James T. Robinson

Samuel Ibn Tibbon’s *Peruš ha-Millot ha-Zarot* and al-Fārābī’s *Eisagoge* and *Categories*

In medieval Jewish philosophy, few reference works were more widely read and influential than Samuel Ibn Tibbon’s *Peruš ha-Millot ha-Zarot* (“Explanation of Unfamiliar Terms,” completed by 1213).¹ This Hebrew philosophical lexicon, which survives in more than fifty
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complete or fragmentary manuscripts, was written as a companion to his revised Hebrew rendering of Maimonides’ Guide of the Perplexed. Often it was transmitted together with the Guide, but it also circulated independently and was read both as a companion to the Guide and as a general introduction to philosophy, giving Hebrew readers their first encounter with the Greco-Arabic sciences.

For the most part, Peruš ha-Millot ha-Zarot (PMZ)—which includes some 190 definitions of “unfamiliar” or technical terms—is organized alphabetically. Ibn Tibbon provides brief definitions, occasional longer discussions, citations of relevant biblical verses or rabbinic dicta, and discussions of philosophical ideas and problems. The exception to this general format is the first entry: ’ekut (the Aristotelian category “quality”). As in his other entries, Ibn Tibbon begins with a brief definition of “quality”; but he then proceeds to give full discussions of the five predicables (genus, species, differentia, property, accident), of definition and description, and of all ten categories, including quality. In total, he defines seventeen terms under ’ekut, presenting a sort of Eisagoge to philosophy, resembling the ancient and medieval Eisagoge tradition.2

This is not all. The first entry in PMZ is exceptional for another reason as well. The definitions presented there are not original discussions by Ibn Tibbon; nor are they even summaries of Arabic philosophical texts. Instead, they are, for the most part, word-for-word translations from al-Fārābī’s Eisagoge and Categories. In all, thirteen of the seventeen definitions under ’ekut are literal renderings from al-Fārābī (differentia, property, accident, and all ten categories).3 Two additional definitions show strong similarities to al-Fārābī (definition and description). In three cases, Ibn Tibbon provides alternative definitions as well, which seem to be drawn from Ibn Sīnā’s Book of Definitions and Ibn Rushd’s Middle Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories (substance, quality, and relative). Ibn Tibbon occasionally adds his own explanatory glosses as well.

This identification of Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic sources in PMZ is significant for many reasons. First of all, in light of Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic sources it is possible to resolve, or at least explain, some of the textual problems in the PMZ manuscripts already identified and described by M. Goshen-Gottstein and C. Fraenkel.4 As will be discussed below (in Part 1), using al-Fārābī as a key it is possible to separate the many surviving manuscripts into three distinct families, which tellingly also correspond with a division according to paleographical criteria: manuscripts written primarily in Spanish script; manuscripts written in Italian script; and manuscripts written primarily in Byzantine script (which also include thirteen Arabic and “Provençalized Latin” glosses).5 Second, the identification of these renderings of al-Fārābī adds yet another item to the list of Ibn Tibbon’s translations, allowing us to gain greater understanding of his work as translator and lexicographer.6


3 Ibn Tibbon’s definitions of “genus” and “species” are similar but not identical to al-Fārābī’s and are therefore not included in this list (nor in the discussion below). I have not yet identified Ibn Tibbon’s exact direct source for these two definitions. See above, n. 1.

4 The paleographical information is based on the catalogue of the Institute for Microfilmed Manuscripts. The term “Provençalized Latin” is Cyril Aslanov’s (see below).

