

The Translation of Maimonides' *Dux neutrorum* as a Reaction to the Talmud Trial?

Görge K. Hasselhoff
Technische Universität Dortmund

As I have shown in my book *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, between 1244 and 1246 Albert the Great was the first scholastic author who quoted Maimonides from the Latin translation of the *Guide for the Perplexed*, usually rendered as *Dux neutrorum*.¹ Since then Maimonides was part of at least the authorities of the Dominican Order to explain problems like the eternity of the world. In that book I also gave some arguments for the place where the translation was made.² Before I summarise these arguments, I will first mention some points of the history of the *Guide* itself. Then I draw your attention to the first chapters of the work and its Latin translation. In a third step I will summarise and present my arguments for the potential place of that translation and the forces behind it.

1. Moses Maimonides and the *Guide for the Perplexed*

When Moses Maimonides in the early 1190s finished his *Dalālat al-Ḥāirīn* it was neither his first nor his last book. Before, he wrote two commentaries on the *Mishna*, after, he published several medical treatises.³ In literature, a number of arguments are raised as to why Maimonides wrote that philosophical treatise at all and how the different parts have to be understood. To mention just three positions: a) After Maimonides had written some works on halakhah he now felt free to turn to Aristotelian philosophy that was his real interest, although it was directed only to a small group of readers (e.g. Leo Strauss⁴). b) Maimonides wrote the *Guide* as a hermeneutical tool to read and understand the Bible (e.g. Friedrich Niewöhner; Herbert A. Davidson⁵). c) The *Guide* is the final part of a lifelong attempt to formulate a philosophy of

1. Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*. – The *Dux neutrorum* was printed by Agostino Giustiniani, Paris 1520 (repr. Frankfurt o. M.: Minerva 1964, reissued in 2005); on Giustiniani and his editions see Hasselhoff, 'Die Drucke einzelner lateinischer Übersetzungen von Werken des Maimonides im 16. Jahrhundert als Beitrag zur Entstehung der modernen Hebraistik: Agostino Giustiniani und Sebastian Münster', pp. 169-188. – A critical edition based on all manuscripts available is a scholarly desideratum; on the difficulties of such an enterprise see Hasselhoff, 'Zur Problematik kritischer Ausgaben der Schriften von Moses Maimonides', pp. 47-53.
2. See Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 123-125.
3. For a survey of his writings see, e.g., Stroumsa, *Maimonides in his World*, pp. xix-xx; Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 330-333.
4. See Strauss, 'How to Begin to Study *The Guide of the Perplexed*'.
5. Niewöhner, 'Maimonides *Dux Neutorum*'; Davidson, *Moses Maimonides*, pp. 332-351

halakhah; therefore the *Guide* belongs to his halakhical writings (Moshe Halbertal⁶). All of these and similar positions can be found in the *Guide*, but for our purpose it suffices to say that it is a truly encyclopaedic work⁷ that comprises all kinds of knowledge of the twelfth century, including Bible exegesis, halakhah, Aristotelian philosophy, astronomy, mathematics, and so on.

More important seems to me with regard to the later Latin tradition the question of languages. Although it should be quite well-known, we have to remember that Maimonides' mother tongue was Arabic, or to be more precise the Jewish dialect of the Mediterranean world called Judaeo-Arabic. In that language he wrote his medical, philosophical, and scientific works.⁸ In addition some of his halakhic writings were also written in Arabic. Other than is implied by editions like that of Frederek Musall and Yossef Schwartz,⁹ Maimonides wrote the Arabic in Hebrew characters.¹⁰ But Maimonides not only wrote Arabic, but also Hebrew. All his Bible quotations in the Arabic works were written in Hebrew, as well as his halakhic chef d'oeuvre, the *Mishneh Torah*.¹¹ For reasons that do not need to be discussed here, throughout the twelfth century Hebrew again became a popular language among the Jews at least in Europe. That led to the translation of halakhic and philosophical works into Hebrew.¹² Concerning Maimonides, this can be shown by the following: Already in the last years of his life the *Guide for the Perplexed* became translated into Hebrew by Shmuel ibn Tibbon, under the title *More ha-Nevukhim*, the proper name until today;¹³ the translator was even in contact with the author as is indicated by a letter-exchange.¹⁴ This translation was quite difficult to read because Ibn Tibbon used many Arabic words as *termini technici*. Nonetheless, his translation was quite accurate. The legend has it that when a ship with the translation reached Egypt, Maimonides had died recently,¹⁵ i.e. in 1204 the translation seems to have been finished. Less than ten years later a second translation of the *Guide* was made by the poet

6. Halbertal, *Maimonides*.

7. Haddad, *Maimonide*, p. 47; 88. – In the aftermath of the 800th anniversary of his death a number of books and volumes dedicated to his memory were published, see, e.g., Hasselhoff and Fraisse (eds.), *Moses Maimonides (1138-1204)*; Tamer (ed.), *Die Trias des Maimonides*; Seeskin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides*; Robinson, *The Cultures of Maimonideanism*.

8. A comprehensive and detailed survey and analysis was given by Davidson, *Moses Maimonides*. Nonetheless, it remains to be discussed whether the de-attribution of some of the works from Maimonides is tenable (see Kraemer, *Maimonides*).

