

Alexander Fidora
(ICREA–Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

**From Arabic into Latin into Hebrew:
Aristotelian Psychology and its Contribution to the Rationalisation of Theological
Traditions***

Toledo, reconquered in 1085 by Alphonse VI from Muslim domination, was beyond any doubt the gateway through which Graeco-Arabic Aristotelian psychology first reached the Latin West.

Among the impressive number of philosophical texts that were translated in the 12th century at the so-called Toledan School of Translators from Arabic into Latin there are several treatises explicitly concerned with the theory of the intellect and the soul. In particular, Dominicus Gundissalinus (1110-1190), Archdeacon of Cuéllar, translated, along with many other works, al-Kindī's and al-Fārābī's respective tracts on the intellect as well as Avicenna's *De anima* from the *Kitāb aš-šifā'*. This latter was translated by Gundissalinus together with a certain Avendauth (i.e. Ibn Daūd), who should be identified with the famous Jewish philosopher Abraham Ibn Daūd.¹

Apart from these translations, Gundissalinus also wrote important works on his own,² namely *De unitate et uno*, *De processione mundi*, *De divisione philosophiae*, and a treatise *De immortalitate animae*, as well as a *Tractatus de anima*, the latter revealing his paramount interest in psychology. Relying on Arabic as well as Latin sources, Gundissalinus's works represent original, and often pioneering, contributions to the history of philosophy. This is true not only with regard to ontology and metaphysics (with the introduction of the term *metaphysica* to the Latin West),³ as well as epistemology (giving up the traditional *ordo scientiarum*, i.e. the scheme of the liberal arts, in favour of an

* This paper was written within the research project "Latin Philosophy into Hebrew: Intercultural Networks in 13th and 14th Century Europe" (200403), at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, with the financial support of the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme. – I am grateful for the assistance of Henryk Anzulewicz (Bonn), John N. Crossley (Melbourne) and Yossef Schwartz (Barcelona/Tel Aviv).

¹ This identification was first advanced by D'ALVERNY (1954-1956), 19-43. Ibn Daūd's chief work, the *Book of the Exalted Faith (Emunah ramah)*, being strongly influenced by Avicenna, d'Alverny's suggestion has generally been accepted by Ibn Daūd scholars; see, e.g., G. D. Cohen in his introduction to ABRAHAM IBN DAŪD, *A Critical Edition with a Translation and Notes of the Book of Tradition*, XXVII-XXVIII, and FONTAINE (1990), 262-263. On the other hand R. Lemay's criticism appears confused and pointless: cf. LEMAY (1987), 408-427.

² For a detailed study of the Toledan Archdeacon and his thought FIDORA (2003).

³ Cf. FIDORA (2004).

Aristotelian division of the sciences),⁴ but also in the domain of psychology: thus Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima* has to be considered the first instance of a Latin reception of Avicenna's psychology as laid out in the latter's *De anima*, also known as *Sextus de naturalibus*.

Not only is Gundissalinus therefore the translator, or rather co-translator, of Avicenna's *De anima*, but he is also the first interpreter of this translation. In fact, Gundissalinus's interpretation of Avicenna's psychology has given rise, over the last eighty years, to a lengthy and polemical discussion, ever since Étienne Gilson suggested reading the *Tractatus* as an expression of what he called the "Augustinisme avicennisant".⁵ In Gilson's eyes, the most distinctive trace of Gundissalinus's reading of Avicenna was his identification of the agent intellect with God, an identification that would have combined genuinely Avicennian ideas, namely the role of the agent intellect within the process of human knowledge, with an Augustinian perspective locating the seminal ideas in the mind of God. As is well known, the French philosopher's interpretation on this point was immediately contested by Roland de Vaux, who suggested the alternative denomination of an "Avicennisme latin".⁶ It is not our intention to enter into this debate in the present paper; nor does it seem necessary, since the question has recently been revisited in a very convincing paper by Steven Marrone, who argues that this identification need not be accounted for with recourse to Augustine, for similar identifications are already present in Arabic texts, namely in al-Ġazālī's *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa*, which was translated by Gundissalinus himself.⁷

Rather than taking up this somewhat tedious question, we shall focus on a completely different aspect of Gundissalinus's translation of Avicenna's *De anima* and his interpretation of this very text, namely the philosophical motivations for the Archdeacon's interest in Graeco-Arabic Aristotelian psychology, and its consequences. For this purpose we would like to draw attention to the respective prologues of Aven-dauth/Gundissalinus's translation of Avicenna's *De anima*, as well as that of the Arch-

⁴ See the introduction to and edition of DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Über die Einteilung der Philosophie / De divisione philosophiae*, ed. Fidora / Werner.

⁵ Cf. GILSON (1929-1930), especially page 85: "En réalité, il suffit de le suivre [sc. Gundissalinus] jusqu'au bout pour constater que, dans sa pensée, l'illumination de l'âme par l'Intelligence agente d'Avicenne fait place à l'illumination de l'âme par Dieu. C'est pourquoi, conservant jusqu'à la lettre même de son modèle, il n'a pas un seul instant l'impression de s'engager dans une voie scabreuse, et c'est avec une étrange inconscience qu'il devient l'initiateur de l'augustinisme avicennisant."

⁶ Cf. DE VAUX (1934), with a partial edition of Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima*. De Vaux's suggestion was also subject to criticism, see BERTOLA (1971).

⁷ See MARRONE (2006). For a similar strand of argument cf. TEICHER (1934), 252-258.

deacon's own *Tractatus de anima*. In the dedicatory prologue that accompanies the translation of Avicenna's *De anima*, addressed to Archbishop John of Toledo, Aven-dauth and Gundissalinus set out by drawing a gloomy picture of their times, in which men trusted their senses alone and were no longer able to perceive their souls and themselves, and were thus incapable of loving God. So it happens, they write, that

men, who have abandoned themselves to the senses, either believe that the soul is nothing or, when they guess its existence from the movement of the body, most hold what it is by faith, and only very few do so by reason. [...] Therefore, Lord, I have taken care of your demand to translate this book on the soul by the philosopher Avicenna, in order that, through your generosity and my work, the Latins may attain certainty about that which until now was not known to them, namely proving by true reasons that the soul exists and what and how it is according to itself and to its effects.⁸

These words of the two translators, which can be read as a philosophical declaration of intention, are echoed by Gundissalinus in his *Tractatus de anima*, where the Archdeacon again emphasises the necessity of a rational examination of the contents of faith, in particular the existence of the soul and its nature. So, at the very beginning of this treatise, we read:

While all men are composed equally by soul and body, nevertheless not all of them have as much certainty concerning their soul as they have concerning their body. This is so because the latter is an object of the senses, while the soul can be reached only through the intellect. Therefore men who have abandoned themselves completely to the senses, either believe that the soul is nothing or, if perhaps they guess its existence from the movement of the body in whatever manner, many hold what it is or how it is by faith only, but very few know this by reason. [...] This being so, I have found reasoned argument among philosophers, and have taken care to collect this in one single treatise. Thus this work, which was ignored by the Latins up to now, being concealed in Greek and Arabic archives, is given to the Latins so that believers, who work so hard for their souls, get to know about the soul not only by faith but also through reason.⁹

⁸ AVICENNA, *Liber de anima seu Sextus de naturalibus*, ed. van Riet, vol. 1, 3-4: "Unde homines sensibus dediti, aut animam nihil esse credunt, aut si forte ex motum corporis eam esse coniciunt, quid vel qualis sit plerique fide tenent, sed pauci ratione convincunt. [...] Quapropter iussum vestrum, Domine, de transferendo libro Avicennae philosophi de anima, effectui mancipare curavi, ut vestro munere et meo labore, Latinis fieret certum, quod hactenus existit incognitum, scilicet an sit anima, et quid et qualis sit secundum essentiam et effectum, rationibus verissimis comprobatum."

