *Cf.* Hasselhoff, 2004, pp. 123-124. *Cf.* also Schwartz, in this volume.

13. For this method of translation, see d'Alverny, 1989.

14. *Cf.* Di Segni, 2016b.

into Latin are characterized by different translation techniques, each technique revealing something about its author or its cultural context.[15] Therefore, a closer examination of the style can reveal important information concerning the historical and methodological circumstances of the *Dux neutrorum*'s composition:[16] is the *Dux neutrorum* to be considered as a literal translation or as a paraphrase? Are some original passages omitted, and if yes, which ones? The answer to these questions could reveal the aim that moved the translator, by indicating his interest with regard to some sections and disinterest with regard to omitted passages. Secondly, it provides information that can be compared to similar methods applied within the context of the 13th century translation movement.

Literal translation or adaptation?

Studies devoted to the style of medieval translations made mainly in Spain, Southern Italy and Provence, divide translations into two main categories: literal and abbreviated ones.[17] Literal translations responded to a specific scientific request and were characterized by terminological precision, while paraphrastic translations were intended as versions for non-specialist readers.

In what follows, I will argue that the *Dux neutrorum* is a combination of literal and paraphrastic translation. Numerous passages have been omitted or reformulated, while in others the adherence to the Hebrew text is so strong that it influences the Latin syntax and vocabulary. Despite this lack of verbatim correspondence, the translation is generally quite trustworthy; Maimonides' original reasoning is mostly reproduced by the translator without misunderstandings.[18] This translation style, combining literality and paraphrase,

---

15. On medieval translations, *cf.* for instance CONTAMINE, 1989; HAMESSE & FATTORI (dir.), 1990; BEER (ed.), 1997; HAMESSE (dir.), 2001; BURNETT, 2009; WISNOVSKY, WALLIS, FUMO & FRAENKEL (eds.), 2011.

16. A recent example of the fruitfulness of such an approach is the study of Michael Scot's translation style, in particular concerning the use of particles, *cf.* HASSE, 2010.

17. For bibliography on medieval translations, see *supra*, n. 14. In particular, for literal translations *cf.* BURNETT, 1997, 2001. For abbreviated translations, *cf.* HASSE, 2011.

18. Few errors can be found, but they are marginal with respect to the entirety of the work. For instance, in the following passage: "*sicut alii, qui dixerunt, quod substantia divisibilis non est in loco, sed communicat locum*" [*Dux neutrorum*, ed. DI SEGNI (henceforth DN), 2016a, p. 142, l. 46-47]. The locution "*substantia divisibilis*" should translate the Hebrew expression עצם המפרד (*'etsem ha-meforad*) [MOSHE BEN MAIMON (henceforth Ḥar.), 1952-53, p. 185], namely the atom. The Latin term should render the notion of something that cannot be divided anymore, such as the atom; however, since no variant

which seems to respond to a practical strategy, adjusts its method according to the content to be translated. Indeed, the translation strategy is not always consistently applied. For instance, in some of the chapters dedicated to Hebrew terms, the word is also given in the original language, while in others only the Latin translation is given.[19] Textual proofs produced in the following lines demonstrate that passages presenting similar difficulties are sometimes translated according to one method, sometimes according to another one.

Literal translations

In this category, some examples are listed of passages translated so literally that the Latin version alone is hardly understandable. Furthermore, examples of the influence of Hebrew morphosyntax on the Latin text are given. Since this phenomenon is widespread in the *Dux neutrorum*, I offer only some representative examples. Each column corresponds to a full sentence in both languages. The Hebrew text reported is Al-Ḥarizi's translation.

TABLE A-1

cum	וכאשר
vero	
Creator divisit nos	גזר האל פרידתנו
et posuisti	שמת
	מגמת
faciem tuam	פניך
ad	אל
finem	מחוז
voluntatis tue	חפצך

---

attesting "*substantia indivisibilis*" is found, it seems that the misunderstanding originated from the translator himself. *Cf.* also Ibn Tibbon's translation: עצם פרדי (*'etsem pirdi*). On this term, see EFROS, 1966, p. 96; *cf.* also SERMONETA, 1969, p. 105, the translation in ancient Italian given by Moses of Salerno (quoted according to Sermoneta's translation): "*I più antichi Mutakallimùn consideravano reale lo 'esem pirdi, detto in volgare 'sostanze indevise'. Nel loro primo postulato dissero che ogni corpo è composto di particelle molto sottili unite tra di loro, in volgare 'atomi'.*"

19. See for instance: "*'Ymago' et 'similitudo' in lingua Hebraica dicuntur 'celem' et 'demut'*" (DN, p. 25, l. 2); while in the following passage, only the Latin translation is given: "*Ascendit super cor, quod eadem est ratio in lingua Hebraica 'similitudinis' et 'fabricationis' seu 'figure'*" (DN, p. 32, l. 2-3).

This passage is taken from the dedicatory letter.[20] The expression "*posuisti faciem tuam ad finem voluntatis tue*" corresponds literally to the Hebrew— except for the word מגמת [*megamat*], which is not translated—but is hardly understandable. The meaning should be: "you moved to the place where you wanted to go."[21] In contrast, the expression גזר האל פרידתנו [literally: the Lord decreed our separation] is more freely translated as "*Creator divisit nos.*"

TABLE A-2

	ותניעני
manus	יד
recessus tui	פרידתך
movit me	
ad componendum	לחבר
librum istum	זה הספר

The expression should mean "your absence moved me to compose this book"; the word *manus* translates literally the Hebrew, but does not make sense in Latin.[22]

TABLE A-3

secundum omnia	בכל מה
que narravimus	שזכרנו
	לך
narratione	בזכרון
simplici	פשוט

---

20. Ḥar., p. 23; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 14ra.

21. *Cf.* the English translation: "you betook yourself elsewhere" (Moses Maimonides, 1963, p. 4); the Italian translation: "ti sei recato dove ti sei recato" (Mosè Maimonide, 2003, p. 68); the French translation: « tu t'en allas d'un autre côté » (Moïse Maïmonide, 1970, p. 5). Modern translations have been based on the Arabic text. The poetic background of Al-Ḥarizi appears clearly when comparing the same sentence with Ibn Tibbon's version: "ופנית לאשר פנית" [literally: "and you turned where you turned"], Moshe Ben Maimon (henceforth Tib.), 2000, p. 3.

22. Ḥar., p. 23; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 14ra.

The duplication "*narravimus narratione*" is typical of the syntax of the Hebrew language.[23]

Omissions explicitly declared

Some omissions due to the impossibility to find a perfect correspondence in Latin are present. They are sometimes pointed out by the translator, but not systematically. In the abbreviated passages, two different persons are explicitly mentioned, namely the *compositor* and the *translator*. The term *compositor* is clearly referred to Maimonides, while it is not clear whether with *translator* one should understand the person responsible for the first translation phase, namely from Hebrew to vernacular, or the person who redacted the written Latin version. References to the Hebrew text may suggest that the *translator* is intended to be the scholar in charge of the first oral translation, but no conclusive proof has been found yet. Moreover, it has already been pointed out by secondary literature that the dynamics of the interaction between the collaborators following the *a quattro mani* method is not clear.[24] The internal remarks to the *translator* and the *compositor* give a paraphrastic character to the text, since the figure of the translator explicitly appears.[25]

---

23. Ḥar., p. 316; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 72ra.

24. *Cf.* Zonta, 2006. On "shadow translators" see also Gutas, 2006, pp. 14-16.

25. Besides the interventions in which the translator underlines the omission of a passage, in *Dux* II, 30, he expresses a personal assertion. Here, the translator seems to embrace Maimonides' view, arguing that he did not want to violate the prohibition by disclosing the secrets of the Law: "*Dixit translator: necessarium est nobis in hoc loco modis omnibus premittere propositionem quandam, a qua non possumus deviare, que est ista: Omnia nomina equivoca, que inveniuntur in lingua Hebraica, tam dicta quam dicenda, indigent expositione lata et profunda et depurata per viam lingue Hebraice. Nec omnes magistri lingue istius sunt apprehensores veritatis huius rationis preter singulares et electos, quos excitavit intellectus suus ad querendum gradum altum, quoniam per scientiam istarum rationum intelligunt archana multa communia operi de Beresit et operi de Mercava et verbis prophetarum omnium. Ista est clavis scientie huius libri. Visum est autem michi, quod si vellem exponere modicum sensum meum super quolibet verbo communi in loco, in quo ponitur, fieret prolixitas magis (vel magna s. l. A), et fortassis prolixitas (om. A) verborum meorum confunderet rationes capituli, cum vellem exponere verba illa, et confunderet verba alta (altera B), que sunt adinvicem colligata sicut flamma ignis cum pruna (prima A) per potentiam sapientis compositoris libri. Similiter etiam plures istarum rationum sunt prohibite, ne ostendantur populo, et vocantur secreta et archana legis. Et idcirco etiam non fui ausus ad hoc extendere manum, sed sufficit nobis dicere, que est (om. A) via, per quam ingrediendum est ad archana ista. Qui vero fuerit intelligens queret eam, donec ingrediatur per eam*" (*Dux neutrorum*, II, 30, ed. Giustiniani, f. 59v; A, f. 143vb; B, f. 115ra-b; C,

B-1

Diversitates de Talmud et parabolarum devitavit translator, quia
non sunt necessarie in hoc loco. Revertamur ad rationem libri.[26]

A relatively long passage dedicated to the kinds of contradiction that can
be found in the Mishnah and in the Talmud—namely the first and the second
kinds—is omitted.[27] In this passage, the Talmudic proceeding of combining the
opinions of several Rabbis is analyzed with the help of some examples. Moreover,
some examples concerning the change of opinion of some Rabbis are given.
Apparently, these arguments must have sounded too specific and extraneous for
a Christian public[28] or they must have been considered as uninteresting by the
translator.