9. Moses Maimonides, *Wegweiser für die Verwirrten*.

10. See Colette and Di Donato, *Maimonide et les brouillons autographes du Dalâlat al-Ḥâ'irîn*, pp. 88-87; 98-101; 130-131; 144-145; 158-159; 176-177.

11. Twersky, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides*.

12. Steinschneider, *Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*; Fishman, *Becoming the People of the Talmud*.

13. Ed. Ibn Shmuel; on this translation see Hasselhoff, 'Zur Problematik kritischer Ausgaben der Schriften von Moses Maimonides', pp. 39-53; Fraenkel, *From Maimonides to Samuel ibn Tibbon*.

14. See Marx, 'The Correspondence Between the Rabbies of Southern France and Maimonides About Astrology'.

15. See Heschel, *Maimonides*, p. 279.

Yehuda al-Ḥarizi.¹⁶ This translation was less accurate (and in some instances even wrong) but it was much easier to read.¹⁷ Ibn Tibbon's translation was circulated in the kingdom of Aragon, in Southern France and in Italy, whereas Al-Ḥarizi's translation was read rather in Navarra and Northern France, but, admittedly, there are only very few copies of that translation preserved today at all,¹⁸ so all conclusions on its distribution are rather tentative.

In all versions, the *Moreh nevukhim* is divided into three books. The first book deals with different words and expressions, the second part deals with cosmological problems and with the modes of revelation. The third part is mainly an analysis and philosophical exegesis of the biblical, i.e. the Old Testament, commandments.

2. From 'Philosophy as Philology' to 'Philosophy without Philology': *Guide for the Perplexed I*¹⁹

To get an impression of the problems connected with the Latin translation of the *Guide for the Perplexed*, we need to have a closer look on the first book in its original version.

In the introduction Maimonides states that he mainly wanted to explain the dark, i.e. difficult to understand, chapters of the books of the biblical prophets. The reason behind that expression is that in rabbinical Judaism the study of metaphysics was not restricted.²⁰ There are the works of creation (*maasse bereshit*) which can be explained to everyone and the metaphysical world (*maasse merkava*) which might be explained only to one student at a time and only if this student is old enough to understand all the secrets and difficult ideas. Yet, Maimonides gives an explanation of the metaphorical use of language. He does so because an old rabbinical proverb says that 'the Torah spoke in the language of men'.²¹ Maimonides then examines some forty words which all are equivocal. Among these words are nouns like image (*tselem*) and likeness (*demut*) (ch. 1), figure (*temunah*) and shape (*tavnit*) (ch. 3), man and woman (*ish* and *ishah*) (ch. 6), place (*maqom*) (ch. 8), throne (*kise'*) (ch. 9), and so on, but also verbs like to see (*ra'ah*), to look at (*hibbit*), to vision (*chazoh*) (ch. 4) or to bear children (*jalad*) (ch. 7), and so on. All these words are explained with examples from the Bible, i.e. from the Old Testament, and from rabbinical literature.

16. On Yehuda al-Ḥarizi see Judah Alḥarizi, *The Book of Tahkemoni*, tr. Segal, p. xiii.

17. Before Michael Schwartz had finished his Hebrew translation, it was even the translation that was preferred by modern readers from Israel.

18. Hasselhoff, 'Zur Problematik kritischer Ausgaben der Schriften von Moses Maimonides', pp. 48-49 with note 46.

19. The very first ideas of the following section were for the first time presented at a meeting of the *Gesellschaft für Philosophie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (GPMR) in Bonn 2007; see Knut Martin Stünkel, *Una sit religio*, p. 258 note 96.

20. See BT Chagiga 11b; 13a.

21. BT Berakot 31b, cf. BT Ketuvot 67b, BT Nedarin 3a.

The analysis of words and biblical terms is followed by an explanation of the names of God of which only the unspeakable tetragrammaton is convenient for God. It is the only name which is not equivocal.

What I presented so far is the Arabic or Hebrew Maimonides. Concerning the Latin translation that, as I mentioned before, was used for the first time in Paris in the middle of the 1240s, we discover something very interesting. And here we need to go into some detail.

First of all we have to state that the main outline of the translation gives the reader an idea of what Maimonides actually had written. The reader is even informed that Maimonides is a Jew and that he wrote not only the *Dux neutrorum* but also a number of halakhic works.²² The reader is not only informed about that fact but also quotations from traditional Hebrew literature are transmitted (*ut dicunt sapientes*, and so on). But a closer reading of the Latin text in comparison with the Arabic original or even the Hebrew translations reveals a number of peculiarities.²³ Already in the introduction we find the following: ‘Diuersitates de Talmud et parabolarum deuitauit translator: quia non sunt necessarie in hoc loco’.²⁴ What is left out are examples of how rabbis dispute and come to their halakhic decisions.²⁵

But it is not the only time that the translators leave out a passage. The introduction to several chapters contains summaries as illustrated by the following examples:

In capitulo decimosexto videtur compositor libri ponere nomen petre equiuocum ad montem, et ad silicem, et ad lapidem. [...]²⁶

(In chapter 16 it is shown that the composer of the book put the name rock equivocally to mountain and to pebble and to stone.)