5 I compared Ibn Tibbon’s definitions with the four extant medieval Hebrew renderings of al-Fārābī’s Eisagoge and the three extant medieval Hebrew renderings of his Categories. I found that, although Ibn Tibbon is sometimes similar or even identical
among other things, they demonstrate his solid understanding of logic and illustrate his didactic concerns. That Ibn Tibbon’s glossary begins with al-Fārābī is significant for another reason as well. It means that most Hebrew readers of the Guide, who would generally begin the study of Maimonides’ work with Ibn Tibbon’s PMZ at their side, were in fact reading the Guide with al-Fārābī. Thus, as Maimonides himself would perhaps have preferred, in the Hebrew tradition study of the Guide began with al-Fārābī.7

This paper presents the evidence relating to Ibn Tibbon’s use of al-Fārābī in his PMZ. Part 1 briefly classifies the manuscripts of Ibn Tibbon’s lexicon, organizing them according to their relation to the Arabic sources and paleography (Spanish script, Italian script, Byzantine script). Part 2 is a critical synoptic edition (based on the Spanish and Italian recensions) of the section of PMZ dependent on al-Fārābī’s Eisagoge, set side by side with its Arabic source. Part 3 is a critical synoptic edition (based on the Spanish and Italian recensions) of the section of PMZ dependent on al-Fārābī’s Categories, set side by side with its Arabic source. Part 4 presents the Arabic and Provençalized Latin glosses found only in the Byzantine recension.

1. The Manuscript Traditions

As indicated above, more than fifty manuscripts of Ibn Tibbon’s PMZ survive, of which forty-three contain all or part of the first entry, ḫkut. By examining these forty-three manuscripts in relation to Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic sources, I was able to establish the existence of three fairly distinct manuscript traditions, which I call (based on the type of script used in the best exemplars of each) Spanish, Italian, and Byzantine. There is also a fourth tradition, more complex and less stable, which shares readings with both the Spanish and the Italian traditions; it represents either an intermediate tradition between the Spanish and Italian or (and this seems more likely to me) a later adaptation resulting from scribal contamination. Although this fourth tradition should be weighed carefully when a full critical edition of Ibn Tibbon’s work is prepared, it does not bear significantly on the subject of this paper and will not be considered in the following discussion.

Of the forty-three manuscripts I examined, I identified fourteen which clearly reflect the unique characteristics of one or another of the three main traditions. These fourteen are listed and briefly described here.

Manuscript tradition A: Spanish

Although the manuscripts in this tradition are late, are often corrupt, and are generally unstable, they nevertheless preserve the readings closest to the Arabic text of al-Fārābī. In my opinion this tradition, to two of the medieval translations, he is also significantly different, and at times translates from a different version of al-Fārābī. Thus it seems clear that Ibn Tibbon was not the author of any of the medieval translations; nor was he influenced by them. On the contrary, his PMZ represents an independent rendering of select passages of al-Fārābī’s text, in effect a fifth version of the Eisagoge and a fourth version of the Categories.

This paper presents the evidence relating to Ibn Tibbon’s use of al-Fārābī in his PMZ. Part 1 briefly classifies the manuscripts of Ibn Tibbon’s lexicon, organizing them according to their relation to the Arabic sources and paleography (Spanish script, Italian script, Byzantine script). Part 2 is a critical synoptic edition (based on the Spanish and Italian recensions) of the section of PMZ dependent on al-Fārābī’s Eisagoge, set side by side with its Arabic source. Part 3 is a critical synoptic edition (based on the Spanish and Italian recensions) of the section of PMZ dependent on al-Fārābī’s Categories, set side by side with its Arabic source. Part 4 presents the Arabic and Provençalized Latin glosses found only in the Byzantine recension.

1. The Manuscript Traditions

As indicated above, more than fifty manuscripts of Ibn Tibbon’s PMZ survive, of which forty-three contain all or part of the first entry, ḫkut. By examining these forty-three manuscripts in relation to Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic sources, I was able to establish the existence of three fairly distinct manuscript traditions, which I call (based on the type of script used in the best exemplars of each) Spanish, Italian, and Byzantine. There is also a fourth tradition, more complex and less stable, which shares readings with both the Spanish and the Italian traditions; it represents either an intermediate tradition between the Spanish and
insofar as it can be reconstructed, represents a first edition of PMZ, which was subsequently revised, most likely by Ibn Tibbon himself. The Italian tradition (discussed below) would seem to represent this revised version. The following manuscripts are the best exemplars of this Spanish tradition:

