Averroes Edition

at the Thomas-Institute, University of Cologne

Edition Guidelines

1. Workflow and Tools

1.1 The *Averroes Project Manager* (APM)

All editions are produced with the aid of the web application *Averroes Project Manager* (APM), that provides tools for transcribing, collating, and building the text and the various apparatuses. It is to be found at: https://averroes.uni-koeln.de/apm/. During the early project phase, as long as the APM is still under construction, the typesetting of the editions will be done with either *Classical Text Editor* or *Indesign*. The digital editions will be produced directly from the APM.

1.2 Research Data Storage

All research data generated within the APM is stored on the project server hosted at the *Regional Computing Centre* at the University of Cologne (RRZK) and there receives daily backup. All other research data generated by the editors and collaborators of the project, is stored on the research data platform of the Thomas-Institute: https://one.thomas.uni-koeln.de.

2. Parts of the Edition

Each edition contains a *praefatio* (no. 3), a bibliography (no. 4), a list of the sigla and abbreviations used (no. 5), the text (no. 6) with an *apparatus criticus* (no. 8) and an *apparatus fontium* (no. 9), as well as—if applicable—an apparatus for testimonia (no. 10) and a comparative apparatus (no. 11). To these are added an index of names, an *index locorum*, and a word index or—in the case of translated works whose *Vorlage* is preserved—a bilingual glossary.

3. Praefatio

3.1 Structure

The *praefatio* contains the following parts: (1) a discussion of the attribution, and the place and date of composition; (2) a description of the direct and indirect transmission of the text with a complete recension of the direct manuscript witnesses and more detailed descriptions at least of the manuscripts selected for full collation; (3) a genealogical analysis of the transmission resulting in a *stemma codicum*; (4) an explanation of the editorial principles followed. To these essential parts others may be added according to the individual requirements of the text in question.

3.2 Language

The *Praefatio* may be composed either in British English (preferably) or in French.

4. Bibliography, Citation Style, Transliteration

4.1 Bibliography and Citation Style

The bibliography accompanying the *praefatio* provides the bibliographical details on all the literature used both in the *praefatio* itself and in possible footnotes to the edition. In every other place the publications will be quoted in an abbreviated form comprising the last name of the author and a short title.

4.1.1 General Rules
Common scholarly abbreviations are used in their Latin form:

id., ead.	ibid.	l. c. (work and page identical) **op. cit.** (work identical)	cf.	e. g.	etc.

Folio (sing, pl.)	Column (sing., pl.)	Volume (sing., pl.)	Editor (sing., pl.)	edited by (sing., pl.)	f., ff.
fol., foll.	**col., coll.**	**vol., voll.** (as in: voll. 1–3) or **vols.** (as in: 3 vols.)	**ed., eds.**	**ed., edd.**	**sq., sqq.**

Note	and others	no place	no date		
nt.	**e. a.**	**s. l.**	**s. a.**		

4.1.2 Monographs
Author's first and last name — comma —Title in italics — when relevant, the Series name and publication number in parentheses — comma — Place and Year of publication — comma — Page numbers (without a preceding "S." or "p.") — period.

EXAMPLES:

Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle* (Études de philosophie médiévale 45), Paris 1957, [3]1976, 21–30.

Georg Wieland, *Ethica – scientia practica. Die Anfänge der philosophischen Ethik im 13. Jahrhundert* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters N.F. 21), Münster 1981, 145–152.

4.1.3 Articles in Journals and Collections
Author's first and last name — comma — Title between quotation marks — comma — [if applicable:] "in" Editors first and last name "(ed.)" or "(eds.)" — comma — Title of Journal or Collection in italics — Volume, then Year in parentheses [citations of Essay Collections from here on should follow the above guidelines for monographs...] — comma — Page numbers (without a preceding "S." or "p.") — period.

EXAMPLES:

Ruedi Imbach, "Le (Néo)-Platonisme médiévale, Proclus latin et l'école dominicaine allemande", *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 110 (1978), 427–448.

Carlos Steel, "The Individuation of the Human Intellect. Henry Bate's Platonic-Nominalistic Position", in J. A. Aertsen, A. Speer (eds.), *Individuum und Individualität im Mittelalter* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 24), Berlin–New York 1996, 230–248.

4.1.4 Short References:
Author's last name — comma — short title in italics or between quotation marks respectively — comma

— page numbers (without a preceding "S." or "p.") — period.

EXAMPLES:

Steel, "Individuation", 230–248.