In prosecutione capituli decimioctauum ponit compositor libri tria verba diuersa que videntur habere eandem significationem in hebraico, in latino autem videntur duo verba illis similia secundum testimonium scripturarum quibus vtitur. Sunt autem ista verba appropinquare et tangere. [...]²⁷

(In the progress of the eighteenth chapter the composer of the book poses three different words that seem to have the same meaning in Hebrew whereas in Latin it seems

22. See Perles, ‘Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen „Führers.“’, p. 103 = Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 2v: ‘Iam autem exposuimus in aggregatione librorum nostrorum in talmude de communia [Giustinia: consequential] rationis huiusmodi (Yet, we already have exposed in the collection of our books on the Talmud about the whole of this argument.)’. – For further examples see Di Segni, ‘Traces of a Vernacular Language in the Latin Translation of Maimonides’ *Guide of the Perplexed*’, p. 46.

23. See already Perles, ‘Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen „Führers.“’

24. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 5r.

25. This was already noted by Perles, ‘Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen „Führers.“’, p. 158.

26. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 8r.

27. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 8v.

[to be] two similar words for them according to the witness of scripture in which they are used. Yet, these words are approach and touch.)

Dixit translator libri quod in hebraico duo verba quibus videtur equipollere altum, sunt vnum in significatione: pro quibus duobus possunt poni ista duo altum, et excelsum, vt sit aliqua differentia inter illa. [...]²⁸

(The translator of the book said that in Hebrew two words that seem to mean the same 'height' are one in significance: for both of them they can be put these two 'height' and 'peak', so that there is another difference between them.)

Or, to give another example, the translator rewrites the chapter. In chapter 15, Maimonides deals with the verb to erect (*natsav* and *yatsav*). He gives four examples from different biblical books²⁹ and then comes to speak on Jacob's dream at Bethel when Jacob saw the heavenly ladder with the angels walking up and down and with God at the end of the ladder standing in heaven (see Genesis 28:13). That God stood there up in heaven is explained by: 'Stood erect upon it signifies God's being stable, permanent, and constant, not the erect position of a body'.³⁰ In Pines' English translation the whole chapter comprises roughly one page. In the Latin translation (ed. Giustiniani) the text is condensed into six lines:

In prosecutione capituli decimiquinti, compositor libri facit mentionem scale Iacob, in cuius explanatione vocat angelos ascendentes et descendentes prophetas³¹: vt ibi, Misit angelum suum et eduxit nos de Aegypto.³² Et iterum. Ascendit angelus domini de Galg [sic!].³³ Et non est dubium quin isti fuerunt prophete: et merito ascensus preceedit descensum, quia post ascensum in acquirendo gradus scale qui noti sunt: erit descensus cum eo didicerit propheta per spiritum sanctum vt legat et doceat habitatores terre.³⁴

(In the progress of the fifteenth chapter the composer of the book makes mention of Jacob's ladder, in its explanation he calls the angels ascending and the prophets descending, as is said: 'He has sent his angel' [Num 20:16] and guided us out of Egypt. And in another place: 'It ascended the Lord's angel from Galg' [Judg 2:1]. And there is no doubt that they were prophets, and the merit of the ascent precedes the descent because after the ascent in acquiring rungs of a ladder which are known: there will be a descent because he will give him a prophet by the Holy Spirit so that he will read and teach the inhabitants of the earth.)

28. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 8v.

29. Namely Ex 2:4; Ps 2:2; Num 16:27; Ps 119:89.

30. Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed* (ed. Pines), p. 41.

31. Cf. Gen 28:13.

32. Num 20:16.

33. Iud. 2:1.

34. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 8r.

Already with these few examples the point should be clear: My thesis is that the Rabbi Moses of the Latin speaking world – especially in the thirteenth century – was less than the Moshe ben Maimon of the Arabic and Hebrew speaking world. Only small parts of his large and encyclopaedic oeuvre had been accessible to authors of the Latin speaking world.³⁵ Even those works which were translated were not translated in full extent but also edited according to the requirements of the translators themselves. But that raises the question as to why the Latin translator abbreviated his *Vorlage*. Did he only omit discussions that were not needed for the Latin readers as Joseph Perles wrote more than 100 years ago or does it belong to a programme connected with the translation?³⁶

3. Where was the *Dux neutrorum* translated?

For a preliminary answer I will turn to the discussion where the translation might have been provided and why I hold that the translation might relate to the Parisian Talmud Trial of 1240.

A first idea for the place of the translation was uttered by Heinrich Hirsch Graetz who speculated that the translation was provided at the imperial court in the Kingdom of Sicily under Frederick II because he employed Michael Scotus as a translator and knew an argument from the *Guide for the Perplexed* as can be shown from Jacob Anatoli's *Malmad ha-Talmidim* ('Teacher of the Disciples').³⁷ But there remain at least two questions that cannot be answered. Firstly, why should a member of the Ibn Tibbon family translate Maimonides from a version that was not produced by them? It is quite unlikely that Anatoli carried Al-Ḥarzi's problematic translation to the emperor's court if he had the translation by his father in law at his disposal.³⁸