---

f. 64rb-64va). "The translator said: it is necessary here for us to make a proposition that
we cannot avoid, and this is: all the equivocal terms found in the Hebrew language—
already mentioned or to be mentioned—need a long and deep explanation, cleaned up
by the means of the Hebrew language. But not all the scholars of that language master
the truth in that field except for a select few ones, who were stimulated by their intellect
to seek a high rank, since by knowing these topics they understand the numerous secrets
belonging to the *Ma'aseh Bereshit* and *Ma'aseh Merkava* and to the words of all the
prophets. This is the key of the doctrine of this book. Moreover, it seemed to me that if I
wanted to express my modest understanding of one of the terms in the passage where it is
mentioned, verbosity would rather occur; and perhaps the verbosity of my words would
confuse the arguments of the chapter, for if I wanted to explain these words, then (the
verbosity) would confuse the profound words that are united to each other, like the flame
of fire is united to the coal, by the ability of the wise author of the book. Similarly, many
of these arguments are forbidden from being revealed to the common folk, and they are
called secrets and mysteries of the Law. And therefore I did not even dare to intervene,
but it suffices for us to say which is the way to enter into these secrets. Anyone who is truly
intelligent will look for (the way), until he enters through it."

26. DN, p. 23, l. 61-62. "The translator avoided the contradictions of the Talmud and
the parables, because they are not necessary here. Let us return to the topic of the book."

27. For the omitted passage, see *Guide*, Introd., pp. 18-19.

28. *Dux neutrorum*'s manuscript tradition bears traces of the attempt to adapt the text
for a Christian public. Numerous marginal notes are found aiming at the explanation
of Hebrew terms. Most probably, these notes are the result of the discussions among the
scholars who translated the text. For instance, a marginal note explains the term *Mishnah*:
"*Mysna est brevis compositio legis, quam fecit quidam Iudeus sapiens, propter cuius etiam
brevitate* [sic] *factus est postea liber, qui dicitur Talmut. Darassot dicuntur obscura quedam
dispersa in Mysna*" (A, f. 4rb; H, f. 2va). "The Mishnah is a short composition of the Law

The following passage is not translated because of the impossibility of rendering the text into Latin:

B-2

Subtracta sunt hic quedam que erant in originali, quia non conveniebant littere quam nos habemus in Genesi.[29]

Two biblical quotations are omitted, namely Is. 42, 20 and Ez. 12, 2. The reason why the book of *Genesis* is mentioned and why these two quotations are not translated is not clear, especially because the Latin version of both verses does not eminently diverge from the Hebrew text.[30] It might be that this annotation was originally conceived for another passage and then erroneously inserted in this one; or that the note reflects an earlier stage of the work, in which some quotations from *Genesis* were not translated.

In I, 20, the equivocal meaning of the Hebrew terms רם (*ram*) and נשא (*nissa*) could not be rendered into Latin, as is pointed out by the translator:

B-3

Dixit translator libri, quod in Hebreo duo verba, quibus videtur equipollere "altum", sunt unum in significatione, pro quibus duobus possunt poni ista duo: "altum" et "excelsum".[31]

Then a much shortened version of the chapter follows. An analogous remark is found in I, 24:

---

that was composed by a certain wise Jew, because of whose shortness the book called Talmud was composed afterwards. Darassot are certain ambiguous passages scattered in the Mishnah."

29. DN, p. 30, l. 67-68. "Some things that were in the original have been omitted, since they did not correspond to the version that we have in the book of Genesis."

30. See Is. 42, 20: "*Qui apertas habes aures, nonne audies*", and: "פקוח אזנים ולא ישמע"; Ez. 12, 2: "*Qui oculos habent ad videndum, et non vident*", and: "אשר עינים להם לראות ולא ראו".

31. DN, p. 60, l. 2-4. "The translator of the book said that in Hebrew two words, which seem to be equivalent to 'high', are the same in meaning; in the place of these two terms, it is possible to use these two: 'high' and 'sublime'."

B-4

> *In capitulo vigesimoquarto multa dicit compositor libri de hoc*
> *verbo "ire", que non videntur ita proprie dici in lingua Latina.* [32]

The chapter sticks to the general structure of the original by summarizing the argumentation and omitting only few biblical quotations, namely Gen. 32, 2; Num. 12, 9; Num. 12, 10; Is. 2, 5.

Chapter I, 15 is a very short version of the original one in which two Hebrew terms—נצב (*natsov*) and יצב (*yatsov*), "to stand erect"—are analyzed. The impossibility to find an equivalent in Latin led the translator to skip most of the chapter by introducing the following sentence:

B-5

> *In prosecutione capituli decimiquinti compositor libri fecit*
> *mentionem scale Iacob, in cuius explanatione vocat angelos*
> *ascendentes et descendentes.* [33]

In doing so, the translator manipulates the argumentation of the chapter, "transforming" it into an exegesis of the biblical episode of Jacob's ladder. However, a marginal note from ms. H contains a reference to the original topic of the chapter:

B-5 *BIS*

> *In quo ponitur verbum consimile huic verbo stare, et tamen est*
> *diversitas inter ea et in Hebraico, sed non est ita in Latino. Et in*
> *explanatione ipsius verbi multa dicit compositor libri in hoc capitulo.* [34]

An analogous proceeding is used in I, 16:

---

32. DN, p. 68, l. 2-3. "In chapter 24 the author of the book says many things about the verb 'to go' that do not seem to be properly expressed in that way in Latin."

33. DN, p. 53, l. 2-3. "In the continuation of chapter 15, the author of the book mentions Jacob's ladder, and in that explanation he calls the angels 'rising' and 'descending' (angels)."

34. H, f. 10ra. "In which a term similar to the term 'to stay' is treated, and nevertheless there is a difference between them in Hebrew, but not in Latin. And in explaining this term the author of the book says many things in this chapter."

B-6

In capitulo sextodecimo videtur compositor libri ponere nomen
petre equivocum ad montem et ad silicem et ad lapidicinam. [35]

Nevertheless, in this case most of the text is translated, and only a few biblical quotations are omitted, namely Deut. 32, 4; Deut. 32, 18; Deut. 32, 30; 1; Sam. 2, 2; Is. 26, 4.

Most of I, 18 is summarized, and it is introduced by a formula that clearly shows the method followed to find the Latin correspondence for a Hebrew term, namely through biblical quotations cited in the chapter:

B-7

In prosecutione capituli XVIII ponit compositor libri tria verba
diversa que videntur habere eandem significationem in Hebraico; in
Latino autem videntur duo verba illis similia secundum testimonia
scripturarum quibus utitur. Sunt autem ista verba accedere vel
appropinquare et tangere. [36]

A marginal note transmitted by ms. A refers to a large portion of text omitted in this chapter:

B-7 *BIS*

Multa verba in originali posita. Subtracta sunt nomina, quia non
consonant lingue Latine. [37]

In the following case (I, 21), not an omission but a doubt concerning how to translate a biblical verse is formulated:

---

35. DN, p. 54, l. 2-3. "In chapter 16 the author of the book affirms that the word 'stone' is equivocal, meaning 'mountain' and 'hard stone' and 'stone quarry'."

36. DN, p. 57, l. 2-6. "In the continuation of chapter 18 the author of the book mentions three different verbs that seem to have the same meaning in Hebrew; but in Latin two terms seem to be similar to them according to the testimony of the Scriptures that he uses. These verbs are 'to approach', 'to come near' and 'to touch'."

37. A, f. 16vb. "In the original many terms are mentioned. These words have been omitted because they do not correspond to the Latin language."