Wieland, *Ethica*, 145 sq.

4.2 Transliteration

Greek is not transliterated. Words from a language tradition different from that of the edited text may be (re-)translated into the language of the *praefatio* or into the language of the text (especially in the *apparatus criticus*), but never without providing the original word in parentheses either in original characters or in transliteration. In the text and footnotes of the *praefatio*, as well as in possible footnotes to the edition, Arabic and Hebrew words should be transliterated unless the point under discussion refers to their graphical shape. However, in longer quotations and comparative tables the original script should be preserved.

4.2.1 Transliteration of Arabic

Transliteration of Arabic, where appropriate, follows the rules of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft (DMG), with the following modifications customary in English language publications:

- au => aw
- ai => ay
- īya => iyya
- ūwa => uwwa

Assimilation of the article to the "sun letters" is ignored in transliteration. Tā' marbūṭa in status constructus is transliterated "-t".

4.2.2 Transliteration of Hebrew

For the transliteration of Hebrew, for which no comparable standard exists, the following rules will be applied: Vowels are transliterated in a simplified way using only a, e, i, o, and u; Segol becomes e; only spoken Shva is transliterated "e". Dagesh forte is transcribed by gemination of the letter concerned, except after the determinate article and other function words (e.g. ־מ). The consonants are transliterated according to the below table:

Hebrew Letters	Transcription
א	'
ב (בֿ)	b (ḇ)
ת	t
ג	g
ח	ḥ
ד	d
ר	r
ז	z
ס	s
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š

צ	ṣ
ט	ṭ
ע	ʿ
פּ (פ)	p (f)
ק	q
כּ (כ)	k (ḵ)
ל	l
מ	m
נ	n
ה	h
ו	w or u
י	y or i

5. Sigla and Abbreviations

The *sigla* for manuscripts are formed, whenever possible, by a single upper-case letter chosen to indicate the city where the manuscript is preserved today. If more than one manuscript is located in the same city, the respective letter is used for the most important among these manuscripts, while the others receive one of the letters of the alphabet not yet used for any other manuscript. Only if no single letter is left, may the upper-case letter be supplemented by a lower-case letter: P, Pa, Pb, Pc…

Exceptions to this rule are made for manuscripts already well-known in the literature by a certain *siglum*. For the Latin edition of the Long Commentary on the *Physics* the list of *sigla* employed in earlier and ongoing editions of other Long Commentaries (on *De caelo*, *Metaphysics* etc) will be respected as far as possible.

Arabic manuscripts are symbolised by single Arabic letters, highlighted by a *madda* (U+0653) in order to clearly distinguish them from the other words and symbols in the apparatus:

$$آ بَ جَ$$

Hebrew manuscripts are symbolised by single Hebrew letters; they are set in bold in order to clearly distinguish them from the other words and symbols in the apparatus. The bold print is not necessary when the Hebrew *sigla* appear in the comparative apparatus of an Arabic or Latin edition.

Later corrections and additions by the hand of the principal scribe are symbolised by a superscript number 1, corrections and additions by other hands by superscript 2, 3 etc: A[1], **ג**[3], בَ[2]. In cases where it is not clear, whether a correction by the hand of the main scribe was made during copying or at a later stage, it is preferable to use only the basic *siglum* and "*corr.*" The same is true when the hand cannot be identified with certainty.

For manuscripts produced conjointly by several hands (a case that occurs in the Hebrew tradition of the corpus) the *sigla* with superscript numbers symbolise the different text hands, corrections and additions being only indicated by "*corr.*" etc:

זה הכח] וזה הוא הכח **ג**[3] נמחק הוא **ג**[2] ‖

6. Text
6.1 Aim and Method

The critical editions undertaken in this project aim to reconstruct the version of the text originally produced by the author or translator respectively; they will neither be synoptic, nor reflect merely a certain manuscript or branch of the transmission, nor again privilege any vulgate version or later adaptation.

The feasibility of a genealogical reconstruction has been denied by several scholars in the case of Hebrew works because of the peculiar editing techniques of learned Hebrew scribes allegedly resulting in rampant contamination.[1] However, we would like to affirm here that, at least for the corpus under discussion, no insurmountable obstacles to a truly critical edition are to be foreseen. The samples analysed so far, have shown that it is generally possible to identify scribal conjectures and later revisions of the text and to trace their readings throughout the transmission. Moreover, even if a genealogical reconstruction should not be able to solve *all* textual problems, it nevertheless remains the only methodologically sound and transparent approach to philosophical texts transmitted in non-autograph manuscripts. It is precisely the function of the *apparatus criticus* to document significant deviations from the reconstructed text and hence to enable the reader to verify the editor's decisions and also to follow the readings of particular manuscripts.