35. Apart from the *More nevuḥim* throughout the thirteenth century only some passages from *Mishne Tora* were translated by Ramon Martí. At the turn of the fourteenth century (Ps.-)John of Capua and Armengaud Blasius translated some medical treatises, see Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 281-290; id., *Moses Maimonides interkulturell gelesen*, pp. 50-52; these translations are part of the critical edition initiated by Gerrit Bos that appears in Utah, the transcriptions are and will be provided by Michael McVaugh and Charles Burnett.
36. In addition, I here have to mention, already Perles demonstrated that the Latin translation seems to have been based on Al-Ḥarzi's Hebrew translation. See Perles, 'Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen „Führers.“', p. 19 note 10, 68-75, 99-110, 149-159, 209-218, 261-268; Rubio, *Aquinas and Maimonides on the Possibility of the Knowledge of God*; recently De Segni, 'Traces of a Vernacular Language in the Latin Translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*', p. 22, based on the afore-mentioned works.
37. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. VII.1, p. 54. Freudenthal, 'Pour le dossier de la traduction latine médiévale du *Guide des égarés*', id., 'Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* and the Transmission of the Mathematical Tract "On Two Asymptotic Lines" in the Arabic, Latin and Hebrew Medieval Traditions', pp. 120-129, later added the argument that there was an interest in the theory of the two asymptotic lines in southern France and that argument appears also in Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*, but this, too, is a weak argument.
38. See Kluxen, 'Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides', p. 33; Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 122-123.

Secondly, scholars cannot provide any convincing argument why the translation should have been made in Italy in the 1230s when the first to quote from it was Albert the Great in the middle of the 1240s in Paris.³⁹ Thirdly, sometimes it is argued that manuscripts which might be dated to the 1260s or 1270s as the copies from the Ottoboni collection in the Vatican and the one in Todi seem to bear references to the Ibn Tibbon translation so that they indicate a translation in Italy. But the Ottoboni manuscript stems from Arras which is not in Italy and, more important, they are not the oldest manuscripts.⁴⁰

More than 65 years ago, Wolfgang Kluxen came up with the idea that the translation was made in Southern France. He had two main arguments for that thesis: First, the Dominicans were engaged in the Maimonides controversy in southern France and burned Maimonides' writings. Second, the convent in Toulouse was a perfect place for translating Maimonides (at least for the compilation known as *Liber de parabola*).⁴¹ Against these arguments one can simply hold firstly that the Dominicans were not engaged in the Maimonides controversy as can be shown from the inquisitorial documents,⁴² and as Yossef Schwartz holds there had never been a burning of Maimonidean writings at all and the burning was an invention by Hillel of Verona.⁴³ And secondly, we do not know of any translation provided in Toulouse or its surroundings at all.

But if the translation cannot be made in southern Italy or in southern France where then might it have been translated?

Here we might come back to what I presented before: In book I most discussions that link Maimonides to the philological and rabbinical world are left out or they are abbreviated to a minimum. This fact points to a place of the translation where rabbinical Judaism did not stand in high respect. For the Christian side, this was the case in Paris in the 1240s. In addition, there are a number of further arguments that make Paris a most likely place for a Latin translation.

First, there are some external arguments. One, I mentioned already before. The first users of the translation were in Paris when they encountered it for the first time. All of them were Dominicans, such as Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and even

39. Neither Roland of Cremona nor Moneta of Cremona nor John of La Rochelle quoted Maimonides from a reading of the *Dux neutrorum*; see Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 62-64. 91-93; Basse (ed.), *Summa theologica Halensis*, p. 2321 note 109. – Di Segni, 'La table des préceptes dans le "Dux neutrorum" de Moïse Maïmonide', pp. 237-240, simply repeats Wolfgang Kluxen's and my arguments concerning the tradition from Roland to Meister Eckhart.

40. Yet, this does not mean that it is impossible that the translation at a later stage was corrected by someone who knew the Ibn Tibbon tradition.

41. Kluxen, 'Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides', p. 34. – And his third argument, as he told me in a private conversation in 2000, was that his Doktorvater Josef Koch had told him to write southern France.

42. See Kolmer, *Ad capiendas Vulpes*, pp. 127-140.

43. Sirat, 'Les manuscrits du Talmud en France Nord au XIIIe siècle', p. 125; Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, p. 123 note 11; Schwartz, 'Einleitung', p. 12.

Roland and Moneta of Cremona,⁴⁴ although the latter two seem not to have quoted from a written source, or if, then from a shorter translation called *Liber de uno deo benedicto* (Book of the one blessed God)⁴⁵ which comprises only book II, Introduction and chapter 1 of the *Guide for the Perplexed*.⁴⁶

A second external argument is the economical: Who might have been interested in a translation and could supply the financial and human resources? With regard to the financial resources the imperial court in Sicily could be a candidate, but the human resources seem to have been situated in Paris in the 1240s: As said before the only translator known by name in Sicily belonged to the Ibn Tibbon family and cannot have been interested in translating Al-Ḥarizi. Furthermore, all members of that translator family provided their name in a colophon or in a translator's preface. In all known manuscripts of the *Dux neutrorum* we do not find a translator's name. On the other hand, the Dominican Convent of St. Jacques in Paris had both, the interest in Jewish literature for theological and political reasons and the financial means, be it that they had friars able to read Hebrew or money to pay a translator from the Jewish community in Paris. Here, Nicolas Donin, Theobaldus de Saxonia, or Henricus Teutonicus come into play whose names we encounter in the history of the Latin Talmud, its translation and condemnation. Even if it was not them who translated the *Dux neutrorum*, it shows that the convent hosted people who had an interest in the Hebrew. And since already in the Talmud translations we do not find a name of the translator apart from that of Donin, it is no wonder that we do not find any for Maimonides.⁴⁷

44. See Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 88-122 with further literature, especially pp. 93-108 (for Albert) and pp. 91-93 (for Moneta).