24 REVUE DES ÉTUDES HÉBRAÏQUES ET JUIVES
Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides'
Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

B-8

Videtur posse haberi ex verbis compositoris libri alia littera in predicto versu: "Sic transivit vox ex parte Creatoris super facies suas, et clamavit Domine Domine", in expositione cuius vocis verba multiplicat.[38]

The reference to the *compositor* denotes the paraphrastic character of the sentence, pointing out a difficulty in translating Maimonides' interpretation of Is. 40, 6.

Omissions explicitly declared in marginal notes

Abbreviations are sometimes pointed out by marginal notes and accompanied by a judgement formulated by the translator, who omitted passages as "useless" or "unnecessary."

Dux neutrorum I, 3 is considered to be "unnecessary" because of the non-correspondence of the terms mentioned in Latin:

C-1

Istud capitulum non est nobis multum necessarium, nam nomina ista, de quibus fit hic mentio, non videntur sic se habere apud nos sicut in lingua Hebraica.[39]

This chapter deals with two Hebrew terms, תבנית (*tavnit*, [shape]) and תמונה (*temunah,* [figure]), which are translated as "*similitudo*" and "*fabricatio seu figura*." However, due to the lack of correspondence between the two languages, the chapter is much shorter in its Latin version. The marginal note transmits also a judgment formulated by the translator, who considered the passage as "unnecessary."

In a similar way, in I, 4 three Hebrew verbs are treated. In the main text, the three verbs ראה (*ra'ah*), הביט (*hibbit*) and חזה (*ḥazah)*, are translated by two Latin

---

38. DN, p. 63, l. 44-46. "From the words of the author of the book it seems that there could have been another wording in the aforementioned verse: 'So the voice from the Creator passed on his presence and proclaimed 'Lord, Lord'', and he spends many words in the explanation of this voice."

39. A, f. 11rb; H, f. 7ra. "This chapter is not very necessary to us, since the terms that are mentioned here do not seem to be among us in the same way as in the Hebrew language."

verbs, "*video*" and "*respicio*," while the third verb, as well as biblical quotations concerning it, is omitted. A marginal note transmitted by ms. A mentions the three Hebrew verbs (in Hebrew, but in a misspelled form), and the corresponding biblical quotation:

C-2

Nota quod compositor huius libri tria verba ponit in principio huius quarti capituli, que dicuntur et proprie et per accomodationem, quorum duo sonant apud nos videre, sed differunt in Hebraico. Primum enim, de quo hic fecimus mentionem, dicitur "ma", "hib" unde (con.; vibude A), dictum est: Viditque et ecce puteus; et: Vidi Dominum. Secundum est "haza", unde dicitur: Viditque in Syon oculus noster; et: Vidit super Iudam et Ierusalem, id est apprehendit intellectum, id est prophetavit.[40]

The translator's judgment intervenes in the following passage, which is considered "useless":

C-3

Intercisum est hoc capitulum, et omissa sunt quedam, que erant in originali, eo quod non videntur multum utilia.[41]

This remark concerns I, 1. However, it does not seem that a chapter was omitted here, but that two biblical quotations were left out, namely Ez. 31, 8, and Ps. 17, 12. The reason why this note indicates the omission of a chapter remains unclear; it could have been a remark testifying an earlier stage of the work, in which this chapter was not translated.

---

40. A, f. 11va. "Note that the author of the book mentions three verbs at the beginning of chapter 4. These are said both properly and metaphorically, and two of them sound among us as 'to see', but they are different in Hebrew. The first one mentioned is 'ma', 'hib', from which it is said: And he saw and behold a well; and: I saw the Lord. The second is 'haza', from which it said: Our eye saw in Syon; and: He saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, namely he grasped the intellect, namely he prophesied."

41. A, f. 9vb; H, f. 6ra. "This chapter is interrupted and some things that were in the original have been omitted, since they do not seem very useful."

Omissions not mentioned

Contrary to the previous cases, following omissions are indicated neither by a sentence in the text nor by a marginal note. In most cases, references to rabbinical literature or biblical quotations are omitted. Since this phenomenon is widespread, it is impossible to give a complete account of it, but only some examples.

In I, 33, a quotation taken from the Talmud has been omitted in the Latin version:[42]

<div align="center">TABLE D-1</div>

Accordingly it is clearly said: *Not many are wise* [Job 32, 9]. The Sages too, *may their memory be blessed*, have said: *I saw the people who have attained a high rank, and they were few* [TB, *Sukkah*, 45b; *Sanhedrin*, 97b]. For the obstacles to perfection are very many, and the objects that distract from it abound.	*Et propter hoc dictum est: "Non multi sapientes" [Job 32, 9], quoniam ea, que impediunt acquirere perfectionem, sunt multa, et que inducunt dubitationes innumerabiles.*

In I, 53, when treating divine attributes, in the original version a quotation from Mishnah, *Avot* is present. This quotation is absent in the Latin text:[43]

<div align="center">TABLE D-2</div>

The Sages call them characteristics and speak of the thirteen characteristics. This term, as they use it, is applied to moral qualities. Thus: There are four characteristics among people who give charity; they are four characteristics among people who go to the house of learning [Mishnah, *Avot* V, 13-14]. This expression occurs frequently. The meaning here is not that He possesses	*Et sapientes vocant ea dispositiones vel mores, et dixerunt, quod sunt tredecim. Et utuntur hoc nomine super naturis et potentiis, que sunt in homine, neque ratio huius dicti exigit, quod in Creatore sint nature vel dispositiones vel mores, sed facit opera similia illis, que proveniunt ex moribus seu dispositionibus nostris de potentiis anime, non quod Creator habeat in se virtutes animales.*

---

42. *Guide* I, 34, p. 73; DN, p. 92, l. 21-23. In this and in the following examples, the English translation is quoted for the sake of simplicity. Al-Ḥarizi presents the omitted passages in Latin.

43. *Guide* I, 54, p. 124; DN, p. 156, l. 5-50.

moral qualities, but that He performs actions resembling the actions that in us proceed form moral qualities–I mean from aptitudes of the soul; the meaning is not that He, may He be exalted, possesses aptitudes of the soul.	

In the same chapter, three biblical quotations (Jud. 21, 22; Gen. 33, 5; Gen. 33, 11) have been omitted:[44]

TABLE D-3

And just as when we give a thing to somebody who has no claim upon us, this is called *grace* in our language—as it says: *Grant them graciously* [Jud. 21, 22]—[so is the term applied to Him:] *Whom God hath graciously given* [Gen. 33, 5]; *Because God hath dealt graciously with me* [Gen. 33, 11]. Such instances are frequent. For He, may He be exalted, brings into existence and govern beings that have no claim upon Him with respect to being brought into existence and being governed. For this reason He is called *gracious*.	*Sicut etiam contingit apud nos, cum aliquis dat donum alicui et non ex debito, vocatur istud gratia; similiter Creator donat, et regit illum, cui non tenetur ex debito in essentia sua et in regimine, et idcirco vocatur gratiosus.*

In I, 47, a list of biblical quotations appears in a shorter form in the Latin version:[45]

TABLE D-4

And God saw the children of Israel [Ex. 2, 25], translated by him [scil. Onqelos]: And the enslavement of the children of Israel was revealed before the Lord. I have surely seen the affliction of My people [Ex. 3, 7], translated by him: the enslavement of My people was surely revealed before Me. And I have also	*Et: "Vidit Dominus filios Israel" [Ex. 2, 25], id est: "Revelatum est ante ipsum deservitium ipsorum"; et: "Vidi afflictionem populi mei" [Ex. 3, 7], id est: "Revelata est ante me"; et: "Vidi populum istum" [Ex. 32, 9], id est: "Detectus est ante me", scilicet "Malitia eorum revelata est ante me"; et: "Vidit Dominus, et iratus*

---

44. *Guide* I, 54, p. 125; DN, p. 157, l. 75-79.
45. *Guide* I, 48, p. 107; DN, p. 134, l. 25-32.

seen the oppression [Ex. 3, 9], translated by him: And the oppression was also revealed before Me. And that He had seen their affliction [Ex. 4, 31], translated by him: For their enslavement was revealed before Him. I have seen this people [Ex. 32, 9], translated by him: this people was revealed before me – for the meaning of this verse is: I saw their disobedience; just as in the verse, And God saw the children of Israel [Ex. 2, 25], the meaning is that He saw their misery. And when the Lord saw [it], He abhorred [them] [Deut. 32, 19], translated by him: And it was revealed before the Lord. When He seeth that their power is gone [Deut. 32, 36], translated by him: For it was revealed before Him – for this too is a state when wrong was done to them and when the enemy was dominant. All these passages are consistent and take into account the verse: And thou canst not look on iniquity [Hab. 1, 13]. Thus it is on this account that [Onqelos] translates every reference to enslavement or disobedience by: It was revealed before Him, or It was revealed before Me.	*est" [Deut. 32, 19], id est: "Revelatum est ante Dominum". Et in hiis omnibus recte processit, sicut propheta dicit: "Non potest videre falsum". Et idcirco omne deservitium et malitiam exponit sic: "Revelatum est ante me".*

In I, 49, a critique against Trinitarian theories is formulated by Maimonides. The passage is not translated into Latin:[46]

<div align="center">TABLE D-5</div>

If, however, someone believes that He is one, but possesses a certain number of essential attributes, he says in his words that He is one, but believes Him in his thought to be many. This resembles what the Christians say: namely, that He is one	*Quicumque vero credit, quod Creator est unus, et habet multas dispositiones, ore dicit, quod est unus, sed corde credit, quod est multiplex, sicut est etiam verbum dicentis, quod est unus, sed habet multas dispositiones, et ipse et sue dispositiones*

---

46. *Guide* I, 50, p. 111; DN, p. 139, l. 15-19.