In spite of this last mentioned function, the futile and counterproductive attempt at a "total" apparatus, comprising all readings of all witnesses, is to be resisted. Instead, each edition will be based on a careful selection of the most reliable manuscripts representing the existing groups or "families" of the transmission. This choice is to be made on the basis of a sample collation of all extant witnesses for a significant portion of the text, and the attendant genealogical reconstruction. Not all variant readings will be recorded in the printed apparatus—not even all variants of the retained manuscripts, inasmuch as this would result in a cluttered and impracticable apparatus. Recurring minor variants and merely orthographical variants will typically be excluded, and the criteria of selection as well as examples of the excluded variants will be presented in the *praefatio*. The digital publication, by contrast, will provide an optional view of all variants recorded during the editing process and of the sample collation.

In the case of texts transmitted in a very restricted number of manuscripts—e.g. the three works by Ibn Bāǧǧa, preserved in only two copies—a complete documentation of variants and a more comprehensive documentation of palaeographic features will be provided, because of the greater impact of these data on the reconstruction of the text.

6.2 Author Versions

Wherever authorial revisions are discernible, originating either from the primary author (Ibn Bāǧǧa, Averroes) or the translator, the edition will capture these different versions and display them in an appropriate manner. The following cases are known to exist in the corpus:

> (a) Different author versions for parts of the text: The successive stages of revision will be documented by printing the alternative versions and/or added paragraphs in different columns, providing a separate *apparatus criticus* for each version.
>
> (b) Translations reworked by the original translator: The edition will reflect the definitive version penned by the translator and document the (usually minor) variants of the earlier version(s) in the *apparatus criticus*.

6.3 Transmitted Versions

Transmitted versions, as distinguished from author versions, are those significantly altered versions of a prior text which are due to (c) a systematic revision by another author or translator on the basis of a different *Vorlage*; (d) a systematic revision based on conjectures and/or stylistic editing; (e) any other

---

[1] Cf. Schäfer, Research into Rabbinic Literature (1986); Schäfer, Once again the Status Quaestionis of Research in Rabbinic Literature (1989); Sirat, Les éditions critiques : un mythe? (1992); Beit-Arié, Publication and Reproduction of Literary Texts in Jewish Medieval Civilization (2000); Bausi et al. (eds.), *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies: An Introduction* (2015), pp. 371–372. See however the criticism of this position in Milikowsky, The Status Quaestionis of Research in Rabbinic Literature (1988); Schäfer and Milikowsky, Current Views on the Editing of the Rabbinic Texts of Late Antiquity (2010).

reworking, e.g. abridgement, insertion of glosses etc. At least cases (c) and (d) are known to exist in the corpus.[2] Depending on the precise nature of the revised version, its relative importance in the overall transmission, and the practical constraints of the project, three equally valid options will be considered and individually decided for each case:

> (1) editing the revised version alongside the original in a separate column or beneath the main text in a smaller font;
>
> (2) providing either a complete transcription of the revised version or significant variants, either in a separate apparatus or among the testimonia;
>
> (3) disregarding the revised version. In this last case, the *praefatio* will provide at least a short description and some examples from the revised version.

6.4 Translation and Original

All translated texts are to be edited primarily with a view to the respective language tradition, the adoption of variant readings into the main text being founded essentially on stemmatic considerations.

However, for all Hebrew and Latin translations whose Arabic *Vorlage* is extant or which are transmitted in parallel Arabic-to-Hebrew and Arabic-to-Latin translations, a close comparison of the different language versions will be conducted and, in a second step, be used to solve difficult textual issues and to correct such mistakes as can be shown to have occurred, in all probability, in the transmission of the translation, even if the correct reading is not attested in the surviving manuscripts.

A parallel procedure will also be applied to Arabic texts whenever the Hebrew and/or Latin translations transmit a superior reading not attested by the extant manuscripts, provided that (a) the existing Arabic variants permit to formulate a clear hypothesis explaining the corruption, or (b) that there exists strong circumstantial evidence (e.g. conformity with the Arabic Aristotle) to support the emendation.

For this practice cf. Gutas, in: Theophrastus, *On First Principles*, pp. 93–101; for the expression of these emendations in the apparatus cf. no. 8.2.10 below.