A1. Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, vat. ebr. 421 (F 496); Spanish script, dated 1449
A2. Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod hebr. 182 (F 1449); Ashkenazi script, dated 1491
A3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, ms héb. 684 (F 11562); Spanish script, dated 1352
A4. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 3091 (F 67); Spanish script, 15th or 16th century

Manuscript tradition B: Italian

This tradition, which is the earliest attested of the traditions (with manuscripts dated 1273 and 1283), is by far the most stable (with relatively few variants). It is also the most polished, with Arabisms frequently removed and replaced with more elegant and Hebraized syntax and terminology. As we will see (e.g., in the remarks on the definition of “quality”), the revisions found in this family of manuscripts were done in light of the original Arabic text. And since it is unlikely that Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic source was identified by a later scholar or student, it seems certain that the revisions were made by Ibn Tibbon himself. The best exemplars of this the Italian tradition are the following:

B1. London, British Library Add. 14763; Margoliouth 904 (F 4930); Italian script, dated 1273
B2. London, British Library Harley 7586A; Margoliouth 906 (F 4876); Italian script, dated 1283
B3. London, British Library Harley 5507; Margoliouth 905 (F 4865); Italian script, 14th or 15th century

B4. Paris, École Rabbinique 40 (F 4018); Italian script, 14th century
B5. Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 3281; De Rossi 1379 (F 13958); Italian script, 15th century

Manuscript tradition C: Byzantine, with unique Arabic and Provençalized Latin Glosses

In general, the Byzantine tradition resembles the Italian, although it occasionally preserves Arabized readings found in the Spanish. With regard to the text itself, this family of manuscripts adds little of significance to the textual history of PMZ. However, the Byzantine manuscripts have something not found in the other manuscripts: thirteen Arabic and Provençalized Latin glosses. A total of five manuscripts contain these multi-lingual glosses, as follows:

C1. Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, vat. ebr. 284 (F 341); Byzantine script, 14th century
C2. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library Evr. I 479 (F 50943); Byzantine script, dated 1331
C3. Parma, Biblioteca Palatina Cod. Parm. 3036; De Rossi 1076 (F 13840); Byzantine script, 14th or 15th century
C4. Hamburg, Staats- und Universitatsbibliothek Cod. hebr. 261 (F 1061); Ashkenazi script, 15th century
C5. Budapest, Magyar tudomanyos akademia, MS Kaufmann A 273a (F15126); Byzantine script, dated 1377

Note that this conclusion is contrary to the thesis of Goshen-Gottstein (“On the Methods of Translation”), who suggested that variations in the manuscripts were the result of later scribal emendation and represent, among other things, a tendency of scribes to over-Arabize. It seems to me that the identification of Ibn Tibbon’s Arabic sources helps strengthen Fraenkel’s contrary thesis (From Maimonides to Samuel Ibn Tibbon) that Ibn Tibbon himself was responsible for revisions he introduced over time.

Note: This text is a corrected version of the original text, with some adjustments to improve readability and clarity.
The next two sections present synoptic editions of Ibn Tibbon’s definitions of differentia, property, accident, definition, description (Part 2), and the ten categories (Part 3) side by side with their Arabic sources. The edition of the Hebrew text of the Spanish tradition is eclectic, based on manuscripts A1 and A2 with corrections in the light of A3 and A4. The edition of the Hebrew text of the Italian tradition, in contrast, is diplomatic, based on the earliest dated manuscript (B1), with only occasional corrections made in the light of other manuscripts. A complete apparatus is provided for each tradition, together with brief remarks about the relation of the two traditions to each other and to the Arabic text upon which they are based. All citations of al-Farabi are from the edition of Rafiq al-ʿAjam, with occasional modifications based on the earlier edition of D. M. Dunlop and the manuscript variants recorded by al-ʿAjam.9 Significant differences between the recensions, and words or phrases that will be singled out for discussion, are underlined.