45. See above note 39. – For the *Liber de uno deo benedicto* see Kluxen, 'Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abendland als Beispiel einer christlich-jüdischen Begegnung', pp. 146-166 and 167-182 (edition: Rabbi Moyses (Maimonides), *Liber de uno Deo benedicto*, ed. by Wolfgang Kluxen). The edition, though, contains some mistakes which reduce its value.

46. The preface which is chapter one of the *Liber de uno deo benedicto* contains a collection of twenty-six preparatory sentences or premises. The first twenty-five of these premises are a collection of sayings of the Aristotelian philosophers mainly concerning the eternity of movement. Since Maimonides held them self-evident he gives no further comments on them. The twenty-sixth premise is according to Maimonides held true by the Aristotelians whereas Maimonides says it was only 'possible – that is, neither necessary, as is affirmed by the commentators of the writings of Aristotle, nor impossible, as is claimed by the Mutakallimun' (translation: Pines, p. 241); the Latin translation of that passage in the *Liber de uno deo benedicto* has it: 'Et quod mihi videtur est quod hoc preparatorium sit possibile non necessitatis sicut dicunt glossatores dictorum Aristotelis quia iudicamus ambigua que sunt emergentia contra illos' (ed. Kluxen, p. 177: 12-14). That translation proves that it is a difficult task to find the version the translators used for their translation. In chapter I of the second book, Maimonides gives proofs of God's existence, of His unity, and of His incorporeal being.

47. Di Segni, 'Traces of a Vernacular Language in the Latin Translation of Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*', pp. 21-48, who, too, cannot give a place for the translation excludes Paris. As a proof, she gives some examples of Romance words in the translation, but she does not consider that there might have been translators from the Iberian Peninsula in Paris (if that Romance words are of Iberian origin). There are numerous cases of 'Spanish' translators in Europe, the best-known are Petrus Alfonsi (fl. 1306-1320) and Abraham ibn Ezra (c. 1092-1168) who travelled through Europe and offered their service at different

Then there is an internal argument that I already touched before. We know that there were connections between the Jewish communities of northern France and the northern part of the Iberian Peninsula where Al-Harizi wrote his translation. And we know that at least Moshe of Coucy who lived in Paris in the 1240s had a strong interest in Maimonides.⁴⁸ Moshe of Coucy took part in the Parisian Talmud Trial as we know from the Hebrew report.⁴⁹ In his *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol* (= *SMaG*) he paraphrased the Maimonidean discussions of all 613 *mitzvot* of the Hebrew Bible. If he was able to do so, he must have had Maimonidean writings at his disposal. This was the case: He followed the Maimonidean order of precepts as it was laid down in *Mishneh Torah*.⁵⁰ Since after the first disputation of Paris the inquisition collected Jewish books that were later returned to the Jewish community, it is not impossible that Maimonides was among these writings. (But this is, admittedly, only speculation.) Nonetheless, Moshe of Coucy's main work points to another interesting point within the Latin translation that was seldom if ever discussed: The Latin translation is added by a list of the 613 precepts of the Bible which is not part of Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*, but in the form translated part of the introduction of *Mishneh Torah*,⁵¹ as is the case with Moshe of Coucy's *SMaG*. Yet, who might have been interested in these precepts? I doubt that philosophers of the Aristotelian tradition were so. So, let us have a closer look at this list of precepts.⁵² They are introduced with the short note:

Hec sunt precepta que proprie dicuntur precepta, et consistunt in faciendo plura ex illis. Alia vero ex eis sunt affirmatiua et sunt duocentum decimum [i.e. quadraginta] octavum secundum numerum membrorum: et alia sunt negatiua, et sunt trecentum sexaginta quinque secundum numerum dierum anni, et inducunt bonas opiniones.⁵³ (These are the precepts that are properly called precepts and they consist of making many out of them. The one kind of them, indeed, are affirmative and their number is 218 [248] according to the number of parts [of the human body] and the other kind are negative and they are 365 according to the number of days of a year, and they introduce good reasons.)

places. Her second argument that a translation by two translators working together is testified only in the Mediterranean is falsified by the translation of the Talmud treated in this volume.

48. On Moshe of Coucy see Galinsky, 'Between Ashkenaz (Germany) and Tsarfat (France): Two Approaches Toward Popularizing Jewish Law', esp. pp. 80-82; and in this volume the article by Ursula Ragacs.
49. See Friedman (tr.), 'The Disputation of Rabbi Yehiel of Paris', p. 128.
50. See Galinsky, 'Rabbis, Readers, and the Paris Book Trade: Understanding French Halakhic Literature in the Thirteenth Century', p. 78; 288 note 32.
51. See Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, ed. Hyamson, pp. 5a-17a.
52. Di Segni edited that list on the basis of those manuscripts that were used by Georg Wieland when he prepared the still unpublished edition on behalf of Wolfgang Kluxen. She does not use all manuscripts available; see Di Segni, 'La table des préceptes dans le "Dux neutrorum" de Moïse Maïmonide', pp. 229-262, at 240; 243-262.
53. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 114r; Di Segni, 'La table des préceptes dans le "Dux neutrorum" de Moïse Maïmonide', p. 243.