In more doubtful cases, the variant readings of the other language traditions will merely be recorded in the comparative apparatus (cf. no. 11).

6.5 Incorporated Aristotelian Text

The Aristotelian text incorporated in Averroes's commentaries (in the case of the Long Commentary) or quoted and/or paraphrased (in the other cases), plays an important role in the history of the formation of the edited texts. For that reason, the relevant Aristotelian passages will not only be indicated in the *apparatus fontium* by a reference to the respective editions, but all deviations from the received Aristotelian text will also be noted in the comparative apparatus.

In general, the Aristotelian text relevant to the edition will be the Arabic language version(s) that were at the disposal of Ibn Bāǧǧa and Averroes. The Greek text will be taken into consideration only if there is reason to suppose that the edited commentary reflects another translation or recension or transmits a more correct reading of the received Greek-into-Arabic translation, not attested in the extant manuscripts of the Arabic Aristotle.

For the edition of the Latin texts, the independent Arabic-into-Latin and Greek-into-Latin translations of Aristotle, which might possibly have influenced the translator of Averroes's commentary,

---

2 Case (c) has been detected in a group of Hebrew manuscripts transmitting Averroes's *Epitomai*, cf. Eichner, Contamination and Interlingual Contamination, pp. 253–259. The alternative Latin "translation" of book VII of the *Long Commentary on the Physics*, contained in ms. Vienna, Cod.lat. 2334, probably constitutes—*pace* Schmieja—a case of (d); cf. Averroes, *Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis Physicorum librum septimum*, ed. Schmieja.

will likewise be compared and their readings reported in the comparative apparatus, wherever such an influence appears to have occurred. The same procedure is followed for the rare independent Hebrew translations of an Aristotelian text.

If the Aristotelian text in its respective translation has not yet received an edition, it will be quoted in full in the *apparatus fontium*. Also, passages not adequately rendered in the existing editions, will be given in full on the basis of an appropriate manuscript.

In the edition of the Long Commentary, the *lemmata* from the Aristotelian text that are quoted in Averroes's comment will be printed in italics in the Latin edition, and enclosed in quotation marks in the Hebrew edition.

6.6 Adiaphorous Variants

For adiaphorous variants which cannot be judged unequivocally on the basis of the stemma, a manuscript or group of manuscripts to be followed in these cases will be chosen on the basis of criteria like age, geographical area etc., and which are thus more likely to reflect the *usus scribendi* of the author or translator.

6.7 Spelling and Grammar

The spelling is to be harmonised, but not to be standardised according to the respective classical state of the language. This is done by adhering to the same reference manuscript or group of manuscripts mentioned in no. 6.6, and by determining the prevalent usage within this witness, which will then be applied uniformly to the whole text.

The variant readings of single manuscripts or multiple manuscripts with identical spelling will be recorded in the apparatus in their original form. However, if multiple manuscripts exhibit semantically identical readings with different spelling, the orthographical variation will be disregarded and the variant will be reported according to the harmonised spelling.

The grammar will not be standardised or even completely harmonised. However, whenever one reading is more correct according to the rules of classical grammar, without being visibly the result of a later stylistic revision, preference will be given to that reading.

6.7.1 Arabic Spelling, Grammar, and Vocalisation

Notwithstanding the aforementioned general rules, a cautious normalisation will be applied in Arabic texts, for which this has been almost uniformly practised in the past. These corrections are not recorded in the apparatus, unless the original reading is ambiguous; in this case, the editorial corrections are set between angle brackets.

- Missing *hamza* is supplied.
- *Alif maqṣūra* is written according to the rules of modern typography.
- The often lacking concord between a finite verb and its following feminine subject is corrected, if there is at least one manuscript which has the grammatically correct reading and if there is no syntactic ambiguity.

The punctuation (*taḥrīf*), which is often partly or entirely lacking in the manuscripts, is tacitly completed both in the text and in the apparatus. In case of remaining doubts, the supplied punctuation is treated as an emendation, and the skeleton (*rasm*) is reported in the apparatus for support.

جملة ل حمله كّ: حمل صّ ‖

Vocalisations to be found in the manuscripts are disregarded and not recorded in the apparatus, unless they might help to elucidate a problematic passage. By contrast, the edited text will be sparingly

vocalised by the editor whenever there is an ambiguity that severely hampers the understanding. In these cases

- only the vowels and apocopatus (*ǧazm*) is noted;
- in passive mode in the perfect tense only the vowel of the first radical,
- and in the imperfect tense the two characteristic vowels are noted;
- the *ǧazm* is not noted in diphthongs;
- long syllables receive no vowel sign.[3]

The *šadda* is placed whenever this can be done with any confidence.