Diana Di Segni

but also three, and that the three are one. Similar to this is the assertion of him who says that He is one but possesses many attributes and that He and His attributes are one, while he denies at the same time His being corporeal and believes in His absolute simplicity.	*sunt unum cum elongatione corporeitatis ab eo et credulitate, quod est simplex verus.*

In the following passage from I, 41 a medical reference is omitted; in the original passage, Maimonides speaks about asphyxia and apoplexy, but this latter reference is missing in the Latin version:[47]

D-6

Quidam Yspanus dixit, quod retinuit hanelitum suum, donec nullo modo hanelabat, sicut contingit in prefocatione matricis in mulieribus, adeo quod nescitur, utrum illa, cui contingit, vivat an non, et hec infirmitas durat per unum diem vel duos.[48]

A passage from I, 51 was greatly shortened in comparison to the original version:

D-7

Genera vero qualitatum sunt quatuor, sicut scis. Inducam autem exemplum cuiuslibet eorum, ut probetur tibi, quod impossibile est aliquam illarum convenire Creatori: primum genus qualitatis est dispositio vel habitus; secundum genus qualitatis est potentia vel impotentia naturalis; tertium genus est passio vel passibilis qualitas; quartum genus qualitatis est forma et figura.[49]

---

47. See Ḥar., p. 155; *Guide* I, 42, p. 92.

48. DN, p. 116, l. 9-13. "A certain Spaniard said that he held his breath until he did not breathe at all, as happens in the case of hysterical asphyxia among women, so much that it is not known whether the afflicted woman lives or not, and this illness lasts for one or two days."

49. DN, p. 145, l. 27-32. "As you know, the types of qualities are four. I will introduce an example for each of these, so that it will be demonstrated to you that it is impossible that any of them is appropriate for the Creator: the first type of quality is disposition or

Here Maimonides deals with the Aristotelian argument of the four genera of qualities,[50] the original reasoning is longer and more elaborate than the above-mentioned passage, every group of quality being analyzed at length by the use of some examples.[51] Given the lack of literality, its synthetic character and the omission of the examples, this passage cannot be considered as a translation, but rather as a free elaboration, possibly conducted on the basis of another source. It is evident that something is missing since in the shortened Latin version all the examples are left out, but not the sentence introducing them: "*Inducam autem exemplum cuiuslibet eorum.*" Moreover, in the Latin text, the fourth genus is "figure and shape," while, according to Maimonides' original text, the fourth genus is "quantity," כמיה (*kammīya*), translated in Hebrew as כמות (*kammut*).[52] In Aristotle's text, the fourth genus is also identified with "figure" and "shape," "σχῆμα" and "μορφή."[53] Therefore, the Latin version of the *Dux* corresponds more to Aristotle's text than to Maimonides' original version. The translator might have used another source for this well-known Aristotelian passage, or he might have been familiar with the *Categories*. However, a correction was added in manuscripts G and L: "*que sequuntur quantitatem*", by which the original notion of "quantity" is introduced again. Moreover, some lines later, manuscripts A, B and E testify to a variant of the lemma "forma et figura,"[54] *i.e.*, "qualitates," which brings the text closer to its original version, expressed in Arabic by the term כיפיה (*kayfiyya*) and translated into Hebrew as איכות (*ekhut*).[55]

Double translations

Within the question of literality or adaptation, the problem of the so-called "double translations" deserves special attention. Doubts in translating are sometimes pointed out by the use of double translations, commonly introduced

---

habit; the second type of quality is natural potency or impotency; the third type is being affected or passive quality; the fourth type of quality is figure and shape."

50. *Cf.* ARISTOTELES, 1949, 8, 8b25-10a26.

51. *Cf. Guide* I, 52, pp. 115-116.

52. See Ḥar., p. 189; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 45ra. MOSHE BEN MAIMON (henceforth *Dalālat*), 1931.

53. ARISTOTELES, 1949, 8, 10a11.

54. DN, p. 145, l. 35.

55. On the difference between Maimonides' exposition and Aristotle's *Categories*, see EFROS, 1966, p. 78, pp. 3-6.

by disjunctive particles such as "vel" and "seu."[56] In the *Dux neutrorum*, most of the double translations are well attested by the manuscript tradition. However, some of them are attested only by manuscripts in the highest position in the *stemma codicum*.[57] It is therefore reasonable to presume that their origin goes back to the translator. Whether double translations should be considered as a sign of lack of literality is a legitimate question; however, if literality is considered to be the "one-to-one" correspondence, then double translations are certainly not literal translations. Since a thorough treatment of double translations within the *Dux neutrorum* will deviate from our purpose, only three examples will be mentioned.

Equivocation between "*fabricatio*," "*compositio*" and "*figura*" often appears, as in the following passages:

E-1

Maior autem pars hominum putat, quod "celem" in lingua Hebraica significat compositionem seu fabricationem rei et formas eius.[58]

Forma spiritualis, que est apprehensio intelligibilis, non fabricatio seu compositio, neque forme corporales.[59]

In the first case, "*compositionem seu fabricationem*" translates עניין (*'inyan*), while "*formas eius*" translates צורתו (*tsurato*);[60] in the second case, "*fabricatio seu compositio*" translate תבנית (*tavnit*), while צורה (*tsurah*) is translated by "*forme corporales*."[61] Ibn Tibbon translates both passages by using תמונה (*temunah*) and תאר (*to'ar*), a choice that corresponds to the Arabic אלשכל ואלתכטיט (*al-šakl wa-al-takṭīṭ*).[62] In another passage, the expression "*fabricatio*

---

56. See, for example, Aristoteles Latinus, 1974, esp. pp. CIV-CIX; Averroes Latinus, 1996, pp. 102-103. On this phenomenon, see Hissette, 2018.

57. *Cf.* Di Segni, 2016a, pp. XLVII-LXIII.

58. DN, p. 25, l. 3-4. "The majority of men thinks that 'celem' in Hebrew means composition or fabrication of a thing and its forms."

59. DN, p. 26, l. 30-31. "The spiritual form, that is the intelligible apprehension, not fabrication or composition, nor corporeal forms."

60. Ḥar., p. 47; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 19va.

61. Ḥar., p. 49; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 19vb.

62. Tib., pp. 19-20; *Dalālat*, p. 15, l. 6.

seu figura" translates the word תבנית (*tavnit*), while "*compositione seu figura*" renders the term תכונתו (*tekhunato*):[63]

> *Fabricatio seu figura dicitur de apparatu rei corporalis vel compositione seu figura in longitudine, vel rotunditate, vel aliis similibus.*[64]

A few lines later, "*forma seu figura*" translates the word צורה (*tsurah*):

> *Similitudo vero dicitur de tribus quasi equivoce: dicitur enim de forma seu figura rei.*[65]

Moreover, the same Hebrew word is also translated as "*specie vel forma*."[66]

Another ambiguity is represented by the words "*attributio*," "*nominatio*" and "*dispositio*," for instance, in the following passage:

<div align="center">E-2</div>

> *Et hec attributio seu nominatio demonstrat quiditatem rei et veritatem eius.*[67]

Here, the double translation concerns the word תאר (*to'ar*), which corresponds to the Arabic צפה (*sifa*).[68] The same equivocation can be found in:

> *Quintus modus nominationis vel attributionis est: cum nominatur res ab opere suo.*[69]

---

63. DN, p. 32, l. 4; Ḥar., p. 56; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 21ra.

64. "Fabrication or figure is said of the apparatus of the corporeal thing or of the composition or figure in longitude, rotundity or other similar things."

65. DN, p. 32, l. 7. "Indeed similarity is predicated about the three almost equivocally: for it is said of the form or the figure of a thing."

66. DN, p. 36, l. 30; Ḥar., p. 63; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 21vb.

67. DN, p. 144, l. 4. "And this attribution or nomination demonstrates the quiddity of a thing and its truth."

68. Ḥar., p. 187; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 44vb; *Dalālat*, p. 77, l. 21.