This note is followed by the list of precepts and prohibitions which is similar to the one that is attached to some editions of *Mishneh Torah*.⁵⁴ Other than the lists of Maimonides' *Sefer ha-mitzvot*⁵⁵ the order is first the 248 precepts and then the 365 prohibitions. Yet, if the list is not part of the *Guide*, why is it then attached to the translation? I would like to suggest that this attribution links the translation with the Talmud Trials and the image of Judaism which is established with the translations provided in its aftermath.

To clarify that point: If we look at the translations not only of the Talmud, but also of the *Liber Krubot / sefer qeruva*⁵⁶ and the translation of Rashi's Bible commentaries⁵⁷ an image of Jews is established that shows them as dull, erroneous, blaspheming, telling only fables and so on. In one word, modern rabbinical Jews are not trustworthy because they falsify the biblical tradition. But this one Jew who is called Rabbi Moyses is the opposite of that kind of Judaism: He explains the Bible, he even enumerates all Mosaic precepts, he uses the *ratio* and employs modern philosophy (Aristotle) to explain biblical aporia such as creation of an eternal world, and so on. He therefore is a perfect counter-image to Talmudic Judaism.

4. Conclusion

In the title of this article I have raised a question: Is the translation of Maimonides' *Dux neutrorum* a reaction to the Talmud Trial of 1240? My tentative answer is yes. My arguments may be summarised as follows: The Dominican Convent of St. Jacques provides for a short time period both a theological interest in Maimonides and an economical basis for a translation. Theologically, Maimonides is a perfect example of a Jew who uses his *ratio* whereas the rest of Judaism, related to the Talmud, is connected only with blasphemies, errors and fables. Economically, the convent hosted for a short while friars and perhaps guests or anonymous translators able to read Hebrew. Since the mendicant order was quite wealthy, it could spend some energy on the theological relevant project of the translation of Maimonides.

The translation of the *Dux neutrorum* itself was read and was widely used not only in the thirteenth century but also in the fourteenth century. To give just two examples, first Thomas of Ireland who in the beginning of the fourteenth century wrote among others the *Manipulus florum* which was widely spread in Europe, and second Meister Eckhart who is among the most extensive readers and users of the *Dux neutrorum*.

Thomas of Ireland is the only author of whom we know which manuscript of the *Dux neutrorum* he actually studied (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France,

54. See above note 51 (ed. Hyamson).

55. See Moshe ben Maimon, *Sefer ha-mitsvot* (ed. Kapach).

56. See the edition in this volume.

57. See the survey of the editions by Gilbert Dahan and by Görge K. Hasselhoff in Hasselhoff, 'Rashi's Glosses on Isaiah in Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 16,558'.

lat. 15973).⁵⁸ In two of his works that usage is documented. Here I will concentrate on the *Manipulus florum* which was written in 1306. That work is a manual for preachers that contains some 6,000 excerpts from classical authors as well as from the Church fathers. Among these excerpts we find two quotations from Maimonides. The first under the heading 'to learn' (*discere*), the second under the heading 'Holy Scripture' (*scriptura sacra*). The excerpt on Scripture is interesting because in Maimonides it is a quotation from a rabbinical midrash (on *Shir ha-shirim* I d), introduced as *Et dixerunt sapientes* ('And the sages said'). In Thomas de Hibernia's collection it is not indicated as a rabbinical saying but as a quotation from Maimonides. Its content is that the sages who read a biblical text depend on each other from generation to generation. The end of that chain of tradition is going back to the truth itself. That truth is an eternal truth beyond any logical truth:

Thomas de Hibernia, *Manipulus florum*,
s.v. 'Sacra scriptura':

Cui assimilabuntur uerba legis et prophetarum antequam veniret Salomon? Puteo cuius aque sunt profunde et frigide et non poterit homo bibere de illis. Sed quid fecit quidam subtilis? Coniunxit funem funi, et lineam linee et hausit et bibit. Sic processit Salomon de similitudine ad similitudinem, de parabola ad parabolam donec stetit super secretis legis. Raby moyses libro primo capitulo primo.⁵⁹

Maimonides, *Dux neutrorum* I, Prol.:

Et dixerunt sapientes: cui assimilabuntur verba legis antequam venerit Salomon? Puteo cuius aque sunt profunde et frigide, et non poterat homo bibere de illis. Sed quid fecit quidam subtilis? Coniunxit funem funi, et lineam linee et hausit. Sic processit Salomon de similitudine ad similitudinem, et de parabola in parabolam, donec stetit super secretis legis.⁶⁰

The second quotation is a Maimonidean excerpt from Alexander of Aphrodisias that I omit here.⁶¹ Both passages show Maimonides as a rational, philosophical Jew.

This is also true for the second author whom I mentioned. Meister Eckhart is among those Dominican authors who in great length quoted from Maimonides.⁶² Other than in Thomas Aquinas there are very few quotations from the first, philological chapters of the *Dux neutrorum*. Perhaps most remarkable is a long quotation in the so-called first *Commentary on Genesis* (on 3:7a). In this particular passage Eckhart quotes Maimonides' explanation of the intellect in man. According to Maimonides the intellect in its highest perfection was given to the first man with the creation. Only after Adam sinned it was corrupted.⁶³ From a certain point in Eck-

58. Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, pp. 152-153.