2. PMZ and al-Farablī’s Eisagoge

Differentia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A1]</td>
<td>[A2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks
As he often does, Ibn Tibbon begins the definition of “differentia” with a meta-level of speech, which alludes to an unnamed source: *hageqhu* (“they have defined it as …”); the definition, which is a literal translation from al-Fārābī, then follows. A short gloss explaining al-Fārābī’s meaning—apparently the work of Ibn Tibbon himself—interrupts al-Fārābī’s exposition. Here, as elsewhere, the Spanish tradition (A) represents a more complete text; for example, it preserves one phrase of the Arabic that is missing in the Italian tradition (B): *bi-qeṣat tekumoraw we-inayanaw ba-muqriyyim*. More significantly, (A) produces a closer and more literal rendering of the Arabic. Thus (A) translates *fi jawbaribi* word-for-word as *be-‘asmo*, whereas (B) uses the less literal *be-‘eṣem ‘amitato*.

Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>המוגדר: הוא hakkilya המגדיר תמונת ירח מקומית י órgãoית</td>
<td>המוגדר: הוא hakkilya המגדיר תמונת ירח מקומי יтверד יгородית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>השווי ממקום אחר ומקומית על תומך ה BigDecimal ממקום אחר ומ流淌</td>
<td>העברת המ assignable ב-B QWidget במיקום אחר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
source was likely known only to Ibn Tibbon, the observed difference between the two traditions is the strongest evidence for the thesis that Ibn Tibbon himself is responsible for the revision.

**Accident**

**A**

A4: אֵדֵד הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר בֶּן אֳשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל.

**B**

B2: אֵדֵד הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר בֶּן אֳשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Remarks

The definition of “property,” like that of “differentia,” consists of word-for-word borrowings from al-Fārābī, together with explanatory glosses and additions, again apparently the work of Ibn Tibbon himself. In Ibn Tibbon’s version, moreover, the example used by al-Fārābī—that of a horse neighing—is replaced by the example of a human being laughing. Here too tradition (A) represents a more literal translation of the Arabic; in this case the differences are especially revealing. For example, (A) translates *tasta*ml̄īt *fī tamytz naw* ‘*an naw* as *tei*‘āsh *be-bakkarat min mi-min*, whereas (B) has *mešammešin bāb b-haydalat min mi-min*. The differences are as follows: (A) translates according to the root meaning of *tasta*ml̄īt (‘.m.l.’), that is, ‘do, make’, replacing it with the corresponding Hebrew root ‘.b.; and it translates *tamyitz* according to the standard Hebrew bakkarah, as already established by Judah Ibn Tibbon. Tradition (B), by contrast, translates the tenth-form verb *tasta*ml̄īt according to the meaning of the form rather than the basic meaning of the Arabic root, as *mešammeš* ‘use, serve’, and *tamyitz* according to the meaning in context, which is the differentiation of one species from another. It is significant that each tradition represents a different interpretation of the Arabic text: the change cannot be due to a corruption or ad hoc revision; it is rather a revision in light of the Arabic original. Since, as noted earlier, the identity of the Arabic...
Remarks

The entire entry “accident” is dependent on al-Fārābī; there are no additions or explanatory glosses. However, as in the previous examples, (A) is the more complete text. It includes one clause of the Arabic that is missing in (B) (see the underlined text), and in general stays closer to the Arabic. Thus, for example, it renders ghayr as bilti rather than u-bilti (as in B) and translates fībī as bo instead of lo (as in B).

Definition and Description

Following the definitions of the five predicables (three of which, as shown above, are translations from al-Fārābī), Ibn Tibbon presents a brief discussion of “definition” and “description.” These too seem to follow the Eisagoge of al-Fārābī, although the use of al-Fārābī is restricted to two short texts. I present here only the two passages in Ibn Tibbon’s discussion that correspond with al-Fārābī, along with the very few variant readings and some brief comments.

Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר] מאמרמחוברמסוגומבדיל</td>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר] מאמרמחוברמסוגומבדיל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
<td>והוא [ר”ל מלתגדר]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

Of note is the fact that Ibn Tibbon offers two distinct translations of the Arabic nātīq: medabber and maskil. This same ambivalence is found in PMZ, s.v. higgayon.10 “Some commentators have explained

‘keep your children from higgayon’ [Ber. 28b] as referring to the science called mantiq in Arabic. The Christians call it dialectics, [referring to the discipline as a whole] with the name of one of its parts. I have followed the [talmudic] commentators with respect to this [terminology] and call [logic] the art of higgayon. But in my opinion it would have been better had they called it the ‘art of speech’ [meleket ba-davar/dibber], following the definition of man as ‘rational animal’ [hay medabber]. Indeed, in my opinion, [logic] ought to be called the ‘art of reasoning’ [meleket ba-sīkel].”
3. PMZ and al-Fārābī’s Categories

**Substance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-
| al-ʿAjam, p. 89; Dunlop, par. 1 |
| hablar: kompana shehada  
| darb shala yadim mesho  
| neser dar yaza nemzam.  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada  
| bahtar al-dhah shi min:  
| mini: sha-dar yada umal  
| yeesheh dha-deh, anaw calal  
| neser: mini: sha-dar yada  
| mesho neser umal calal  
| dar yaza nemzam, anaw  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-ʿAjam, p. 89; Dunlop, par. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| hablar: kompana shehada  
| darb yaza umal  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada  
| bahtar al-dhah shi min:  
| mini: sha-dar yada umal  
| yeesheh dha-deh, anaw calal  
| neser: mini: sha-dar yada  
| mesho neser umal calal  
| dar yaza nemzam, anaw  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada |

| Quantity |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A-
| al-ʿAjam, pp. 93, 95; Dunlop, par. 6, 10, 11 |
| hablan: chakako ba al-
| ʿumma shehada  
| dar yaza umal  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada  
| bahtar al-dhah shi min:  
| mini: sha-dar yada umal  
| yeesheh dha-deh, anaw calal  
| neser: mini: sha-dar yada  
| mesho neser umal calal  
| dar yaza nemzam, anaw  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-ʿAjam, pp. 93, 95; Dunlop, par. 6, 10, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| hablan: chakako ba al-
| ʿumma shehada  
| dar yaza umal  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada  
| bahtar al-dhah shi min:  
| mini: sha-dar yada umal  
| yeesheh dha-deh, anaw calal  
| neser: mini: sha-dar yada  
| mesho neser umal calal  
| dar yaza nemzam, anaw  
| amr al-hukm shehada shahada |

**Remarks**

Ibn Tibbon provides two definitions of “substance.” The first is drawn word-for-word from al-Fārābī, whereas the second (presented below) resembles Ibn Sīnā’s *Book of Definitions*. The only significant textual variant is found in the material drawn from al-Fārābī, in which tradition (A) preserves the literal rendering of the plural with possessive pronoun, mawdʿāthiḥi (in Hebrew nosʾāw), whereas (B) has the singular without the possessive pronoun: nosʾā.

---

Other differences worthy of note: Manuscript tradition (A) presents somewhat different terminology than (B), using mitpared—instead of meforder—for munfasal. And only (A) has the correct translation of fi waṣṭ shayy minhuḥaḍd, as be-’emṣa’it darar mimmemnu ḡevul. (B) adds the possessive pronoun to ‘emṣa’it, and is missing ḡevul (perhaps due to scribal corruption), which translates a term found in the Arabic.
Remarks

As with “substance,” here also Ibn Tibbon presents two alternative definitions: the first from al-Farabi, the second from Ibn Rushd (see below). Only (A) preserves the plural of bake’t, rendered as tekunot, as opposed to (B), which has the more elegant, but less literal, sem le-kol tekunab (the same is true in the text of Ibn Rushd, cited below, which shows that this is an intentional revision and not a haphazard scribal error). Similarly, (A) translates literally ajnās mutawassita as sugim ‘emsat’iyim, whereas (B) has sugim tahtaw.

Ibn Rushd

 فال: واسم الكيفية الهيدايات التي بها ينطيل في الأشخاص كيف هي.

A1

ם תקונה לש זה

ד"כ שמירת המקנה: "탄ונת" ו"קיתון תקונת: קיתון מקשה, תקנית מקשה.