69. DN, p. 148, l. 95; *cf.* Ḥar., p. 194; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 45vb. "The fifth mode of nomination or attribution is: when a thing is named from its action."

Shortly after, the same Hebrew word is also translated as "*dispositio seu nominatio*":

> Tu vero invenies, quod omnis dispositio seu nominatio attributa
> Creatori secundum opinionem credentis dispositiones in esse Creatori.[70]

Finally, the word "*dispositio*" is used also in two other double translation constructions, the first one corresponding to the Hebrew word מדות (*middot*):

> Et sapientes vocant ea dispositiones vel mores, et dixerunt, quod
> sunt tredecim.[71]

The second one to the word תכונות (*tekhunot*):

> Opera, que proveniunt a nobis secundum mores vel dispositiones
> nostras animales.[72]

A peculiar case is represented by the following passage:

E-3

> Multum distat inter probationem querentis de anitate rei per
> signa, et inter inquisitionem demonstrantis per intellectum veritatem
> quiditatis et substantie rei.[73]

For the word "*anitate*," the manuscript tradition transmits the variants "*veritate*" and "*quiditate*." Only ms. A, through a correction in the margin, testifies three variants, while "*anitate*" alone is transmitted by mss. B, H, K, L, N; "*veritate*" alone is transmitted by mss. C, D, E; and "*quiditate*" by mss. G, I. These

---

70. DN, p. 149, l. 13; Ḥar., p. 195; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 46ra. "Indeed you will find that any disposition or nomination attributed to the Creator according to the opinion of the one who believes that dispositions are in the Creator's being."

71. DN, p. 156, l. 45; Ḥar., p. 202; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 47v. "And the wise men call them dispositions or habits, and they have said that they are thirteen."

72. DN, p. 157, l. 87-88; Ḥar., p. 205; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 48ra. "Actions that come to us according to our habits or our animal dispositions."

73. DN, p. 122, l. 3-5. "There is a big difference between the demonstration that looks for the *anitas* of a thing through signs and the inquiry that demonstrates through the intellect the truth of the quiddity and substance of a thing."

three terms translate the Hebrew word מציאות (*metsi'ut*), corresponding to the Arabic וגוד (*wuğūd*).[74] These variations might be the result of a later correction that was not clearly indicated. Furthermore, the same word is translated as "*inventio seu essentia*" a few lines later.[75]

Non literal-translations: the context

Textual proofs shown in the previous paragraph demonstrate that the *Dux neutrorum* can be considered as a combination of literal and paraphrastic translation. The categorization of translations according to their style made by secondary literature implies a criterion based on the recipient: literal translations are considered to be addressed to scholars, while abbreviated ones aimed at a non-specialized public. Moreover, in his study of Hebrew medieval translations Mauro Zonta introduced the category of "professional" and "non-professional" translators, with the former describing translators who adopted the literal method.[76] However, in order to better define the relationship between literality/ non literality and professionalism/unprofessionalism, it is useful to look at similar cases within the panorama of the 12th and 13th century translation movement.

Generally speaking, the method of translating verbatim was employed by most of the translators in Spain and at the court of Frederick II in Southern Italy. For instance, translators working in the 12th century Toledo, such as John of Seville, Dominicus Gundisalvi and Gerard of Cremona, used a "one-to-one" correspondence method, where every single Arabic word was translated into Latin;[77] if this was not possible, a transliteration of the difficult term was given.[78] The literal translation technique was an explicit and deliberated

---

74. Ḥar., p. 160; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 38vb; *Dalālat*, p. 65, l. 17. On this term, see EFROS, 1966, p. 78.

75. DN, p. 123, l. 39; Ḥar., p. 163; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 39v. In other passages of the *Dux*, the word "*quiditas*" usually translates the Hebrew term מהות (*mahut*)—corresponding to the Arabic מאייה (*mahīya*)—while "*veritas*" renders אמתה ('*amittah*), which is in Arabic חקיקה (*ḥaqīqa*). On this term, see d'ALVERNY, 1959, pp. 59-91.

76. *Cf.* ZONTA, 2001, p. 131: "The literal method was employed by professional translators, who were rendering into Hebrew texts either for themselves or for other philosophers"; *ibid.*, p. 133: "Paraphrastic translations into Hebrew (or, better, translations centered less on the language and culture of the original text that on those of their readers) are analogous to the so-called 'vulgarizations'."

77. *Cf.* BURNETT, 2009, esp. pp. 63-72.

78. *Cf.* HASSE, 2010, p. 37.

choice of the translator, and was methodologically justified in order to prevent mistakes originating by personal interpretations.[79]

Within the Arabic-into-Latin translation movement, literal translations are the most represented, while abbreviating translators form a minority. The aim of abbreviated translations is to render the text more palatable for Latin readers, and therefore to adapt it for a different public. Two main techniques are used in abbreviated translations: groups of words or sentences are omitted, or entire passages are summarized.[80] The most influential translator belonging to this category is Michael Scot.[81] In his translations, some passages are rendered literally, while other sentences are abbreviated.[82] Abbreviations are used in sentences considered by the translator as being superfluous or containing additional information or repetitions. Moreover, references to Islamic culture and Arabic language are often omitted.[83] The aim of such an abbreviating technique is to Latinize the text or to extract information on a specific topic.[84]

Scot's method seems to be similar to the one found in the *Dux neutrorum*. Passages analyzed in the previous paragraph show the same fluctuation between a literal and non-literal translation technique. The main concern seems to be the adaptation of the text for Christian readers, this process being made clear by additions that explain terms or notions of the original text. Adaptations may be useful to pass from a culture to another one; from a restricted public to a more general one; or to select information considered as significant in opposition to unimportant one. By taking the freedom of abbreviating and summarizing the text, the scholars who translated the *Dux neutrorum* consider themselves

---

79. *Cf.* the preface to John of Seville's translation of Thābit ibn Qurra, *De imaginibus*: "*Ego autem in omnibus magis litteraturam secutus sum ne longius a veritatis tramite recederem*", in Burnett, 2009, pp. 77-78.

80. *Cf.* Hasse, 2011, pp. 170-171.

81. On Michael Scot's style, *cf.* Carmody, 1960; Van Oppenraay, 1990; Hasse, 2011, pp. 165-167.

82. *Cf. ibid*. *Cf.* also the judgement of M. Bouyges in Averroès, 1952, p. CIV: « *Si la traduction latine dénote une belle connaissance de la langue arabe, on n'y voit pas le souci de ne rien négliger [...] résumer, supprimer font partie de sa méthode.* » *Cf.* also Van Oppenraay, 1990, p. 124: « *On peut dire en général que Michel Scot cherche à traduire l'arabe le plus fidèlement possible* [...] *le phénomène de l'abréviation du texte arabe, qui par rapport au texte grec se montre souvent verbeux et plein de digressions, est caractéristique de la méthode de traduction de Scot.* » Oppenraay gives numerous examples of the abbreviation technique.

83. *Cf.* the examples given by Hasse, 2011, pp. 166-167.

84. *Cf. ibid.* for the abbreviation technique of Theodore of Antioch.

as "interpreters" of the text, and not only as mere "translators." Their selection criteria is clearly expressed by their judgment with regard to passages considered "useless" (see C-3) or "unnecessary" (see C-1). To interpret a text and to select relevant passages from it implies reflection or discussion among scholars well aware of what they were doing. Instead of considering paraphrastic translations as the consequence of a lacking knowledge of the language or of the topic treated, it is useful to look at what they actual reveal about the interests of the translators. *Dux neutrorum*'s translators were interested in specific content, and the omitted passages indicate what they were not interested into. Therefore, the question of the non-literality should be readdressed from a different perspective. On the basis of the translators choices, it is hence legitimate to ask what was their field of interest: were they concerned with theological matters or philosophical ones? Moreover, if they aimed at theological questions, were they interested in problems pertaining the Old Testament or rabbinical literature?

The field of interest

The question of the field of interest is directly related to the aim that led in the first place to the translation of the *Guide of the Perplexed*. To understand if the translation was produced in a circle of Hebraists or by scholars mainly interested in philosophy and science clarifies the motivations that moved its commissioner. So far, evidence has been conflicting. If, on the one hand, the choice of Al-Ḥarizi's version as a source for the Latin translation hints in favor of the hypothesis of a Hebraists' circle, since in this Hebrew version philosophical contents—especially philosophical terminology—were adapted for a non-specialized public; on the other, the above-mentioned passage D-7, in which Aristotle's reasoning is given more faithfully than in Maimonides' original text, shows an independent knowledge of Aristotelian philosophy.