⁹ DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 31: "Cum omnes homines aequae constant ex anima et corpore, non tamen omnes sic certi sunt de anima sicut de corpore; quippe cum hoc sensui subiaceat, ad animam vero non nisi solus intellectus attingat. Unde homines solis sensibus dediti aut animam nihil esse credunt, aut, si forte ex motu corporis eam utcumque esse coniciunt, quod sit vel quomodo se habeat plerique fide tenent, sed paucissimi ratione convincunt [...] Quapropter quicquid de anima apud

This passage literally coincides with Avendauth and Gundissalinus's prologue to their translation of Avicenna's *De anima*. Yet its phrasing is even more radical: the contents of faith shall not only be believed in, but they need to be grounded on philosophical reasoning: "non iam fide tantum, sed etiam ratione comprehendant".

There can be no doubt that both prologues formulate a decidedly philosophical programme, namely incorporating the contribution of Graeco-Arabic Aristotelian psychology into the formation of a rational theology which should be based on a philosophical reflection upon its central tenets. This being the translators' and the author's ambitious programme, one can of course ask whether it had any impact on, or consequences for, the history of both philosophy and theology.

Albert the Great's philosophical transformation of the theological discourse on the soul

To answer this question in general would of course far surpass the scope of this paper; especially with regard to Avicenna. His role for later medieval philosophy has been dealt with in several monographs published in recent years, such as the excellent survey by Dag Nikolaus Hasse: *Avicenna's 'De anima' in the Latin West*.¹⁰ The focus in this paper will be more modest: we will present two early – and in our eyes highly significant – examples of the reception of the psychological texts translated and produced in Toledo: one concerning their impact on the Latin-Christian tradition, and the other revealing their strong influence in the Jewish philosophical circles of the 13th and 14th centuries.

We shall start with the Latin-Christian case, since it is first chronologically. In fact, the Latin reception of Gundissalinus's translations and his own psychological doctrine can be traced back to the end of the 12th or the beginning of the 13th century, when John Blund wrote his *Tractatus de anima*, which draws strongly on both Avicenna's *De an-*

philosophos rationabiliter dictum inveni, simul in unum colligere curavi. Opus siquidem latinis hactenus incognitum utpote in archivis [MSS C, P: arcanis] graecae et arabicae tantum linguae reconditum [...] ad notitiam latinorum est deductum ut fideles, qui pro anima tam studiose laborant, quid de ipsa sentire debeant, non iam fide tantum, sed etiam ratione comprehendant." – M. J. Soto Bruna and C. Alonso del Real (both Pamplona) are currently preparing a new critical edition of Gundissalinus's treatise which will take into account further manuscripts.

¹⁰ HASSE (2000).

ima and Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima*.¹¹ Yet the first explicit reference to Gundissalinus's treatise is to be found in the anonymous treatise *De anima et potentiis eius* (ca. 1225), edited by René-Antoine Gauthier, where we read: "Toletanum autem translator utrumque intelligit esse ponendum in definitione animae [i.e. that it is a potency of an organic body, A.F.]."¹²

Most important among the Latin recipients of Gundissalinus's psychological translations and works is Albert the Great. Although the 19th-century Paris edition of his works disguises the presence of our philosopher by misreading the Latin "Toletanus" consistently as "Collectanus", it is nevertheless not at all difficult to identify large portions from both Gundissalinus's translation of Avicenna and his *Tractatus de anima* among Albert's very early writings, namely in his *De homine*.¹³ This work is the second part of Albert's *Summa de creaturis*, which is preceded by *De IV coaequaevis*, and was written before Albert started his studies in theology in Paris, viz. in the early 1240s, either in Paris or still in Cologne.

As such, the *Summa de creaturis* is a work that is theological in substance, dealing in its first part with the creation of prime matter, the heavens, time and the angels, and then turning, in its second part, to human beings and their psychological constitution. Through its form and contents the *Summa de creaturis* has to be seen in continuity with Albert's earlier works: *De sacramentis*, *De incarnatione* and *De resurrectione*. This is also true for the second part of the work, which we shall focus on, that is *De homine*, where Albert's approach is clearly oriented towards the analysis of the pre-lapsarian constitution of man. Nevertheless, and this is of great importance for our discussion, from the very first pages onwards, Albert introduces into this theological treatise on man a markedly philosophical perspective.

We shall illustrate this by a short glance at the fundamental question that Albert tackles right at the beginning of *De homine* (Q. II, a. 2): namely whether the soul is a substance or not. This is, as Albert says, a question that concerns its definition; and in order to solve this question he sets out by distinguishing two kinds of definitions of the soul:

¹¹ A comprehensive study of this work and its place in the history of philosophical psychology can be found in D. Werner's edition: JOHN BLUND, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Werner, see her introduction pages 9-93.

¹² Gauthier (1982), 29.

¹³ Albert's *De homine* has been published in volume XXXV of the Borgnet edition (Paris 1896). A critical text for the *Editio Coloniensis* is currently being prepared by H. Anzulewicz and J. R. Söder, who have published parts of the text they are establishing in a Latin-German selection of texts: ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Über den Menschen*, ed. Anzulewicz / Söder. We shall refer to the Borgnet edition, indicating in brackets the corresponding pages of the Latin-German version for the parts it contains.

“Ponantur primo definitiones sanctorum et postea philosophorum”,¹⁴ in other words, he distinguishes theological and philosophical definitions. Accordingly, in what follows, Albert lists different definitions by the saints, i.e. Christian theologians, such as Augustine, St Bernard and others, who maintain that the soul is a substance. Subsequently these opinions are contrasted with opposing views, taken from the secular tradition. Now, before giving his own solution to the question, which will consist of a differentiation of a logical, a physical and a metaphysical approach to the soul and its definition, Albert turns explicitly to the arguments of the philosophers, which he promised at the beginning of this article, saying: “Sed in contrarium arguunt philosophi sic”; the philosophers are thus invoked to invalidate the opposing arguments to the saint’s views and to prepare Albert’s own reply.