6.7.2 Latin Spelling

The edition will adopt medieval orthography, in particular: lowercase *u* and uppercase *V* and *e* is retained in place of the diphthongs. Nevertheless, some normalisation will be adopted: -*cio*- changed into -*tio*- (because *c* and *t* are often indistinguishable in the mss).

6.8 Punctuation

All punctuation will be editorial and modern.

6.9 Division of the Text; Titles

The explicit logical division of the text—e.g. into *commenta*, book (*maqāla*), unit (*ǧumla*), chapter (*faṣl*) etc—is respected and highlighted by centred headlines. In cases where these titles are missing in the transmission, they will be provided between angle brackets like all other editorial additions. By contrast, no editorial divisions will be introduced on this level. In particular, divisions present in one language tradition but not in the other must not be transferred to the texts in whose transmission they do not appear. Relevant corresponding sections from another language tradition should rather be indicated by a mark in the text combined with a marginal reference (cf. no. 7); this reference may also be repeated in the running titles at the head of the page.

Further subdivisions into paragraphs or sections based on the argumentative and literary structure of the text can be introduced by the editor in order to facilitate reading and reference. This is particularly called for in all longer portions of text that have not been explicitly subdivided by the author. These subdivisions will not have titles and only be highlighted by paragraph and indentation. A paragraph count may be introduced between square brackets, and should follow the numbering system: 1, 2, 3… or 1.1, 1.2, 1.3…, 2.1… For Arabic texts Indian-Arabic numerals are employed.

7. Reference Systems

The page changes of relevant previous editions will be marked in the text by a vertical line | (U+007C) combined with a note in the exterior margin consisting of the *siglum* of the respective edition and the new page number.

In the edition of commentaries which either include the complete Aristotelian text or closely paraphrase large sections of it, reference to the source may be made by giving the relevant Bekker numbers either between vertical lines in the text or in the inner margins. This can either supplement or replace the reference in the *apparatus fontium*. The Bekker numbers should also appear in the running titles at the head of the page.

---

3 Cf. Blachère and Sauvaget, *Règles pour éditions et traductions de textes arabes*, pp. 13–14 (§§ 40–41).

8. Apparatus criticus

8.1 Layout

Underneath the text is printed, in the first place, the list of available witnesses (no. 8.3), followed, in this order, by the apparatus of *testimonia* (no. 10) and the *apparatus criticus*. After that follow the comparative apparatus (no. 11) and, finally, the *apparatus fontium* (no. 9). The different apparatuses are separated by a short horizontal line. Further references (no. 7) are provided on the margins.

8.2 Style of Apparatus

The edition is provided with a negative apparatus; the *lemma* quoted is separated from the variants by the sign]. The sign is omitted when the information given in the apparatus entry does not contain variant readings, e.g.

> **3** subiectum *in marg.* A

> **7** est *om.* C

More detailed rules are given in the following sub-sections.

In editions of Latin texts, the apparatus language is Latin; the abbreviations used for the editorial remarks are based on Bidezet et al., *Emploi des signes critiques*.

In editions of Arabic and Hebrew texts the apparatus runs from right to left, in the same direction as the text, and is composed in the language of the respective text.

The Arabic and Hebrew apparatus uses no symbols like +, -, and brackets to express the editorial comments, as is mostly found in editions that present a right-to-left apparatus. The reason for that is threefold: (1) There is no established standard for these symbols, so that the apparatus cannot easily be understood. (2) More tricky cases like "*ante* fortuna *add.* bona P" cannot be clearly expressed with symbols like + at all. However, one needs to be able to distinguish between, for example, the following two variants without having to repeat the whole phrase:

من الرجال] كثير من الرجال بّ   من كثير الرجال جّ ‖

In our system this becomes   قبل من ز كثير بّ   بعد من ز كثير جّ ‖

(3) Many of the brackets variously used in modern Arabic and Hebrew editions already have other well-established uses in editorial philology, so that the practice is actually confusing.

On the other hand, a Latin or English apparatus for Arabic and Hebrew editions—set aside its slightly colonialist overtones—is equally confusing because of the permanent changes in reading direction between lemmata and readings on the one hand, and editorial remarks on the other hand. This creates a lot of ambiguity, and especially in longer apparatus entries that stretch over a line break.