Had the translation been made out of an interest merely in religious matters pertaining the Old Testament, one would have to explain first of all why a philosophical text such as the *Guide of the Perplexed* has been chosen over a purely theological one. However, at the end of the *Dux neutrorum*, most manuscripts present an addition to the *Guide*'s original text, the so-called *Liber preceptorum*.[85] This addition is well attested by the manuscript tradition and most probably was originally translated together with the *Dux neutrorum*. This text is an abbreviated list of the 613 Jewish precepts contained in Maimonides'

---

85. *Cf.* Hasselhoff, 2004; Di Segni, 2014.

introduction to his *Mishneh Torah.*[86] The presence of the *Liber preceptorum*, whose content is oriented towards religious practice, speaks for the hypothesis of a Hebraists' circle interested in biblical law. Nonetheless, the *Liber preceptorum* has also been summarized with respect to its original source: in some cases, it is impossible to understand the content of a precept without knowing the original text.[87] Secondly, the list of precepts contained in the introduction to the *Mishneh Torah* is already a shorter version of Maimonides' *Sefer ha-mitswot.*[88] Had the interest been purely in the Jewish precepts, the translators would not have abbreviated the text or they would have translated directly from the *Sefer ha-mitswot.*[89] More likely, since in *Dux neutrorum* III, Maimonides refers at length to different categories of precepts, the translators might have decided to present a short overview to render the text understandable for a Latin public.

As what concerns rabbinical literature, if the interest was mainly in the Oral Law, it is hardly understandable why passages from the Talmud are often omitted (see B-1; D-1; D-2).

Finally, another hint in favor of the religious motivation seems to be the epithet with which Latin authors commonly referred to Maimonides, namely "Rabbi Moyses." By doing so, they openly acknowledge Maimonides as a religious authority. But does that imply that he was seen mainly as a religious authority and not as a philosophical one? It is not the place here to reconstruct the entire

---

86. Moses Maimonides, 1981, pp. 5a–17a.

87. *Cf.* the positive commandement n° 223: "*Ut fiat a sacerdote sicut Scriptura dicit*" (*cf.* Di Segni, 2014, p. 250). The commandment concerns the woman suspected of adultery (Num. 5, 11-28), but this is not mentioned in the Latin text. The commandment is therefore incomprehensible in its Latin version. *Cf.* also the positive commandment n° 180: "*Ut fiat testibus sicut facere voluerint*" (*ibid.*, p. 249). It is referred to the witnesses who give a fake testimony and have to be punished by the same punishment they wanted to provoke with their testimony (Deut. 19, 19). Because of its shortness, the Latin formulation is not clearly understandable. However, this is not due to a poor knowledge of the matter, *cf.* for instance the commandment n° 108 (*ibid.*, p. 247) concerning purification through the ashes of the red cow (Num. 19). The original Maimonidean text does not mention the red cow, but uses the word נדה (*niddah*) instead, which expresses a state of impurity. The translator must have known well the topic, since he refers the commandment to the red cow: "*Quod aque vacce rufe polluentes sint hominem mundum, et mundatrices pollutionis ex mortuo solummodo.*"

88. Moïse Maïmonide, 1888.

89. The *Sefer ha-mitswot* was originally written in Arabic, but by the time of the *Dux neutrorum*'s composition a Hebrew translation was available by Abraham ben Samuel ibn Ḥasdai (*cf.* Steinschneider, 1893, p. 927).

philosophical reception of the Latin Maimonides—a task that has been already carried out by numerous scholars;[90] however, an example is worth of mentioning.

Among Latin authors, Maimonides' philosophical authority was typically invoked within the discussion on the world's eternity.[91] His answer to the problem, namely that Aristotle himself was not convinced of the world's eternity, became renowned in the Latin Middle Ages.[92] Nevertheless, Maimonides' authority was not only cited as an answer to the Aristotelian argument, but also in order to provide Aristotle's text. This can be seen, for instance, in Ramon Martí's *Pugio fidei* (1278).[93] In this monumental work of religious controversy, the discussion on the world's eternity is grounded on Maimonides' authority.[94] Here, the Jewish philosopher does not only have the function of defending the world's creation, but is also "responsible" for the truthfulness of Aristotle's words, since—according to Martí—they are quoted *de verbo ad verbum*:

> *Quod et ipsum Aristotelem minime latuisse probat Rabi Moses*
> *in More Nebochim, Ductore Nutantium, cap. decimoquinto partis*
> *secunda per verba Aristotelis, quae de verbo ad verbum inducit.*[95]

As in the case of other Dominicans, Maimonides is here addressed as "Rabi Moses," but at the same time his philosophical authority is strongly associated with Aristotle.

The form "Rabi Moyses" is found in the manuscript tradition at the beginning of the *Dux neutrorum*.[96] The first sentence in Latin follows exactly the version

90. It is impossible here to give a complete account of the bibliography on the topic, but see for instance KLUXEN, 1966; IMBACH, 1990; RIGO, 2001; HEIDRICH, 2010.

91. *Cf.* for instance ROHNER, 1913; DALES, 1982; DUNPHY, 1983; SEESKIN, 1997.

92. *Cf. Guide* II, 15, p. 289: "My purpose in this chapter is to make it clear that Aristotle possesses no demonstration for the world being eternal, as he understands this. [...] I mean to say that he himself knows that he possesses no demonstration with regard to this point, and that the arguments and the proofs that he sets forth are merely such as occur to the mind and to which the soul inclines. [...] Aristotle cannot be supposed to have believed that these statements were demonstrations, for it was Aristotle who taught mankind the methods, the rules, and the conditions of demonstration."

93. RAYMUNDUS MARTINUS, 1687 (henceforth PF).

94. *Cf.* PF, I pars, 14 cap., 1-3, pp. 230-231; PF, I pars, 14 cap., 6, pp. 233-234.

95. PF, I pars, 14 cap., 3, p. 231; *cf. Guide*, II, 15, pp. 289–292. "Rabi Moses in More Nebochim, the Guide of the Hesitators, demonstrates that it hardly escaped Aristotle himself, in chapter 15 of the second part through the words of Aristotle, that he quotes literally."

96. "*Dixit Rabi Moyses Egyptius in apertione libri sui*", DN, p. 1, l. 3.

given by Al-Ḥarizi, who used the epithet "Rabbenu."[97] Moreover, it is not surprising that the Jew involved in translating the *Dux neutrorum* would refer to Maimonides with the epithet "Rabbi," as any Jew would do. Later Latin authors likely picked up the epithet "Rabbi" directly from the manuscripts of the *Dux neutrorum*. Therefore, the use of the this epithet does not necessarily imply that they considered him as a religious authority, and it reflects the usual way to refer to a Jewish scholar. Moreover, the epithet had also the practical function of avoiding any possible confusion with the biblical Moses.

Conclusion

Textual proofs given in the previous paragraph demonstrate that the *Dux neutrorum* is a mixture of literal and non-literal translation. Usually, in 12th and 13th century translation movement, when applied, the literal method is used consistently. The same is not true for the *Dux neutrorum*. Inconsistencies found in the *Dux neutrorum* show that literality is not due to a stylistic choice, but it rather responds to a practical strategy. The paraphrastic method leaves the freedom of sometimes following verbatim the source while abbreviating other passages according to their content. The ultimate aim is to adapt the text to the needs of a public that does not have the knowledge to fully understand the text without cultural mediation.

Determining the translators' field of interest helps to solve many of the problems raised by the *Dux neutrorum*, such as the motivation that led to its translation. This question cannot be answered easily, *a fortiori* because of the inconsistencies present in the text and in its translation method. However, some arguments clearly speak in favor of a philosophical interest, such as the reference to Aristotle discussed in D-7. Had the scholars been interested in matters purely pertaining the Jewish law, they would not have translated a clearly philosophical text, such as the *Dux neutrorum*. Moreover, the absence of quotations from the Talmud (see B-1; D-1; D-2) seems to exclude an interest in rabbinical texts. As already shown elsewhere,[98] most probably a couple of translators was at work, this would also explain the apparent contradictions found while considering the question of the field of interest. The Jewish scholar brought his linguistic competency in the Hebrew language, and more generally in Judaism, while the Christian translator was probably more versed in philosophy. From this

---

97. Ḥar., p. 22; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Hébreu 682, f. 13va.

98. *Cf.* Di Segni, 2016b.

perspective, the choice of Al-Ḥarizi's over Ibn Tibbon's translation (and over the Arabic original) is not inconsistent with the presence of some very technical philosophical terms (even with a degree of uncertainty) as well as passages from Aristotle.[99]

In my opinion, the motive for translating a work such as the *Guide of the Perplexed* must have been very similar to the reasons that in the past, and still today, inspired a great number of translations: interest about a foreign text that had made scandal inside a neighboring community. And the reason why this work produced such a big scandal among Jewish communities was precisely its philosophical content.[100] A more in-depth analysis of philosophical terminology is planned and it will certainly help to clarify the philosophical interest of the translators.[101]

Bibliography

Alexander de Hales, 1924, *Summa theologica*, ed. Klumper Bernardinus, Quaracchi, Firenze, 769 p.