Now, who are these “philosophers”? One of the arguments Albert produces under this title stems from Avicenna and his *Sextus de naturalibus* claiming that the proper subject of the soul can only be what it is through the soul itself and that therefore it must be a substance. In addition, he also quotes a certain Constabulus, i.e. Quṣṭā Ibn Lūqā and his *De differentia spiritus et animae*, a work that was translated with the participation of Gundissalinus. Gundissalinus even included some of its arguments in his *Tractatus de anima*, among which is the argument referred to in this place by Albert. According to this argument whatever receives opposite influences and remains one and the same, is a substance, and since the soul is subject to opposite virtues and vices it must therefore be a substance. Next, we also find an explicit reference to Gundissalinus himself among the philosophical arguments listed by Albert. Thus we read:

So says the Toledan: Whatever exists is either a substance or an accident. But nothing which through its presence constitutes a species of a substance and when it withdraws destroys it, is an accident. Yet, the different species of the soul through their presence constitute the species of the plant, of the animal and of man, and when they withdraw, they destroy it. Therefore each species of the soul is a substance.¹⁵

¹⁴ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 10a (24).

¹⁵ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 12a (quoted from the Latin-German version, 34): “Item Toletanus: Quicquid est, aut est accidens aut substantia. Nihil autem quod adveniens constituit speciem substantiae et recedens destruit eandem, est accidens; quaelibet species animae adveniens constituit speciem plantae, animalis et hominis, et recedens destruit eandem; ergo quaelibet species animae est substantia.” Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 37: “Item quicquid est, aut est substantia aut accidens. Sed anima non est accidens. Nihil enim quod adveniens constituit et recedens destruit, accidens est; sed anima adveniens constituit animal et recedens destruit; ergo anima non est accidens; est igitur substantia.”

There remain three further philosophical arguments in favour of the soul's being a substance, but they are not attributed to any philosopher in particular.

Thus, from the six philosophical arguments given, the three that Albert singles out by a clear attribution can be traced back to Gundissalinus and his translations and writings, which makes the Toledan philosopher an important point of reference for Albert's explicitly philosophical approach to anthropological and psychological questions. The extraordinary role that Gundissalinus plays for Albert's *De homine* is clearly confirmed by the further development of his treatise in which references to the Toledan philosopher, together with his psychological translations and writings, abound.

Thus, in Article 3 of Quaestio II, Albert, using the very same procedure of confronting theological and philosophical claims, poses the question of the soul's incorporeality. Quoting once more Augustine and St Bernard, he states that the soul must be corporeal, one argument being that the angels seem to possess a body. To refute this position, Albert again quotes Quṣṭā Ibn Lūqā, listing five arguments from his *De differentia spiritus et animae* in favour of the soul's incorporeality. At the end of this series of arguments, he remarks: "These are Ibn Lūqā's reasons. And some of them can also be found in the Toledan author, and he added one to them, which is taken from Avicenna, and which concerns the rational soul as such." According to this additional argument the intellectual species cannot be in the intellect as in a body.¹⁶ Now, in his own solution to the question, Albert clearly sides with the philosophers, reinterpreting the authoritative statements of the saints, as he calls them, in a way that allows him to reconcile their position with the incorporeality of the soul.

This discussion of the soul's incorporeality not only gives us a taste of the complex argumentative balance Albert establishes between theological and philosophical approaches in *De homine*. Moreover, the text we have just quoted reveals Albert's awareness of the intricate connections between the different Toledan texts he is handling: on

¹⁶ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 15a-b: "Istae sunt rationes Constabuli. Et quasdam etiam istarum ponit Toletanus, et addit unam quae sumpta est ab Avicenna, quae est de anima rationali simpliciter, hanc scilicet: Species intelligibiles quae sunt in intellectu, aut sunt in eo ut in corpore, vel in habente esse per corpus, sicut potentia quae operatur in organo, habet esse per corpus. Si primo modo, aut illae formae sunt divisibiles, aut indivisibiles [...]" Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 38-39: "Id ergo quod est subiectum intelligibilium vel est corpus vel aliquid habens esse per corpus, [vel non]. Si [autem subiectum intelligibilium est corpus vel aliquid habens esse] per corpus, tunc intellecta forma subsistit per se vel in aliquo eius divisibili vel in aliquo eius non divisibili [...]" The way in which Albert quotes and reconstructs Gundissalinus's argument suggests that his manuscript of the *Tractatus* belonged to the family represented by Muckle's MS C, which omits "vel non" as well as a part of the following sentence (see the brackets in the quotation) thereby offering an incomplete alternative, as Albert does.

the one hand the influence of Quṣṭā Ibn Lūqā's *De differentia spiritus et animae* on Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima*, which does indeed draw strongly on this text, and, on the other hand, Gundissalinus's close relation to Avicenna. This intertextual awareness, as we may call it, is a clear indicator of Albert's very good knowledge of these texts, which he must have been comparing systematically; a fact that is also confirmed by other references to Gundissalinus, in which Albert mentions him along with Avicenna and Quṣṭā Ibn Lūqā.¹⁷ He even makes a connection between Gundissalinus and al-Ġazālī, saying that both are following the tracks of Avicenna.¹⁸

Further, in the succeeding questions of *De homine*, Gundissalinus and his translations and writings remain an inescapable point of reference for the philosophical dimension of Albert's argumentation. In Quaestio III, for instance, which discusses different philosophical issues concerning the soul, in particular its motion, Albert repeatedly refers to Gundissalinus. We cannot analyze his arguments here; suffice it to say that in his solution to the problem of whether the soul is subject to motion or not, Albert comes to the conclusion that "it has to be said that the soul is not moved by any species of motion, as is proved by the philosophers, namely Aristotle and Avicenna, Averroes, Quṣṭā Ibn Lūqā, al-Fārābī and the Toledan".¹⁹ Gundissalinus and the authors he translated are invoked here as part of a venerable philosophical tradition: the last representative of which is the Toledan Archdeacon himself.

Yet, despite Albert's general sympathy for, and his familiarity with, Gundissalinus and the psychological tradition he represents, his attitude is not one of unconditional assent. In fact Albert criticises him severely for his doctrine of a *creatio mediante intelligentia*, i.e. the creation of the rational soul through the mediation of angels, operating in God's service. This is a doctrine that Gundissalinus expounds not only in his *Tractatus de anima* but also in his *De processione mundi*,²⁰ and which one can trace to the *Liber de causis*.²¹ It is also found in the works of the Jewish philosopher and co-translator of

¹⁷ Cf. ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 64a: "Contra hoc sunt multae rationes Toletani et Avicennae", and 76b: "In contrarium sunt rationes Avicennae, quas ponit etiam Toletanus."

¹⁸ See ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 463b: "In hac etiam sententia expresse est Avicenna in VI de *Naturalibus*, et duo sequentes vestigia eius, scilicet Algazel et Toletanus."

¹⁹ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 28a-b: "Dicendum, quod anima non movetur aliqua specie motus, ut probant philosophi Aristoteles, et Avicenna, Averroes, Constabulus, Alpharabius, et Toletanus."

²⁰ DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *De processione mundi*, ed. Soto Bruna / Alonso del Real, 211, 214 and 220.