For these reasons, we opt for an all-Arabic and all-Hebrew apparatus respectively, making use of short words and a limited set of easily decipherable abbreviations in order to compose the editorial remarks. Only abbreviations rooted in the respective language tradition are employed; for the Arabic these are based on Gacek, *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: A Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography*. This procedure has the added advantage of closely mirroring the firmly established conventions of Latin (and Greek) editions, and thus to guarantee a high measure of conformity between the Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew editions produced by the project.

In Latin the variant readings are printed in roman letters, the editorial remarks in italics. In Arabic and Hebrew no italics are employed, instead the editorial remarks are printed in a smaller font.

The line numbers in the apparatus are printed in bold font.

The *sigla* are separated from the respective reading or editorial remark by a space, and from the next reading belonging to the same unit of textual criticism by an em-space (U+2003). The end of each

unit is marked by a double vertical line ‖ (U+2016).

8.2.1 Lemma

The lemma is always reported in the apparatus. If the lemma comprises more than two words, only the first and last are quoted in the apparatus, separated by a dash. If the variant relates to single words of a longer textual passage, only the relevant words are quoted in the apparatus, separated by an ellipsis.

‖ ٨ التأثير – هو] نقص تّ

‖ ١١ هل ... أو] أ ... أم جّ

‖ **8** מתוך – 10 לפי] חסר **ת**
‖ **11** או ... או] אם ... או אם **פ**

8.2.2 Additions

The addition of one or several words is recorded under the lemma of that word from the text which bears the closest semantic relation to the addition—no matter, whether it precedes or follows it. If there is no such privileged relation, the addition should by preference be recorded under the preceding word of the text. In many cases it will not be necessary to state explicitly that an addition occurs after the lemmatized word, inasmuch as this is the most natural reading of "*add.*" and its Arabic and Hebrew counterparts anyway.

post praedicamentorum *add.* aliorum E ‖

post praedicamentorum *add.* aliorum E   aliquorum F ‖   (different mss having different additions)

ante ente *add.* de V ‖

ante ente *add. et del.* de V ‖   (when the addition has been cancelled)

praedicamentorum] praedicatorum T   *add.* aliorum E ‖

‖ بعد صنائع ز فلسفية جّ

‖ بعد صنائع ز فلسفية جّ   معلومة قّ

‖ قبل الوجود ز واجب بّ

‖ قبل الوجود ز وضرب واجب بّ

‖ صنائع] صناعة تّ   ز فلسفية جّ

‖ **א** אחרי הבית נוסף הזה
‖ **ב** ההוא   **א** אחרי הבית נוסף הזה
‖ **כ** לפני הבית נוסף זה
‖ **כ** לפני הבית נוסף ונמחק זה
‖ **א** נוסף הזה   **ג** הבית] האות

8.2.3 Omissions

Omissions are indicated by *om.* / חסר / نقص ; when both omission and variants occur, the variants will be recorded first:

sunt *om.* A H P ‖

sunt] sint F   *om.* A H P ‖

‖ هيولى نقص نّ صّ

هيولى] هيولاني قّ   نقص نّ صّ ‖

חומר חסר **א ג** ‖

חומר] חומרי **כ**   חסר **א ג** ‖

8.2.4 Deletions

Deletions are indicated by *del.* / נמחק / ضرب. Deletions by different scribal hands are recorded by using the appropriate *sigla* detailed above under no. 5.

ante ente *add.* de V   *del.* V² ‖

قبل الوجود ز واجب بّ   ضرب بّ¹ ‖

לפני הבית נוסף זה **כ**   נמחק **כ ²** ‖

8.2.5 Lacunae

Blanks intentionally left in a manuscript will be recorded by *lac.* / פער / بياض. If appropriate, the length of the gap can be recorded.

8.2.6 Unreadable and doubtful passages

When the editor is not sure about his reading of a variant, he indicates this by *ut vid.* / נ"ל / ظ.

    mus] mas *ut vid.* L

واجب] ظ واحد عّ ‖

טין] טוב נ"ל **א** ‖

When only part of the word is clearly legible, angle brackets may used around the parts guessed by the editor:

    naturalis] n<aturali>ter L

By contrast, when an abbreviation is clearly readable, but its interpretation is uncertain, the expansion is included in round brackets

    naturalis] r(ationa)lis L

When part of the word cannot be reconstructed, ellipsis is used:

    naturalis] ...ter L

When, for reasons of damage to ink or manuscript, a word is not readable at all, this is indicated by *illeg.* / مطموس / משובש.