59. Quoted from the edition in Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, p. 205 note 356.

60. Rabbi Moyses, *Dux neutrorum* (ed. Giustiniani), f. 3v.

61. See Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 203-204.

62. Schwartz, 'To Thee is silence praise'; Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*, pp. 207-221; id., *Moses Maimonides interkulturell gelesen*, pp. 64-70.

63. See Meister Eckhart, 'Expositio libri Genesis', p. 349.

hart's history of quoting Maimonides the Christian refers to Maimonides in a very positive way. All quotations are close to the Latin translation, but it seems that they are mere quotations and only in a few cases Eckhart transformed these quotations into his own thinking, but this is a different story.⁶⁴ Also with this second author it can be shown that the practical usage of the Latin Maimonides was in terms of philosophical exegesis rather than in Hebrew philology. This direction was given by the Parisian translation efforts from the 1240s.

Bibliography

Texts by Maimonides

- Rabbi Moyses, *Dux dubitantum aut perplexorum*, ed. Augustinus Justinianus, Paris 1520 (Reprint Frankfurt: Minerva Journals, 1964/2005).
- Moshe ben Maimon, *Sefer ha-mitsvot*. Arabic-Hebrew, ed. Josef Kapach ([Jerusalem:] Pardeś, 1958).
- Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, translated with an introduction and notes by Shlomo Pines; with an introductory essay by Leo Strauss (Chicago, IL/London: The University of Chicago Press, and Toronto/Canada: The University of Toronto Press, 1963).
- Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah. The Book of Knowledge*, ed. according to the Bodleian (Oxford) Codex with introduction, biblical and talmudical references, notes and English translation by Moses Hyamson (Jerusalem/New York: Feldheim Publishers, New corrected edition 1981).
- Doctor Perplexorum (Guide of the Perplexed)* by Rabbi Moses ben Maimun (Rambam). Hebrew version of R. Samuel ibn Tibbon, Revised (on the basis of the first edition, early prints and manuscripts) and vocalized by Yehuda ibn Shmuel (New Revised Edition) (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 2000).
- Moses Maimonides, *Wegweiser für die Verwirrten. Eine Textauswahl zur Schöpfungsfrage*, arabisch/hebräisch – deutsch, tr. Wolfgang von Abel *et al.*, ed. by Frederek Musall and Yossef Schwartz, Herders Bibliothek der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 19 (Freiburg i. Br. *et al.*: Herder, 2009).

Secondary Literature

- BASSE, Michael (ed.), *Summa theologica Halensis. De legibus et praeceptis*, lateinischer Text, deutsche Übersetzung und Kommentar, Veröffentlichungen des Gabmann-Instituts zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, 62 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018).

64. See Schwartz, 'To Thee is silence praise'.

- DAVIDSON, Herbert, A., *Moses Maimonides. The Man and His Works* (Oxford: University Press, 2005).
- DI SEGNI, Diana, 'La table des préceptes dans le "Dux neutrorum" de Moïse Maïmonide', in *Das Gesetz – The Law – La Loi*, ed. by Andreas Speer and Guy Guldentops, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 38 (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014), pp. 229-262.
- , 'Traces of a Vernacular Language in the Latin Translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*', *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 83 (2016), 21-48.
- ECKHART, Meister, 'Expositio libri Genesis', in *Meister Eckhart, Die lateinischen Werke*, vol. 1, ed. and tr. by Konrad Weiss (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1964), pp. 185-444.
- FISHMAN, Talya, *Becoming the People of the Talmud: Oral Torah as Written Tradition in Medieval Jewish Cultures* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011).
- FRAENKEL, Carlos, *From Maimonides to Samuel ibn Tibbon. The Transformation of the Dalālat al-Ḥā'irīn into the Moreh ha-Nevukhim* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2007) [Hebrew].
- FREUDENTHAL, Gad, 'Pour le dossier de la traduction latine médiévale du *Guide des égarés*', *Revue des Études Juives*, 147 (1988), 167-172.
- , 'Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* and the Transmission of the Mathematical Tract "On Two Asymptotic Lines" in the Arabic, Latin and Hebrew Medieval Traditions', *Vivarium*, 26 (1988), 113-140.
- FRIEDMAN, John (tr.), 'The Disputation of Rabbi Yehiel of Paris', in *The Trial of the Talmud Paris, 1240*, Translated by John Friedman, Jean Connell Hoff and Robert Chazan, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation*, 53 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), pp. 126-168.
- GALINSKY, Judah D., 'Between Ashkenaz (Germany) and Tsarfat (France): Two Approaches Toward Popularizing Jewish Law', in *Jews and Christians in Thirteenth-Century France*, ed. by Elisheva Baumgarten and Judah D. Galinsky (New York-Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 77-92.
- , 'Rabbis, Readers, and the Paris Book Trade: Understanding French Halakhic Literature in the Thirteenth Century', in *Entangled Histories: Knowledge, Authority, and Jewish Culture in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. by Elisheva Baumgarten et al. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), pp. 73-89. 286-292.
- GRAETZ, Heinrich, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, vol. VII.1. *Geschichte der Juden von Maimunis Tod (1205) bis zur Verbannung der Juden aus Spanien und Portugal*, 4th edition ed. by Jacob Guttmann (Leipzig: Leiner, 1897).
- HADDAD, Gérard, *Maïmonide*, *Figures du Savoir*, 8 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998).
- HALBERTAL, Moshe, *Maimonides. Life and Thought*, translated from the Hebrew by Joel Linsider (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014).