²¹ See FIDORA/NIEDERBERGER (2001), especially proposition 3, 8-9 and 18 and the editors' commentaries on these propositions.

Gundissalinus: Abraham Ibn Daūd.²² In the *Tractatus de anima* Gundissalinus puts forward a long list of arguments for his position, introducing them as the “philosophers’ proofs”.²³

Albert picks up only three of these proofs, which he says are the Toledan philosophers’ strongest arguments,²⁴ namely that a) the cause of the soul must be in some way subject to change, since every soul is created anew in a specific moment in time – but God, of course, cannot be subject to change,²⁵ b) that if man’s soul were created directly by God there would be no difference between the dignity of the human soul and that of an angel, and therefore God cannot have created man’s soul directly,²⁶ and c) that God’s act being infinite, the human soul’s existence and essence would necessarily be infinite too if God created man’s soul directly, but this is not the case, so God is not the creator of the human soul, but it is created by mediation of the angels.²⁷ Albert then goes on to quote further arguments for the *creatio mediante intelligentia*, e.g. the third proposition of the *Liber de causis*, and a passage from Isaac al-Israeli’s *Liber de definitionibus*, another text translated by Gundissalinus.²⁸

²² Cf. ABRAHAM IBN DAŪD, *The Exalted Faith*, ed. Samuelson / Weiss, 173.

²³ Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 49-51.

²⁴ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 83a: “Istae sunt rationes Toletani fortiores, et quasdam alias ponit debiles, quas subticemus.”

²⁵ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 82b: “Ostendit ergo Toletanus sic: Causa nunc agens et non prius, necesse est quod agat per aliquam dispositionem sibi advenientem; causa animae qua fit, est causa nunc agens et non prius; ergo necesse est, quod agat per dispositionem novam sibi advenientem; primae causae sive Deo nulla nova dispositio advenit; ergo non erit causans immediate hanc animam.” Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 49-50: “Cum aliquis fit agens qui fuit non agens, necesse est hoc fieri propter novitatem alicuius rei quae contingit, scilicet vel conditionis vel naturae [...] Deo autem nihil novi advenit, tunc enim variabilis esset, quod est impossibile. Igitur ab ipso non creatur anima.”

²⁶ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 82b: “Immediate recipere ab optimo nobilium est quam recipere per medium ab illo. Si ergo anima recipit immediate esse a Deo, recipit ipsum nobilissimo modo. Sed ab nobilissimo modo recipiendi sequitur nobilissimum esse receptum. Ergo videtur quod anima secundum hoc deberetur habere nobilissimum esse; hoc autem est esse intelligentiae angelicae; ergo anima deberet esse angelus quod non est verum; ergo nec recipit immediate esse a Deo, sed ab angelis.” Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 50: “Item ad recipiendum aliquid ab aliquo, nihil est dignius eo quod illud recipit nullo mediante. Si igitur anima recipit esse a primo factore nullo mediante, tunc nihil est dignius ea ad recipiendum illud ab illo; sed substantia intelligentiae dignior est ad hoc; ergo anima non recipit esse a primo factore nullo mediante.”

²⁷ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 82b: “Ab infinito agente secundum potentiam agendi actus est infinitus; sed Deus est agens infinitum; ergo actus eius immediatus erit infinitus; anima non habet esse infinitum; ergo non erit a Deo immediate sed mediantibus angelis.” Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 50-51: “Quicquid movet animam non potest esse infinitum quoniam quicquid movet aliud aut movet per se aut per accidens. Si autem id quod infinitum est movet aliud per se, necesse est ut motus, qui ab eo fit, sit infinitus; sed motus animae finitus est; igitur non fit ab infinito [...]”

²⁸ In later years (ca. 1264-1267), Albert wrote a commentary on the *Liber de causis*, in which the discussion of the *creatio mediante intelligentia* should play an important role. For the *Liber de causis* and its influence on Albert and others, see FIDORA/NIEDERBERGER (2001), 205ff.

Yet, this time, Albert's own solution is in line with the saints, namely Augustine and John of Damascus, and opposed to the philosophers' views. For even though, as Albert says, Gundissalinus tried to ease the open contradiction between the philosophers' doctrine which he expounded and the saints' teachings, his position is still untenable. Rather, one has to maintain that the angels were not involved in the creation of human soul at all. As Albert says:

The Toledan author tried to justify himself with respect to the saints, saying that although he wished to maintain that the angels created the souls, he was not claiming that the angels were creators. For the creator is he who by his own authority and power makes something from nothing. But the angels do this as ministers of God and by his authority. Yet even so, on the grounds of unquestionable faith, one has to maintain that the angels do not even create as God's ministers, since the honour of the creator is singular [...] and must not be transferred.²⁹

This very same discussion reappears in a later work of Albert's, his *Summa theologiae*. In its second part (written in the 1270s), Albert again deals with Gundissalinus's arguments concerning the *creatio mediante intelligentia*, which are now attributed to a certain "Johannes Toletanus",³⁰ an attribution which was used by Manuel Alonso for arguing that the *Tractatus de anima* was not written by Gundissalinus but that the work should be ascribed to his collaborator, the Jewish philosopher Avendauth.³¹ Yet this later reference to the *Tractatus de anima* in Albert's work is of scant value, since the second part of the *Summa theologiae* seems to have been put together by his disciple Godefredus de Dusborch, drawing on material from Albert's early works, which he rearranged in a sometimes hasty and not very reliable manner.³² Thus, the *Summa's* arguments in favour of and against the *creatio mediante intelligentia* reproduce in a rather confused way the text from *De homine* we have just discussed.³³

²⁹ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 83b: "Toletanus excusat se et a dictis sanctorum, dicens quod licet consentiat animas creari ab angelis, non tamen dicit angelos esse creatores; quia creator est ille, qui propria auctoritate et virtute aliquid de nihilo facit; sed angeli faciunt hoc ministrantes Deo et auctoritate Dei. Sed indubitanta fide tenendum est, quod angeli non creant etiam ministerio; honor enim creatoris singularis est [...] et ideo non debet transponi." Cf. DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 51: "Angeli creant animas ministerio tantum, non auctoritate. Et ideo anima creatura angeli non dicitur, sed Dei, cuius auctoritate creatur." Gundissalinus here seems to be paraphrasing a passage from Peter Lombard (*IV Sent.*, d. V, 3, cf. PL 192, col. 852).

³⁰ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 52b: "Proceditur ex rationibus quas ponit Johannes Toletanus Archiepiscopus in libro suo *De anima*."

³¹ See Alonso (1948), 77 (Alonso maintained the identity of Ibn Daūd and John of Spain).

³² See the introduction by D. Siedler and P. Simon to the edition of ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Summa theologiae* I, 1, 1-50A (Ed. Colon. 34, 1), IX-XVI.

³³ A. SCHNEIDER (1906), 436-439 discusses Albert's response to Gundissalinus.