A2

A2A4

A4

A3

A

Relative, Relation

B

A

al-'Ajam, pp. 103-4; Dunlop, par. 21

Remarks

“Relative” is the third and final term for which Ibn Tibbon provides an alternative definition. And here, in the previous example, the second definition (given below) comes from Ibn Rushd’s Middle Commentary on Aristotle’s Categories. The only textual difference noteworthy of note is the translation of li-aglî in (A) as bi-glal and in (B) as bi-glul. This would seem to result from a mistake in transmission rather than an alternative translation of the text. Note also that Ibn Tibbon changes al-Fârâbî’s example “father” and “son,” most likely because he had no Hebrew equivalent for the Arabic ubûwa and bûnîwa (“fatherhood” and “sonship”). Instead, he uses the equivalent examples ‘adnû and ‘aved, with the corresponding abstract terms ‘adnut and ‘avedut, adding “father” and “son” at the end.

Ibn Rushd

When

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29

The following passage (see also p. 56) is from the Hebrew translation by Ibn/Tibbon.
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When

B

A

al-’Ajam, pp. 108-9; Dunlop, par. 29
The definition of “when” is borrowed literally from al-Fārābī, with only one short clause (underlined in the Arabic) left out. As is usual, (A) preserves the more literal translation; for example, \( \text{\textit{am zamānī bi-maḥḍūd}}, \) as \( \text{\textit{\`al zamān ha-mugbal}}, \) rather than \( \text{\textit{\`al ba-zeman ha-mugbal la-davar}} \) (as in B).
The definition of “state” or “position” is taken directly from al-Fārābī, with a final concluding remark on the translation of the Guide added. The only significant difference relating to the Arabic is near the end, where (A) preserves the plural ajzāʾ al-makān with helqē ba-maqom, whereas (B) has the singular helq ba-maqom.
Remarks
The definition of “having” or “possession” is nothing other than the first paragraph of al-Farabi’s definition. In general, (A) uses the same prepositions as the Arabic, whereas (B) replaces them with prepositions that work better in Hebrew. The only significant difference is near the end, where (A) translates wa-minbu radt literally, as u-minmennu resoni, whereas (B) presents a looser but more elegant version, u-mehem mah she-bu’ resoni.

Passion, Being Acted Upon

B

A

Action, Acting Upon

B

A

Remarks
The definition of “passion” or “being acted upon” is a translation of al-Farabi, with no additions or changes. Here too (A), as always, represents a more literal translation, for example rendering biyya anwa’ al-harika, as hem miney ba-tenu’tab, whereas (B) translates hem lefi miney ba-tenu’tab, adding the preposition lefi.
4. The Arabic and Provençalized Latin Glosses in the Byzantine Recension

As noted above, five manuscripts of PMZ—four of which are written in Byzantine script—carry thirteen glosses which give, for certain terms, their equivalents in Arabic and in laʿaz, i.e., in the language of the Christians, which in this instance means Latin or “Provençalized Latin.” Although Ibn Tibbon sometimes introduced Arabic and Latin/Romance glosses into his writings—elsewhere in PMZ and in his other books14—it seems certain that these glosses do not go back to Ibn Tibbon himself; they appear in only these five manuscripts; in two cases (“categories” and “species”) they appear out of place within the text, suggesting that at some point during transmission they entered the body of the text from the margin; and in one case (no. 8, on “substance”), the gloss seems to refer to Ibn Tibbon in the third person, showing that it was written by someone else. The glosses are, however, of interest, inasmuch as they are relatively early (from the thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries), and thus can be counted among the earliest extant bilingual philosophical glosses in Hebrew.15

The thirteen glosses preserved in the Byzantine recension are reproduced here, together with brief discussions. The identification of the glosses as Latin and “Provençalized Latin,” as well as the philological explanations, is based on correspondence with Cyril Aslanov (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), for whose erudite advice I am much indebted.

1. Categories

The Arabic term is maqūlāt, and in laʿaz it is: predicamentz.