Alexander de Hales, 1948, *Summa theologica*, ed. Perantoni Pacifico Maria, Quaracchi, Firenze, 413 p.

Guilelmus de Alvernia, 1674, *De universo*, Paris, 413 p.

Alverny Marie-Thérèse d', 1959, « Anniyya-anitas » *in* Collectif, *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson de l'Académie française*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies/J. Vrin, Toronto/Paris, p. 59-91.

Alverny Marie-Thérèse d', 1989, « Les traductions à deux interprètes, d'arabe en langue vernaculaire et de langue vernaculaire en latin » *in* Contamine Geneviève (dir.), *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Éditions du CNRS, Paris, p. 193-206.

99. *Cf.* the case of the word *anitas* mentioned in the passage E-3.

100. On the Maimonidean controversy, see Silver, 1965.

101. An inquiry on philosophical terminology is planned as part of the GIF Project Nᵒ. G 1332-116.4/2016.

ANZULEWICZ Henryk, 2007, „Das Bild von Moses Maimonides. Kritische Anmerkungen zu einer Studie" in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, nᵒ 54, pp. 579-599.

ARISTOTELES, 1949, *Categoriae,* ed. MINIO PALUELLO Lorenzo, Clarendon, Oxford, 96 p.

ARISTOTELES LATINUS, 1973, *Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. GAUTHIER René, Brill, Leiden, 588 p.

AVERROÈS, 1952, *Tafsīr mā baʿd aṭ-ṭabīʿāt*, éd. BOUYGUES Maurice, Imprimerie Catholique, Beyrouth, 242 p.

AVERROES LATINUS, 1996, *Commentum medium super libro Peri hermeneias Aristotelis*, ed. HISSETTE Roland, Peeters, Louvain, 224 p.

BEER Jeanette M. A. (ed.), 1997, *Translation theory and practice in the Middle Ages*, Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University (coll. Studies in medieval culture), Kalamazoo, 282 p.

BURNETT Charles, 1997, "Literal Translation and Intelligent Adaptation amongst the Arabic-Latin Translators of the First Half of the Twelfth Century" in SCARCIA AMORETTI Biancamaria (a cura di), *La diffusione delle Scienze Islamiche nel Medio Evo Europeo*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, pp. 9-28.

BURNETT Charles, 1997, "Translating from Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: Theory, Practice and Criticism" in LOFTS Steve G. & ROSEMANN Philipp W. (dir.), *Éditer, traduire, interpréter : essais de méthodologie philosophique*, Éditions de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie, Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 55-78.

BURNETT Charles, 2001, "The Coherence of the Arabic-Latin Translation Program in Toledo in the Twelfth Century" in *Science in Context*, nᵒ 14 (1-2), reproduced in BURNETT 2009, pp. 249-288, DOI : 10.1017/S0269889701000096.

BURNETT Charles, 2009, *Arabic into Latin in the Middle Ages: the translators and their intellectual and social context*, Ashgate Variorum, Farnham, 412 p.

REVUE DES ÉTUDES HÉBRAÏQUES ET JUIVES
42 Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides'
Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

Carmody Francis J., 1960, "The Latin Style of Michael Scot in *De Celo*" *in* Hand Wayland D. & Arlt Gustave O. (eds.), *Humaniora. Essays in Literature-Folklore-Bibliography*, Locust Valley, New York, pp. 208-218.

Moneta Cremonensis, 1743, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. Thomas Augustinus Ricchinius, Roma, 568 p.

Dales Richard C., 1982, "Maimonides and Boethius of Dacia on the Eternity of the World" in *The New Scholasticis*, n° 56, pp. 306-319.

Di Segni Diana, 2014, « La table des préceptes dans le *Dux neutrorum* de Moïse Maïmonide » *in* Speer Andreas & Guldentops Guy (hrsg. v.), *Das Gesetz, The Law, La Loi,* de Gruyter (coll. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, n° 38), Berlin, p. 229-292.

Di Segni Diana, 2016a, *Moses Maimonides and the Latin Middle Ages. Critical Edition of Dux neutrorum I, 1-59*, [s.n.] Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln im Fach Philosophie, Digitalpublikation KUPS.

Di Segni Diana, 2016b, "Traces of a Vernacular Language in the Latin Translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*" in *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales*, n° 83 (1), pp. 21-48, DOI : 10.2143/RTPM.83.1.3154583.

Dienstag Jacob Israel (ed.), 1975, *Studies in Maimonides and St Thomas Aquinas*, Ktav, New York, 350 p.

Dunphy William, 1983, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Creation. A Critique of Their Historians" *in* Gerson Lloyd Phillip (ed.), *Graceful reason*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, pp. 361-379.

Efros Israel, 1966, *Philosophical terms in the Moreh Nebukim*, AMS Press, New York, 157 p.

Freudenthal Gad, 1988, « Pour le dossier de la traduction latine médiévale du *Guide des Égarés* » in *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. 147, p. 167-172, DOI : 10.2143/REJ.147.1.2012894.

Gutas Dimitri, 2006, "What Was There in Arabic for the Latins to Receive?" *in* Speer Andreas & Wegener Lydia (hrsg. v.), *Wissen über Grenzen,* de Gruyter (coll. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, n° 33), Berlin, pp. 3-21.

Hamesse Jacqueline (dir.), 2001, *Les traducteurs au travail : leurs manuscrits et leurs méthodes : actes du colloque international organisé par le « Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture » (Erice, 30 septembr-6 octobre 1999),* Brepols, Turnhout, 545 p.

Hamesse Jacqueline & Fattori Marta (dir.), 1990, *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale. Traductions et traducteurs de l'Antiquité tardive au* XIVe *siècle*, Institut d'études médiévales de l'Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-La-Neuve/Cassino, 402 p.

Hasse Dag, 2010, *Latin Averroes Translations of the First Half of the Thirteenth Century*, Olms, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, 38 p.

Hasse Dag, 2011, "Abbreviation in Medieval Latin Translations from Arabic" *in* Wisnovsky Robert, Wallis Faith, Fumo Jamie C. & Fraenkel Carlos (eds.), *Vehicles of Transmission, Translation, and Transformation in Medieval Textual Culture*, Brepols, Turnhout, pp. 159-172.

Hasselhoff Görge K., 2004, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses: Studien zum Bild von Moses Maimonides im lateinischen Westen vom 13. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert*, Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg, 400 p.

Hissette Roland, 2001, « Des traductions doubles et Guillaume de Luna ou de Lunis » *in* Hamesse Jacqueline (dir.), *Les traducteurs au travail : leurs manuscrits et leurs méthodes : actes du colloque international organisé par le « Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture » (Erice, 30 septembre-6 octobre 1999)*, Brepols, Turnhout, p. 257-273.

Imbach Ruedi, 1990, „Ut Ait Rabbi Moyses. Maimonidische Philosopheme bei Thomas von Aquin und Meister Eckhart" in *Collectanea Franciscana*, n° 60, pp. 99-116.

Imbach Ruedi, 1995, «Alcune precisazioni sulla presenza di Maimonide in Tommaso» *in* Lorenz Dietrich & Serafini Stefano (a cura di), *Istituto san*

Tommaso: Studi 1995, Pontificia Università S. Tommaso d'Aquino, Roma, pp. 48-64.

Joël Manuel, 1863, *Verhältniss Albert des Grossen zu Moses Maimonides: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie*, Schletter'schen Buchhandlung, Breslau, 38 p.

Kluxen Wolfgang, 1954, „Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides" in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, n° 21, pp. 22-50.

Kluxen Wolfgang, 1955, „Maimonides und die Hochscholastik" in *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, n° 63, pp. 151-165.

Kluxen Wolfgang, 1966, „Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abendland als Beispiel einer christlich-jüdischen Begegnung" *in* Wilpert Paul & Eckert Willehad Paul (hrsg. v.), *Judentum im Mittelalter: Beiträge zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch*, de Gruyter (coll. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, n° 4), Berlin, pp. 146-166.

Kluxen Wolfgang, 1986, "Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism" *in* Yovel Yirmiahu, Pines Shlomo *et al.* (eds.), *Maimonides and philosophy: papers presented at the sixth Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter, May 1985*, Nijhoff, Dordrecht, pp. 224-232.

Kluxen Wolfgang, 2004, « Maïmonide et l'orientation philosophique de ses lecteurs latins » *in* Lévy Tony & Rashed Roshdi, *Maïmonide, philosophe et savant (1138-1204)*, Peeters, Louvain/Paris, p. 395-409.