At any rate, our concern here is not with internal textual criticism of Albert's works. What we have tried to outline and characterise in the course of the preceding remarks is Albert's use of Gundissalinus's translations and works on psychology. From the examples we have given, to which many other implicit and explicit references of Albert to Gundissalinus could be added,³⁴ it is indubitably evident that the young Albert was very familiar with these Toledan texts on Graeco-Arabic Aristotelian psychology and that he introduced them into his discussion with a clear and well-defined objective: these texts were to serve as philosophical points of reference, which would ensure that the theological sources, whose authors Albert addresses as the saints, were read against a philosophical background.

Ludger Honnefelder has pointed out that *De homine*, which enjoyed a wide diffusion in the Middle Ages, is one of the very first instances of Albert's attempt to integrate philosophical reflection into the theological discourse of his time by applying the philosophical standards to theological discussions and thus transforming theology into a science.³⁵ As we have seen, this transformation is doubtless dependent on the Toledan Graeco-Arabic tradition of Aristotelian psychology, since Albert draws directly on these sources, and his intention is very much in line with that of Gundissalinus: "non iam fide tantum, sed etiam ratione", that is how the discussions of the soul were to proceed according to the Spanish Archdeacon. With Albert the Great this ambitious philosophical programme would be implemented in the theological discourse of 13th-century Christian Europe while reaching, at the same time, its first culminating point.

Hillel of Verona and philosophical discourse on the soul in the Jewish tradition

Not only can we identify the influence of Gundissalinus's psychology at the very origin of the transformations and shifts that would determine Latin philosophy during the 13th century, his influence was also decisive in medieval Hebrew philosophy. The *Tractatus de anima* was the very first Latin philosophical text to be translated into Hebrew, giving rise to a long series of Hebrew translations of scholastic texts.

³⁴ A first list of references was produced by CALLUS (1939), 339, n. 4. It was completed by Hasse (2000), 13, n. 3. Accordingly the explicit (!) references are: Ed. Paris. 35 (= *De homine*): pages 12a, 15a, 24a, 28b, 64a, 71b, 76b, 78a, 82b, 83a, 83b, 102b, 463b, 467b; Ed. Paris. 33 (= *Summa theologiae*): 52a and 53a.

³⁵ Cf. L. Honnefelder in his preface to ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Über den Menschen*, ed. Anzulewicz / Söder, VIII-IX.

Gundissalinus's treatise on the soul was put into Hebrew in the 12th or the early 13th century³⁶ and is preserved in a single Cambridge manuscript together with fragments of a translation of Aristotle's *De anima*. After a few pages from Aristotle's text, the anonymous translator confesses:

So far I have translated the text of the book written by Aristotle himself; but it was hard and difficult, and so I have given up translating it and have taken another book, one written by the philosopher of Toledo who expounded the subject of Aristotle's work. It begins with the words 'All men' – the prologue of the book extending to the words 'It is proper', which form the beginning of the book itself.³⁷

Obviously, the translator was primarily interested in Aristotle and his book, but faced with its difficulty, he preferred to translate Gundissalinus's treatise. The situation is, by the way, not very different from that of Hermann the German, a 13th-century Toledan translator who gave up his translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* because of its difficulty and instead translated Averroes's *Commentary* on the same work.

Most important for us is the fact that Gundissalinus's treatise was evidently known to, and used by, Jewish scholars in the 13th century. This is demonstrated, for instance, by Rabbi Gershom ben Shlomo of Arles in his encyclopaedic work called *The Gate of the Heavens*, which dates from the end of the 13th century.³⁸ In the prologue to this work Rabbi Gershom explains his intention and his method:

My spirit turned to the enquiry and study of the subtle and high science, asking for instruction; but this science is far away from me and hidden from my eyes. Now, I had at my disposal only a few books of wise philosophers translated from their languages into Hebrew, but with these books I gave light again to my eyes. And I turned to those big books and the arguments laid out in them, one here, the other there, and I collected these arguments in one place, abbreviating and gathering

³⁶ J. Teicher dates the translation to the first half of the 12th century. M. Zonta, however, believes it to be from the 13th century. Cf. TEICHER (1954-1956), 409, and ZONTA (1996), 195. The first half of the 12th century is certainly too early with regard to Gundissalinus's own dates; I would rather suggest the end of the 12th / beginning of the 13th century.

³⁷ MS Cambridge, University Library, Add. 1858, fol. 184a. *Apud* TEICHER (1954-1956), 404. Teicher's comparisons between the Hebrew translation and the Latin original are most interesting. They show, among other things, that the Hebrew translation reproduces an older state of the text of the treatise than that which has come down to us in the Latin manuscripts. Thus Teicher notes that in the Hebrew there is a passage missing that would correspond to a gloss in the Latin manuscripts, and which was subsequently incorporated into the Latin text. (The passage in question refers to the *creatio mediante intelligentia*. The fact that it is quoted by Albert, cf. n. 29 above, means that in Albert's days it had already been incorporated into the Latin original of the *Tractatus*.)

³⁸ Cf. ZONTA (1996), 213.

them with my hands. And I learned a lot from the mouths of Hebrews and non-Hebrews and I quoted everyone at his place.³⁹

Already the principle of composition of this encyclopaedia and Gershom's appraisal of the non-Hebrew authors remind us of Avendauth's, and especially of Gundissalinus's, attitudes. But there are further similarities, for in the 11th chapter, which Gershom devotes to the soul and its powers, he says:

Aristotle writes in the beginning of his book *De anima* that all men are equal in body and soul, but not all are conscious of the reality of the soul (in the same degree) as they are aware of the reality of their body. This is not astonishing, since the body is perceived by the senses, while the soul is conceived only by reason. Accordingly, people who perceive only concrete things do not believe in the existence of a soul, or they assume that the soul extends over all the parts⁴⁰ of the body on the ground that this one moves. But they know of the essence and the properties of the soul by way of tradition. Only a few perceive this with reason. [...] Therefore we now have established by reasoning whether there exists a soul or not [...]⁴¹

These are, of course, Gundissalinus's words from the prologue to his *Tractatus de anima*, which we have quoted above. The parallelism continues and has been analysed by Jacob Teicher and, in more detail, by Juliane Lay.⁴² The fact that Rabbi Gershom attributes his quotation to Aristotle should not surprise us, for he clearly depends on the afore-said Hebrew translation where, as we have said, Gundissalinus's text replaced the missing parts of the translation of Aristotle's *De anima*.

The most interesting and prominent Jewish follower of Gundissalinus, however, is Rabbi Hillel of Verona, who was active in the second half of the 13th century in Northern Italy. Hillel, who may have studied in Barcelona, where he could have become acquainted with the Hispanic philosophical tradition, is the author of a book called the *Retributions of the Soul*, which dates from between 1287 and 1291, and was written in Forlì, close to Bologna. In this work, we again find a Rabbi having recourse to Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima* along with other texts by Latin authors, such as Thomas Aquinas.

³⁹ *Apud* TEICHER (1933), 8.

⁴⁰ Gershom's Hebrew text, which follows the translation we have mentioned above, reproduces the reading of MS M of Muckle's edition, which is corrupt here misreading 'ubicumque' for 'utcumque'.