Comment: The Latin, praedicamenta, is vulgarized as predicamentz.

2. Genus

Sug in Arabic is jins, and in laʿ az: genus.

Comment: Here the Latin, genus, is given.

14 See, e.g., Perû ha-Mïlot ha-Zarot, ed. Even-Shemuel, s.vv. ‘iṣātis, mavdil, hazyah, barkayah šegenit, meḥuv, ḥaqqeḥ, kaddar, maʿamar baggadi (pp. 34, 36, 44, 47–48, 54, 57–58, 65–66); Robinson, Commentary on Ecclesiastes, par. 600–601; Samuel Ibn Tibbon, Maʿamar Yiqqawu ha-Mayim, ed. M. Bischeles (Pressburg, 1837), p. 150.

3. Species

The term בּרֵכָה תּוֹתִית הָעָלָה אֲסָפְּרִישָׁא is.

Min in Arabic is naw, and in laʿaz: especie.

Comment: The word especies is, according to Aslanov, a “cross-formation between Latin species and Provençal especia.”

4. Differentia

The term גֵּדֶר is in laʿaz: definitio.

Comment: Here the Latin, definitio, is given.

5. Property

As for the term בּוֹק, which in laʿaz is descriptio...

Comment: Once again the Latin, descriptio, is given.

6. Substantive


I summarize our email correspondence. See also Aslanov, Le Provençal des Juifs, p. 41.

Cl. Peruš ha-Millot ha-Zarot, ed. Even-Shemuel, pp. 24–25, where this text is not preserved.


rasm; and similarly he translated ʿuqqay as rusūmi [see, e.g., Ps. 50:16]. Because of this, I have translated the Arabic term rasm into Hebrew as ʿoq. The practice of consulting Saadia’s Arabic translation of the Bible as something like a Hebrew-Arabic-Hebrew dictionary was already recommended by Judah Ibn Tibbon in his ethical will.
Comment: Once again I quote Aslanov: “As for *aliquid/adliqit*, it is obviously Latin. However, there is a problem with the spelling. By experience, I can say that whenever a Judeo-Romance gloss contains a *thav*, it is a corruption, because there is no reason for *thav* to appear in a Romance word written in Hebrew letters. So it is a corruption of some other spelling (by itself the metathesis is a corruption). I would suggest a correction like: אָלִיקוֹיָד”.

12. **When**

The [Hebrew] term *matay* is close to the Arabic *mata*̄, which in *laʿaz* is: *quando*.

Comment: Here the Latin, *quando*, is given.

13. **Possession, Having**

In Arabic *labu*, and in *laʿaz: abere*.

Comment: Here *abere* or *avere* is, according to Aslanov, “a hybrid cross-formation between Latin *habere* and Provençal *aver*. It exists neither in Latin nor in Provençal. It is part of the virtual interlingua.”

**Conclusion**

1. Of the seventeen definitions presented in *PMZ*, s.v. ‘*ekut*, thirteen (differentia, property, accident, and the ten categories) are literal translations from al-Farābī, while two (definition and description)
borrow short passages from al-Fārubī. In three other cases (substance, quality, relative) Ibn Tibbon provides alternative definitions to those of al-Fārubī, which are drawn from Ibn Sīnā and Ibn Rushd.

2. Based on comparison with the Arabic sources, it is possible to identify four distinct recensions of PMZ, corresponding to a classification by paleographical criteria. One, preserved in (predominantly) Spanish manuscripts, is close to the Arabic. A second recension, preserved in Italian manuscripts, is less literal but more elegant; since its variations with respect to the Spanish tradition were made with reference to the Arabic source on which Ibn Tibbon silently drew it can be taken as nearly certain that this revision was made by Ibn Tibbon himself. A third manuscript tradition (the Byzantine) includes unique Arabic glosses and glosses in la‘az — here Latin or “Provençalized Latin.” Lastly, a fourth recension is an intermediate tradition between the Spanish and the Italian manuscripts or represents a later contaminated version created by mixing and combining readings from the Spanish and the Italian.