8.2.7 Transpositions, Dittography and Repetitions

Words appearing in transposed order will usually be recorded in full in the apparatus. Only in cases where the transposition affects a longer passage, the situation will be described with *trsp.* In Arabic and Hebrew this should be avoided altogether.

    non *post* contrario *trsp.* F ‖

When a word or group of words is copied twice in a row, this is recorded by *bis scr.* / הוכפל / كرر.

super *bis scr.* G ‖
super *bis scr. et primum del.* G ‖
super *bis scr. et alterum del.* G ‖

في كرر نّ ‖

في كرر وضرب الاول نّ ‖

في كرر وضرب الثاني نّ ‖

בפועל הוכפל **א** ‖
בפועל הוכפל ונמחק הא׳ **א** ‖
בפועל הוכפל ונמחק הב׳ **א** ‖

When a word or group of words is repeated later in the text, this is recorded with *iter*. / שוב / ثانيا.

23 *post* essentialiter *iter*. 17 non accidentaliter V ‖

٢٣ بعد بالذات ثانيا ١٧ ولا بالعرض ثّ ‖

23 אחרי כלו שוב 17 או רובו **ט** ‖

8.2.8 Corrections

Corrections in the proper sense, i.e. changes for the better, are recorded by *sed corr*. / תוקן / صح. The place of the correction, and possibly the scribal hand, are likewise indicated.

cui] cuius *sed corr*. B ‖
cui] cuius *sed supra lin. corr*. B ‖
cui] cuius *sed in marg. corr*. B ‖
cui] cuius *sed in marg. corr*. B² ‖

آلات] آلة صح خّ ‖

آلات] آلة صح فوقه خّ ‖

آلات] آلة صح ه خّ ‖

آلات] آلة صح ه خّ ٢ ‖

כלים] כלו תוקן **ג** ‖
כלים] כלו תוקן מעליו **ג** ‖
כלים] כלו תוקן בשול **ג** ‖
כלים] כלו תוקן בשול **ג** ² ‖

Changes that are not corrections are recorded in the same manner by using *mut*. / הומר אל / غير إلى.

cui *in* cuius *mut*. B ‖

آلات غير إلى آلة خّ ‖
כלים הומר אל כלו **ג** ‖

8.2.9 Emendations and Reported Conjectures

Parts of the text which, according to the editor's judgement, are to be suppressed, are enclosed between square brackets [ ].

Additions made by the editor are set, in the text, between angle brackets 〈 〉 (= U+3008 and U+3009). When an addition seems necessary but cannot be supplied, this is indicated by ellipsis: 〈…〉 The addition is recorded in the apparatus in the same manner as other emendations (see below).

Corrupt words or passages that cannot be healed are enclosed between obeli † † (=U+2020). Ellipsis is used in order to indicate missing text: †….†

Emendations are not indicated in the text but only in the apparatus. When there is support of one sort or another for the emendation, this is quoted in the apparatus. More precisely, variants from

single manuscripts or other sources—e.g. another language tradition recorded in the comparative apparatus—are quoted with their respective *siglum*. Emendations proposed by scholars are recorded under the scholar's last name. Emendations are always recorded in the style of a positive apparatus. The expressions used are: coni. / صح (for an unsupported conjecture) or ل (for one replacing [*badal*] an extant reading) / תוקן.

aggregationibus *coni.* חבורי Heb: aggregatione A C G K L ‖

specialis *coni.*: spiritualis A F G ‖

specialis *coni. Müller*: spiritualis A F G ‖

الحائرين ل الجائزين بّ:   الخارجين تَ ثَ كَ ‖

الحائرين صح: الخارجين بّ تَ ثَ كَ ‖

الحائرين صح *Pines*: الخارجين بّ تَ ثَ كَ ‖

חומר תוקן هيولى عّ: חמור א ג פ ‖

חומר תוקן: חמור א ג פ ‖

חומר תוקן *Freudenthal*: חמור א ג פ ‖

In difficult cases, it may be helpful to report readings from previous editions or emendations proposed by scholars without, however, adopting them. This is indicated by *scr.* / כתב / كتب.

spiritualis] specialis *scr. Müller* ‖

الخارجين] الحائرين كتب *Pines* ‖

חמור] חומר כתב *Pines* ‖

8.3 Traditio Textus (Apparatus of Available Witnesses)

All manuscripts used for the edition will be listed in a separate apparatus at the top of the other apparatuses in order to record: (1) the exact place in the manuscript where the reported text starts, (2) the paging, (3) the columns, and (4) the passages lacking.