⁴¹ GERSHOM BEN SHLOMOH, *The Gate of Heaven (Shaar ha-Shamayim)*, trans. and ed. Bodenheimer, 320-321.

⁴² Cf. her unpublished *Mémoire de Maîtrise*, Paris 1978: *L'astronomie et la métaphysique de Rabbi Gershom ben Salomon d'Arles*, especially pages 165-189.

As Josef Sermoneta has shown in his edition of the text, Hillel draws strongly on Gundissalinus's treatise, which he is rendering directly from the Latin, viz. independently of the existing Hebrew translation.⁴³ Already the opening remarks of the work betray the author's Toledan source materials, reproducing, as did Gershom, Gundissalinus's own words:

Therefore I endeavoured to gather the sayings of the philosophers which are spread here and there in big and voluminous books, and I arranged them in an order and explained them, so that they be not difficult to grasp for those who long for wisdom, and that they be not refused. In this I pursued a single purpose, which is to understand the truth. [...] For, the soul being what makes a man be a man and thus constitutes human existence, it is not appropriate to forget that which has caused our own essence.⁴⁴

Hillel's treatise itself is divided into two parts, which may seem, at a first glance, rather loosely connected: the first half is dedicated to the soul's existence, its essence and its relation to the active intellect, while the second half turns to eschatological questions concerning the retributions of the soul after death.⁴⁵ It is in the first half of this philosophico-theological work, that Hillel makes abundant use of Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima*. Surprisingly enough, he does not only quote extensive passages from the *Tractatus* but he also read and used Avendauth/Gundissalinus's Latin translation of Avicenna's *Liber sextus de naturalibus*.

As far as Gundissalinus's *Tractatus de anima* is concerned, there are three fields of particular interest where Hillel introduces this text's arguments: namely with regard to the existence of the soul, the question as to whether the soul is a substance or an accident, and the problem concerning the soul's motion. The passages he quotes within these contexts show a striking parallelism with regard to Albert's reading of the Spanish Archdeacon. Thus, to prove the soul is a substance, Hillel sets out by saying:

We have to assume that the soul is either a substance or an accident, for in these two all of reality is contained. Yet, it cannot possibly be an accident, since according to Aristotle this is something that exists only as a possibility but is not a necessary part of the definition [of a thing]. It [i.e. the

⁴³ Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, esp. the *apparatus* at pages 1-26.

⁴⁴ Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 1; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefes'*, trans. Geyer, 19. Y. Schwartz is currently preparing a new Hebrew-German edition of the work under the ERC-research project "Latin Philosophy into Hebrew".

⁴⁵ For a more detailed interpretation of Hillel's work see Y. SCHWARTZ (2004).

accident] is therefore corruptible, while its subject persists, that is to say, the existence of its subject does not depend on its presence; for its going does not affect its subject.⁴⁶

Even though Hillel gives it an Aristotelian colouring, this argument is clearly reminiscent of Gundissalinus, in particular of a passage which we have also come across in Albert. This becomes even clearer as Hillel's argument proceeds:

There can be no doubt that the soul is a substance that is joined with an accident, since apart from substance and accident there is nothing other than a substance joined with an accident. According to Plato's views on substance, whatever is one in number while capable of receiving various alterations, is called a substance. And furthermore, whatever operates something while it exists, and once it ceases to be, its operation ceases too, is a substance. Now, with regard to the soul, both are true. [...] Therefore it is a substance.⁴⁷

In this quotation Hillel fuses two arguments from the *Tractatus de anima*, the Latin text of which reads:

Plato animam sic definit dicens: anima est substantia incorporea corpus movens. Quod autem anima sit substantia sic probatur; quicquid recipit contraria, cum sit unum et idem numero, substantia est. Sed anima, manens una et eadem numero, recipit contraria quae sunt virtutes et vitia [...]. Ergo anima substantia est.

Item quicquid est, aut est substantia aut accidens. Sed anima non est accidens. Nihil enim quod adveniens constituit et recedes destruit, accidens est; sed anima adveniens constituit animal et recedes destruit; ergo anima non est accidens; est igitur substantia.⁴⁸

As a matter of fact, Gundissalinus's argument, which points to Plato, can be traced back to Qusṭā Ibn Lūqā's *De differentia spiritus et animae*, and it is under the latter's name that we have already encountered it in Albert's *De homine*. Thus, both arguments to prove the soul is a substance, which Hillel takes over from Gundissalinus can be identified in Albert, one being attributed to Qusṭā Ibn Lūqā, the other to the "Toletanus":

⁴⁶ HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 12-13; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefesah'*, trans. Geyer, 29.

⁴⁷ HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 15; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefesah'*, trans. Geyer, 31-32.

⁴⁸ DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS, *Tractatus de anima*, ed. Muckle, 37

Constabulus in libro *De differentia spiritus et animae*: Quicquid recipit opposita, cum unum sit numero et immutabile in sua essentia, substantia est; sed anima rationalis recipit virtutes et vitia, cum sit una numero; ergo recipit opposita; est igitur substantia [...] Item Toletanus: Quicquid est, aut est accidens aut substantia. Nihil autem quod adveniens constituit speciem substantiae et recedens destruit eandem, est accidens; quaelibet species animae adveniens constituit speciem plantae, animalis et hominis, et recedens destruit eandem; ergo quaelibet species animae est substantia.⁴⁹

It is very significant that Hillel and Albert use the same arguments in order to prove the soul is a substance; yet, while Albert attributes them to different authors, being well aware of Gundissalinus's sources, Hillel in presenting them *en bloc* seems to have taken them as he found them in Gundissalinus.

Further, also with regard to whether the soul is in motion or not, one can detect interesting parallels between Albert's and Hillel's approaches to Gundissalinus. Albert, as was said above, sided with Gundissalinus and other philosophers, such as Aristotle and Averroes, in maintaining that the soul was unmoved. Hillel also subscribes to the Toledan philosopher's position on this issue, reproducing literally many arguments concerning the discussion on the soul's motion as he found them in the *Tractatus de anima*.⁵⁰

Now, even though the similarities one can observe in the use both Albert and Hillel are making of Gundissalinus's text are striking, it seems that they cannot be explained in terms of a direct dependence of the latter on the former. The fact that Hillel quotes several passages that are not in Albert forbids us from establishing any direct textual relation between *De homine* and *The Retributions of the Soul*. It is true that Hillel of Verona was very familiar with 13th-century Latin scholasticism, quoting passages from Thomas Aquinas and others, as we have said before, but he does not seem to have used Albert's works for writing his *Retributions*.

In the absence of an historical explanation, the similarities between Albert and Hillel with regard to their recourse to Gundissalinus have to be accounted for in a different way. Thus they have to be considered the expression of their common systematic interest in certain issues of Gundissalinus's psychology, namely its genuinely philosophical outlook, for which the discussion of the soul's being a substance, its incorporeality and the problem of its motion are indeed paradigmatical.