- HASSELHOFF, Görge K. and Otfried Fraisse (eds.), *Moses Maimonides (1138-1204) – His Religious, Scientific, and Philosophical Wirkungsgeschichte in Different Cultural Contexts* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2004).
- , ‘Die Drucke einzelner lateinischer Übersetzungen von Werken des Maimonides im 16. Jahrhundert als Beitrag zur Entstehung der modernen Hebraistik: Agostino Giustiniani und Sebastian Münster’, in *Gottes Sprache in der philologischen Werkstatt: Hebraistik vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Giuseppe Veltri and Gerold Necker (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004), pp. 169-188.
- , ‘Zur Problematik kritischer Ausgaben der Schriften von Moses Maimonides’, *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 46, (2004 [2005]), 39-53.
- , *Dicit Rabbi Moyses: Studien zum Bild von Moses Maimonides im lateinischen Westen vom 13. bis 15. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2nd ext. ed. 2005).
- , *Moses Maimonides interkulturell gelesen*, Interkulturelle Bibliothek, 20 (Nordhausen: Bautz, 2009).
- , ‘Rashi’s Glosses on Isaiah in Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS 16,558’, in *Studies on the Latin Talmud*, ed. by Ulisse Cecini and Eulàlia Vernet i Pons, Documents, 113 (Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2017), pp. 111-128.
- HESCHEL, Abraham J., *Maimonides. Eine Biographie* (Berlin: Reiss, 1935).
- JUDAH ALHARIZI, *The Book of Tahkemoni. Jewish Tales from Medieval Spain*, translated, explicated, and annotated by David Simha Segal (Oxford/Portland, OR: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2001).
- KLUXEN, Wolfgang, ‘Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides’, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 21 (1954), 23-50.
- , ‘Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abendland als Beispiel einer christlich-jüdischen Begegnung’, in *Judentum im Mittelalter: Beiträge zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch*, ed. by Paul Wilpert (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1966), pp. 146-182.
- KOLMER, Lothar, *Ad capiendas Vulpes. Die Ketzerbekämpfung in Südfrankreich in der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts und die Ausbildung des Inquisitionsverfahrens*, Pariser Historische Studien, 19 (Bonn: Lohrscheid, 1982).
- KRAEMER, Joel L., *Maimonides. The Life and World of One of Civilization’s Greatest Minds* (New York et al.: Doubleday, 2008).
- MARX, Alexander, ‘The Correspondance Between the Rabbies of Southern France and Maimonides About Astrology’, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 3 (1926), 311-358; 4 (1927), 493-494.
- NIEWÖHNER, Friedrich, ‘Maimonides *Dux Neutorum*’, in *Hauptwerke der Philosophie. Mittelalter*, ed. by Kurt Flasch, Universal-Bibliothek, 8741 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998), pp. 175-191.
- PERLES, J[oseph], ‘Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen „Führers.“’, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 24 s. a. [1875], 9-24; 67-86; 99-110; 149-159; 209-218; 261-268.

- ROBINSON, James T. (ed.), *The Cultures of Maimonideanism: New Approaches to the History of Jewish Thought*, Supplements to the Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy, 9 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009).
- ROUSE, Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland*, Studies and Texts of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 47 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979).
- RUBIO, Mercedes, *Aquinas and Maimonides on the Possibility of the Knowledge of God: An Examination of the Quaestio de Attributis*, Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought, 11 (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006).
- SCHWARTZ, Yossef, 'To Thee is silence praise'. *Meister Eckhart's Reading in Maimonides' Guide of the Perplexed* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2002) [Hebrew].
- , 'Einleitung', in *Hillel von Verona, Über die Vollendung der Seele*, hebräisch – deutsch, tr. by Y. Schwartz and Alexander Fidora, ed. by Y. Schwartz, Herders Bibliothek der Philosophie des Mittelalters, 17 (Freiburg i. Br. et al.: Herder, 2009), pp. 9-48.
- SEESKIN, Kenneth (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Maimonides* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- SIRAT, Colette, 'Les manuscrits du Talmud en France Nord au XIIIe siècle', in *Le brûlement du Talmud à Paris 1242-1244*, ed. by Gilbert Dahan and Élie Nicolas (Paris: Cerf, 1999), pp. 121-139.
- and Silvia Di Donato, *Maimonide et les brouillons autographes du Dalâlat al-Hâ'irîn* (Guide des Égarés) (Paris: Vrin, 2011).
- STEINSCHNEIDER, Moritz: *Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher* (Berlin: Kommissionsverl. des Bibliographischen Bureaus, 1893; reprint Graz: Akad. Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1956).
- STRAUSS, Leo, 'How to Begin to Study *The Guide of the Perplexed*', in Moses Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, tr. by Shlomo Pines (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. xi-lvi.
- STROUMSA, Sarah, *Maimonides in his World. Portrait of a Mediterranean Thinker* (Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- STÜNKEL, Knut Martin, *Una sit religio. Religionsbegriffe und Begriffstopologien bei Cusanus, Llull und Maimonides* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2013).
- TAMER, Georges (ed.), *Die Trias des Maimonides: Jüdische, arabische und antike Wissenskultur* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2005).
- TWERSKY, Isadore, *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides* (Mishne Torah) (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1980).