1 Intentio: A 37ra1   B 42vb20   V 12r7 ‖

9. *Apparatus fontium*

The *apparatus fontium* runs in the same direction as the text, and is composed in the language of the text. It identifies all explicitly quoted sources, and—as far as possible—also the unacknowledged quotations. All published texts will merely receive a reference to the exact pages and lines in the respective editions, while texts extant only in manuscript are quoted in full. If possible, the source should be given exactly in the version(s) available to the author or translator (see also no. 6.5).

10. Testimonia

We designate the indirect transmission of the edited text as *testimonia*. Only *testimonia* relevant for establishing the text are recorded. The apparatus runs in the same direction as the text and is composed in the language of the text.

11. Comparative apparatus

The comparative apparatus records (1) readings relevant for establishing the text, (2) significant deviations from the other language versions of the same work by Averroes, and (3) from the primary sources used by the author or translator, especially from the respective Aristotelian texts. The apparatus

runs in the same direction as the text and is composed in the language of the text, but the readings are given in their original language and script. If the editor deems it necessary, they may be (re-)translated into the language of the edited text.

12. Comparative Summary of Abbreviations Used in the Apparatus

Use	Latin		Arabic		Hebrew	
	source	abbreviation	source	abbreviation	source	abbreviation
Addition	addidit	*add.*	zāda	ز	נוסף	
Deletion	delevit	*del.*	ḍarb	ضرب	נמחק	
Omission	omisit	*om.*	naqṣ	نقص	חסר	
Lacuna	lacuna	*lac.*	bayāḍ	بياض	פער	
Doubtful reading	ut videtur	*ut vid.*	aẓannuhu	ظ	נראה לי	נ״ל
Unreadable	illegibile	*illeg.*	maṭmūs	مطموس	משובש	
Dittography	iteravit	*iter.*	ṯāniyyan	ثانيا	שוב	
Correction	corrigit	*corr.*	ṣaḥḥa	صح	תוקן	
written in the margin	in margine	*in marg.*	hāmiš	ھ	בשול	
written above the line	supra lineam	*supra lin.*	fauqahū	فوقه	מעליו	
Emendation	conieci(t)	*coni.*	badal	ل	תוקן	
			ṣaḥḥa	صح		
Reported reading or conjecture	scripsit	*scr.*	kataba	كتب	כתב	

References

Daniel Abrams, *Kabbalistic Manuscripts and Textual Theory: Methodologies of Textual Scholarship and Editorial Practice in the Study of Jewish Mysticism. Second revised edition with a new chapter: Textual Fixity and Textual Fluidity: Kabbalistic Textuality and the Hypertexualism of Kabbalah Scholarship*, Los Angeles–Jerusalem 2013.

Malachi Beit-Arié, "Publication and Reproduction of Literary Texts in Jewish Medieval Civilization: Jewish Scribality and its Impact on the Texts Transmitted", in Y. Elman, I. Gershoni (eds.), *Transmitting Jewish Traditions: Orality, Textuality, and Cultural Diffusion*, New Haven–London 2000, 225–247.

Joseph Bidez, Anders Bjørn Drachmann, *Emploi des signes critiques. Disposition de l'apparat dans les éditions savantes de textes grecs et latins. Conseils et recommandations par J. Bidez et A. B. Drachmann. Édition nouvelle par A. Delatte et A. Severyns*, Bruxelles–Paris 1938.

Sterling Dow, *Conventions in editing: A suggested reformulation of the Leiden system*, Durham 1969.

Dimitri Gutas, *Theophrastus On First Principles (known as his Metaphysics)*, Leiden–Boston 2010.

Chaim Milikowsky, "The Status Quaestionis of Research in Rabbinic Literature", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39 (1988), 201–211.

Peter Schäfer, "Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Quaestionis", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 37 (1986), 139–152 .

Peter Schäfer, "Once again the Status Quaestionis of Research in Rabbinic Literature: An Answer to Chaim Milikowsky", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 40 (1989), 89–94.

Peter Schäfer, Chaim Milikowski, "Current Views on the Editing of the Rabbinic Texts of late Antiquity: Reflections on a Debate after Twenty Years", in M. Goorman, P. Alexander (eds.), *Rabbinic Texts and the History of Late-Roman Palestine* (Proceedings of the British Academy 165), Oxford 2010, 79–90.

Horst Schmieja, *Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis Physicorum librum septimum: Vindobonensis, lat. 2334*, Paderborn 2007.