⁴⁹ ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *De homine* (Ed. Paris. 35), 11b-12a (quoted from the Latin-German version, 32-34).

⁵⁰ Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 21ff.; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefes'*, trans. Geyer, 37ff.

As we have said before, Hillel's treatise, like Albert's, had a theological motivation, namely the eschatological perspective concerning the soul's retributions in the afterlife. For Hillel one of the greatest errors of some of his fellow Jews consisted in imagining these retributions as corporeal pleasure or suffering.⁵¹ This is, as he states in the prologue to his work, the reason why he wishes to embark on a philosophical discussion of the soul and its incorporeal nature, before dealing with the rewards and chastisements of the soul in the context of Biblical and Talmudic tradition. Hillel's intention is obviously with theology, but his method of choice to establish the soul as an incorporeal substance is that of philosophy. This becomes very clear from the last sentences of the first half of the book, immediately before Hillel switches to the theological discussion concerning the soul's afterlife. Referring to the disposition of his work, he apologizes for dealing with the philosophers and their schools first, instead of starting off directly with the Holy Scripture and the wise Jews. However, he says it was convenient to do so, "because the former [i.e. the philosophers and their schools] yield proved conclusions",⁵² offering a solid basis for the theological discussion which is to follow.

What may have appeared to some of his interpreters as a loose juxtaposition of different treatises – a philosophical tract on the soul and its nature first, and a theological reflection in the second place – is therefore, quite the contrary, a well-tempered attempt to arrive at a synthesis of philosophical reasoning and theological wisdom. By the way, Hillel is well aware of the fact that the philosophical reasons he pieces together from different sources are not original in themselves, but – and this is what matters to him – the outcome of this synthesis is definitely innovative. Thus, with some pride, he tells his readers that he called this book *The Retributions of the Soul*, because in the Hebrew tradition there existed no other book under this title.⁵³ This should of course not be misunderstood as a merely bibliographical piece of information; rather, what is at stake here is Hillel's philosophico-theological programme, which is new. And indeed modern scholarship has confirmed that Hillel's book is the very first philosophico-theological or – to speak with Yossef Schwartz – "systematic" theological treatise on the soul. And as

⁵¹ Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 3; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefes'ch*, trans. Geyer, 20.

⁵² Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 60; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefes'ch*, trans. Geyer, 65.

⁵³ Cf. HILLEL OF VERONA, *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. Sermoneta, 4; German translation in HILLEL OF VERONA, *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefes'ch*, trans. Geyer, 22.

such, it seems to be unprecedented in the Jewish tradition placing Hillel clearly within the Latin-Christian context and its rationalisation of theology.⁵⁴

This process within Jewish philosophy does not end with Hillel; in the same way as Albert embodies both the implementation of a new approach and a first but not the last culminating point of this perspective, so too Hillel has to be considered as establishing an enduring tradition within Hebrew philosophy. Thus from the 13th to 15th century, one can observe a rise of a very strong interest among Italian Jews in Christian philosophico-theological discussions. One of the protagonists of this movement, which has been described as “Hebrew scholasticism”, is Yehudah Romano, who translated several Latin works into Hebrew during the first half of the 14th century. Among his translations we find Gundissalinus’s tract: *De unitate et uno*, as well as numerous works by Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas and Giles of Rome. In both his translations and his own philosophical writings, Yehudah shows a particular concern with psychology, especially with the theory of the intellect. This topic becomes a *leitmotif* for his writings up to the point that, as Josef Sermoneta has stressed, the doctrine of the intellect turns into Yehudah’s “fede filosofica”, his philosophical creed.⁵⁵

In the light of this, it is no exaggeration to say that Graeco-Arabic psychology, as it was transmitted first through the texts written and translated in Toledo and later on in other parts of Christian Europe with the reception of Averroes, became a constitutive element of philosophico-theological endeavours not only in the Latin-Christian tradition, but was likewise decisive for the evolution of Jewish philosophy. This strictly parallel interest is eventually confirmed by the fact that among the translations done by Yehudah we also find parts of Albert’s *De homine* – the “wise Teutonic”,⁵⁶ as Yehudah calls him –, a work which, as we have seen, was of paramount importance for the rationalisation of the Christian discourse on man and his soul.⁵⁷

Conclusions

We are now at the point where we can go back to the issue raised at the beginning of this paper: namely, Avendauth and Gundissalinus’s programmatic interest in Graeco-

⁵⁴ See SCHWARTZ (2003).

⁵⁵ Cf. SERMONETA (1965).

⁵⁶ Cf. RIGO (1995), 154.

⁵⁷ RIGO (1995), 151.

Arabic Aristotelian psychology and its impact on, or consequences for, the history of both philosophy and theology. As we have said, with their translations and works, Avendauth and Gundissalinus suggested a philosophical programme that was directed at the rationalisation of Christian faith. Christians, they claimed, should not only believe in the soul's existence and its nature, but they should also be provided with rational, that is to say philosophical, arguments to prove their tenets. After what has been said, there can be no doubt that not only did 13th- and 14th-century authors, such as Albert and Hillel, use the translations and works on psychology by these Toledan authors, and closely follow their arguments, but in doing so they also stuck faithfully to the philosophical intentions expressed by Avendauth and Gundissalinus, incorporating, as those authors did, philosophical standards into their theological writings on the soul.

What is more, the programme outlined by the two Toledan scholars would not only shape the philosophico-theological discourse of the Latin-Christian world, but – far surpassing the scope of their explicit intentions – it became a crucial element for the rationalisation of the Jewish theological debates too. The translations of psychological texts from Arabic into Latin, as they were produced in 12th-century Toledo, are part of a much broader intellectual phenomenon, a pan-European project, if we may say so, in which the translation activity from Arabic into Latin gave way to an analogous translation process from Latin into Hebrew.

As we have stressed throughout this paper, it is hardly possible to account for this coincidence in purely historical terms. Rather, the strictly parallel evolution of the Latin and the Hebrew discussions on the soul has to be understood as a direct consequence of the inherent systematic potential of Graeco-Arabic Aristotelian psychology to become the basis for a philosophical reformulation of some of the central tenets of the different theological traditions. It was on this basis that the different intellectual and religious communities around the Mediterranean started to revise their theological traditions and to work on a shared philosophical discourse that substantially contributed to the rationalisation of the different theological traditions across medieval Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

ABRAHAM IBN DAŪD (1976), *A Critical Edition with a Translation and Notes of the Book of Tradition*, trans. G. D. Cohen (Judaica. Texts & Translations, 1st Series, Number 3), Philadelphia.

ABRAHAM IBN DAŪD (1986), *The Exalted Faith*, ed. and trans. N. M. Samuelson / G. Weiss, Cranbury, NJ.

ALBERTUS MAGNUS (1896), *De homine*, ed. A. Borgnet (Ed. Paris. 35), Paris.

ALBERTUS MAGNUS (1978), *Summa theologiae* I, 1, 1-50A, ed. P. Simon / W. Kübel / H. G. Vogels (Ed. Colon. 34, 1), Münster i. W..