Moshe Ben Maimon, 1931, *Dalālat al-ḥā'irīn*, ed. Munk Salomon & Joël Issachar, Junowitz, Jérusalem, 517 p.

Moshe Ben Maimon, 1952, *Moreh nevukhim*, ed. Scheyer B. Simon, Maḥbarot le-Sifrut, Tel-Aviv, 923 p.

Moshe Ben Maimon, 2000, *Moreh nevukhim*, ed. Even-Shmuel Yehudah, Mossad Harav Kook, Jerusalem, 599 p.

Moïse Maïmonide, 1888, *Le Livre des préceptes*, ed. Bloch Moïse, Lipschtutz, Paris, 335 p.

Moses Maimonides, 1963, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, ed. Pines Schlomo, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 658 p.

Moïse Maïmonide, 1970, *Le Guide des égarés : traité de théologie et de philosophie*, ed. Munk Salomon, G.-P. Maisonneuve et Larose, Paris, 462+380+532 p.

Moses Maimonides, 1981, *Mishneh Torah: The book of knowledge*, ed. Hyamson Moses, Feldheim Publishers, New York, 186 p.

Mosè Maimonide, 2003, *La Guida dei perplessi*, a cura di Zonta Mauro, UTET, Torino, 803 p.

Heidrich Peter, 2010, *Im Gespräch mit Meister Eckhart und Maimonides,* hrsg. v. Niemann Hermann Michael, Lit. Verlag, Berlin, 242 p.

Perles Joseph, 1875, „Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundene erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen 'Führers'" in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, n° 24, pp. 9-24; 67-86; 99-110; 149-159; 209-218; 261-268.

Rabi Moses Aegyptius, 1520, *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum*, ed. Augustinus Iustinianus, Parisiis, 122 p.

Raymundus Martinus, 1687, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos cum observationibus Josephi de Voisin, et introductione Jo. Benedicti Carpzovi, qui simul appendicis loco Hermanni Judaei opusculum de sua conversione ex manuscripto Bibliothecae Paulinae Academiae Lipsiensis recensuit*, Friederich Lanckis, Lipsiae, 961 p.

Rigo Caterina, 2001, „Zur Rezeption des Moses Maimonides im Werk des Albertus Magnus" *in* Senner Walter & Anzulewicz Henryk (hrsg. v.), *Albertus Magnus: zum Gedenken nach 800 Jahren: Neue Zugänge, Aspekte und Perspektiven*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, pp. 29-66.

Rohner Anselm, 1913, *Das Schöpfungsproblem bei Moses Maimonides, Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Schöpfungsproblems im Mittelalter*, Aschendorff, Münster, 140 p.

REVUE DES ÉTUDES HÉBRAÏQUES ET JUIVES
46 Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides'
Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

RUBIO Mercedes, 2006, *Aquinas and Maimonides on the possibility of the knowledge of God: an examination of the* Quaestio de attributis, Springer, Dordrecht, 323 p.

SEESKIN Kenneth, 1997, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Creation" in *Medioevo*, n° 23, pp. 453-472.

SERMONETA Giuseppe, 1969, *Un Glossario filosofico ebraico-italiano del XIII secolo*, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Roma, 568 p.

SERMONETA Giuseppe, 1980, «Federico II e il pensiero ebraico nell'Italia del suo tempo» in ROMANINI Angiola Maria (a cura di), *Federico II e l'arte del Duecento italiano: Atti della III settimana di studi di storia dell'arte medievale dell'Università di Roma*, Congedo editore, Galatina, pp. 186-197.

SILVER Daniel Jeremy, 1965, *Maimonidean criticism and the Maimonidean controversy, 1180-1240*, Brill, Leiden, 219 p.

SIRAT Colette, 1989, « Les traducteurs juifs à la cour des rois de Sicile et de Naples » in CONTAMINE Geneviève (dir.), *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, Éditions du CNRS, Paris, p. 169-1991.

STEINSCHNEIDER Moritz, 1864, „Kaiser Friedrich II. über Maimonides" in *Hebräische Bibliographie*, n° 7, pp. 62-66.

STEINSCHNEIDER Moritz, 1893, *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher*, Kommissionsverlag des Bibliographischen Bureaus, Berlin, 1117 p.

VAN OPPENRAAY Aafke, 1990, « Quelques particularités de la méthode de traduction de Michel Scot » in HAMESSE Jacqueline & FATTORI Marta (dir.), *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale. Traductions et traducteurs de l'Antiquité tardive au XIVᵉ siècle*, Institut d'études médiévales de l'Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-La-Neuve/Cassino, p. 121-129.

WISNOVSKY Robert, WALLIS Faith, FUMO Jamie C. & FRAENKEL Carlos (eds.), 2011, *Vehicles of Transmission, Translation, and Transformation in Medieval Textual Culture*, Brepols, Turnhout, 433 p.

Wohlman Avital, 1988, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide : un dialogue exemplaire*, Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 417 p.

Wohlman Avital, 1995, *Maïmonide et Thomas d'Aquin : un dialogue impossible*, Éditions universitaires, Fribourg, 196 p.

Zonta Mauro, 2001, "Medieval Hebrew Translations: Methods and Textual Problems" *in* Hamesse Jacqueline (dir.), *Les traducteurs au travail : leurs manuscrits et leurs méthodes : actes du colloque international organisé par le « Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture » (Erice, 30 septembre-6 octobre 1999)*, Brepols, Turnhout, p. 129-142.

Zonta Mauro, 2006, "The Jewish Mediation in the Transmission of Arabo-Islamic Science and Philosophy to the Latin Middle Ages. Historical Overview and Perspective of Research" *in* Speer Andreas & Wegener Lydia (hrgs. v.), *Wissen über Grenzen,* de Gruyter (coll. Miscellanea Mediaevalia, nº 33), Berlin, pp. 89-105.

Abstract: The question of the *Dux neutrorum*'s origin has been lengthily debated. To disclose part its "mystery" it would be useful to understand the cultural project behind such an enterprise: Why was this text translated and who was the public addressed? A closer examination of the translation technique can reveal important information concerning the historical and methodological circumstances of the *Dux neutrorum*'s composition: is it to be considered as a literal translation or as a paraphrase? Are some original passages omitted, and if yes, which ones? The answer to these questions could reveal the aim that moved the translator, by indicating his interest with regard to some sections and disinterest with regard to omitted passages. Secondly, it provides information that can be compared to similar methods applied within the context of the thirteenth-century translation movement.

Keywords: Hebrew-into-Latin, Dux neutrorum, Latin Maimonides, 13th century translation movement, translations techniques

Résumé : La question de l'origine du Dux neutrorum *a été longuement débattue. Pour y répondre, il serait utile de comprendre ce qu'était le projet culturel de cette traduction. Pourquoi ce texte a-t-il été traduit et quel en était le destinataire ? Une analyse approfondie de la méthode de traduction pourrait donner des informations importantes sur les circonstances historiques et les particularités méthodologiques de la composition du* Dux neutrorum *: ce texte doit-il être considéré comme une*

REVUE DES ÉTUDES HÉBRAÏQUES ET JUIVES
48 Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides’
Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

traduction littérale ou plutôt comme une paraphrase ? Y a-t-il des passages omis ? La réponse à ces questions pourrait indiquer le but du traducteur, en montrant son intérêt pour certaines sections ainsi que son manque d'intérêt pour les passages omis. Ces informations pourraient être utiles pour une comparaison avec les méthodes appliquées dans le cadre du mouvement des traductions vers le latin au treizième siècle.

Mots-clefs : de l'hébreu au latin, Dux neutrorum, Maïmonide en latin, mouvement des traductions au treizième siècle, techniques de traduction

תקציר: שאלת מקורו של התרגום הלטיני כבר נידונה רבות. כדי לענות עליה כדאי לבדוק את ההקשר התרבותי של מפעל זה: מהן הסיבות שהוליכו לתרגום ומי היה קהל היעד שלו? ניתוח שיטת התרגום עשוי לגלות מידע בעל חשיבות הן על הנסיבות ההיסטוריות של מלאכת התרגום והן על השיקולים המתודולוגיים בקומפוזיציה שלו. השאלות המרכזיות הן : האם התרגום הינו מילולי או שמדובר בעיבוד? האם ניתן לאתר קטעים שהושמטו? תשובה על שאלות אלו עשויה לחשוף את מטרותיו של המתרגם, את מידת העניין (או חוסר העניין) שהוא מגלה בקטעים נתונים ובנוסף לכך ניתן להשוות את שיטת התרגום עם אותן האופייניות לתנועת התרגום ללטינית במאה ה-13.
מלות מפתח: מעברית ללטינית, הרמב"ם בלטינית, הגירסה הלטינית של המורה (דוקס נטרורום), המתרגמים ללטינית במאה ה-13,טכניקות של תרגום