ALBERTUS MAGNUS (2004), *Über den Menschen*, ed. and German trans. H. Anzulewicz / J. R. Söder (Philosophische Bibliothek 531), Hamburg.

AVICENNA (1968-1972), *Liber de anima seu Sextus de naturalibus*, ed. S. van Riet, 2 vols. (Avicenna latinus), Louvain / Leiden.

DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS (1940), *Tractatus de anima*, ed. J. Th. Muckle, in *Mediaeval Studies* 2, 23-103.

DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS (1999), *De processione mundi*, ed. and Spanish trans. M^a. J. Soto Bruna / C. Alonso del Real (Colección de Pensamiento Medieval y Renacentista 7), Pamplona.

DOMINICUS GUNDISSALINUS (2007), *Über die Einteilung der Philosophie / De divisione philosophiae*, ed. and German trans. A. Fidora / D. Werner (Herders Bibliothek des Philosophie des Mittelalters 11), Freiburg i. Br.

GERSHOM BEN SHLOMOH (1953), *The Gate of Heaven (Shaar ha-Shamayim)*, trans. and ed. F. S. Bodenheimer, Jerusalem.

HILLEL OF VERONA (1911), *Ein Psychologe nach Maimonides und sein Hauptwerk 'Tagmule hannefesch' ('Vergeltung der Seele')*, Kap. I bis IV, German trans. and introd. M. Geyer, Frankfurt am Main.

HILLEL OF VERONA (1981), *Sefer Tagmule ha-Nefesh*, ed. J. Sermoneta, Jerusalem.

JOHN BLUND (2005), *Tractatus de anima*, ed. and German trans. D. Werner (Herders Bibliothek des Philosophie des Mittelalters 6), Freiburg i. Br.

STUDIES

ALONSO, M. (1948), "Gundisalvo y el *Tractatus de anima*", in *Pensamiento* 4, 71-77.

D'ALVERNY, M.-Th. (1954-1956), "Avendauth?", in *Homenaje a Millás-Vallricosa*, 2 vols., Barcelona, vol. 1, 19-43.

BERTOLA, E. (1971), "È esistito un Avicennismo latino nel Medioevo?", in *Sophia* 39, 318-334.

CALLUS, D. (1939), "Gundissalinus' *De anima* and the Problem of Substantial Form", in *The New Scholasticism* 13, 338-355.

FIDORA, A. (2003), *Die Wissenschaftstheorie des Dominicus Gundissalinus – Voraussetzungen und Konsequenzen des zweiten Anfangs der aristotelischen Philosophie im 12. Jahrhundert* (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 6), Berlin.

FIDORA, A. (2004), "Zum Verhältnis von Metaphysik und Theologie bei Dominicus Gundissalinus", in M. Lutz-Bachmann / A. Fidora / A. Niederberger (eds.), *Metaphysics in the 12th Century – On the Relationship Among Philosophy, Science and Theology* (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 19), Turnhout, 67-84.

FIDORA, A./NIEDERBERGER, A. (2001), *Von Bagdad nach Toledo. Das 'Buch der Ursachen' und seine Rezeption im Mittelalter. Lateinisch-deutscher Text, Kommentar und Wirkungsgeschichte* (excerpta classica 20), Mainz.

- FONTAINE, T. A. M. (1990), *In Defence of Judaism. Abraham Ibn Daūd. Sources and Structures of 'ha-Emunah ha-Ramah'* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 26), Assen, 262-263.
- GAUTHIER, R.-A. (1982), "Le traité *De anima et potentiis eius* d'un Maître ès Arts (vers 1225)", in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 66, 3-55.
- GILSON, É. (1929-1930), "Les sources gréco-arabes de l'augustinisme avicennisant", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 4, 4-149.
- HASSE, D. N. (2000), *Avicenna's 'De anima' in the Latin West. The Formation of a Peripatetic Philosophy of the Soul 1160-1300* (Warburg Institute Studies and Texts 1), London / Turin.
- LAY, J. (1978), *L'astronomie et la métaphysique de Rabbi Gershom ben Salomon d'Arles*, unpublished Mémoire de Maîtrise, Paris.
- LEMAY, R. (1987), "De la scolastique à l'histoire par le truchement de la philologie: itinéraire d'un médiéviste entre Europe et Islam", in B. Scarcia Amoretti (ed.), *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel medio evo europeo. Convegno internazionale, Roma, 2-4 ott. 1984*, Rome, 399-535.
- MARRONE, S. P. (2006), "From Gundisalvus to Bonaventure: Intellect and Intelligences in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries", in M. C. Pacheco / J. F. Meirinhos (eds.), *Intellect et imagination dans la philosophie médiévale. Actes du XIe Congrès International de Philosophie Médiévale de la Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale (S.I.E.P.M.), Porto, du 26 au 31 août 2002*, 3 vols. (Rencontres en philosophie médiévale 11,1-3), Turnhout, vol. 2, 1071-1081.
- RIGO, C. (1995), "Yehudah ben Mosheh Romano, traduttore degli scolastici latini", in *Henoch* 17, 141-170.
- SCHNEIDER, A. (1906), *Die Psychologie Alberts des Großen nach den Quellen dargestellt* (BGPhMA IV, 6), Münster.
- SCHWARTZ, Y. (2003), "Hillel ben Shmuel ben Elazar (bzw. Eliezer) aus Verona", in A. B. Kilcher / O. Fraisse / Y. Schwartz (eds.), *Metzler Lexikon jüdischer Philosophen. Philosophisches Denken des Judentums von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Stuttgart / Weimar, 74-76.
- SCHWARTZ, Y. (2004), "Die Seelenlehre des Hillel aus Verona: Aristotelische Psychologie zwischen Maimonismus und Thomismus", in M. Lutz-Bachmann / A. Fidora / P. Antolic (eds.), *Erkenntnis und Wissenschaft – Probleme der Epistemologie in der Philosophie des Mittelalters / Knowledge and Science – Problems of Epistemology in Medieval Philosophy* (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 10), Berlin, 253-264.
- SERMONETA, J. (1965), "La dottrina dell'intelletto e la 'fede filosofica' di Juhudàh e Immanuel Romano", in *Studi medievali*, Serie terza, 6/2, 3-78.
- TEICHER, J. (1933), "Gershon ben Shelomoh e Gundissalino", in *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 9, 5-25.
- TEICHER, J. (1934), "Gundissalino e l'agostinismo avicennizzante", in *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 26, 252-258.
- TEICHER, J. (1954-1956), "The Latin-Hebrew School of Translators in Spain in the Twelfth Century", in *Homenaje a Millás-Vallícosa*, 2 vols., Barcelona, vol. 2, 401-443.
- DE VAUX, R. (1934), *Notes et textes sur l'avicennisme aux confins des XIIIe-XIIIe siècles*, Paris.
- ZONTA, M. (1996), *La filosofia antica nel Medioevo ebraico. Le traduzioni ebraiche medievali dei testi filosofici antichi* (Philosophica. Test e studi 2), Brescia 1996.