

CHAPTER 11

Early quotations from Maimonides’ Guide of the Perplexed in the Latin Middle Ages

Introduction

Moses Maimonides’ *Guide of the Perplexed* counts among the most influential Jewish philosophical and theological texts, not only within the Jewish tradition. Indeed, the *Guide* had a remarkable impact especially on the Latin-speaking world from the thirteenth-century onwards. Shortly after its two Hebrew translations, three different Latin versions of the *Guide* started to circulate. The first is the *Liber de parabola* (1223-1224), often attributed to Michael Scot.¹ The recipient of this text is Romanus (maybe cardinal Romanus, who went to Paris as a papal legate),² and the *Liber* was probably composed in Rome. The *ocasio scribendi* is a question asked by Romanus concerning the use of salt instead of honey for offerings at the Jerusalem Temple.³ The question leads the author to treat the subject of biblical metaphors. Then the *Liber* approaches the question of biblical precepts by dividing them into positive and negative ones. From *folio* 4r on, the content of the text corresponds to Maimonides’ *Guide* iii.29-30; 32-49 on the allegorical interpretation of the biblical law. The *Liber de parabola* can be considered a compendium rather than a translation, most probably composed on the basis of Ibn Tibbon’s version. While its author seems to be a Jew, the *Liber de parabola* is intended for a Christian public; in fact, no references to the *Talmud* are found, a sign that the

¹ Cf. W. Kluxen, “Literargeschichtliches zum lateinischen Moses Maimonides,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 21 (1954), 23-50, 41-46. See also G. Hasselhoff, “The Reception of Maimonides in the Latin World: the evidence of the Latin translations in the 13th-15th century,” *Materia giudaica*, 6/2 (2001), pp. 258-280, p. 261. The *Liber de parabola* is transmitted by Paris, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Ms. 601, foll. 1ra-16vb [E], cf. *Catalogue général des manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Université de Paris et Universités des Départements* (Paris: Plon, 1918), p. 150. The catalogue attributes it to Michael Scot, since the same manuscript transmits his translation of the *De celo et mundo*.

² Cf. Kluxen, “Literargeschichtliches,” p. 44.

³ Cf. ms. E, fol. 1ra.

text has been adapted for Christian readers.

The second writing originating from Maimonides' *Guide* is the *Liber de uno Deo benedicto* (around 1240), which is a translation of the twenty-five philosophical premises to *Guide* ii, and of ii.1.⁴ The introduction summarizes Aristotelian principles, while the first chapter deals primarily with the proof of God's existence and God's incorporeality. This text seems to be completely independent of the other two Latin versions.

The complete translation of the *Guide of the Perplexed* appeared in Latin under the title *Dux neutrorum*. The translation was mainly based on Al-Ḥarizi's Hebrew text.⁵

However, recent research has revealed that another source was involved; whether the second source was Ibn Tibbon's translation or the Arabic original is still not clear.⁶ We neither have information on the identity of the translator nor on the time and place of the composition.

Different hypotheses have been formulated by scholars: Steinschneider,⁷ Perles,⁸ Sermoneta,⁹ Thorndike,¹⁰ and Freudenthal¹¹ support the hypothesis that it derives from the court of Frederick II; Kluxen¹² suggested a composition in Southern France; Hasselhoff¹³ supports a

⁴ Rabbi Moyses, "Liber de uno Deo benedicto," edited by W. Kluxen, in P. Wilpert, *Judentum im Mittelalter: Beiträge zum christlich-jüdischen Gespräch* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1966), pp. 167-182.

⁵ Cf. J. Perles, "Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundenene erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen ‚Führers‘," *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 24 (1875), 9-24; 67-86; 99-110; 149-159; 209-218; 261-268.

⁶ Some incongruities with al-Ḥarizi's text have been pointed out by M. Rubio, *Aquinas and Maimonides on the possibility of the knowledge of God* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006), pp. 275-276. Moreover, a collation of *loci critici* between al-Ḥarizi's, Ibn Tibbon's, the Arabic and the Latin texts is provided in D. Di Segni, *Moses Maimonides and the Latin Middle Ages. Critical edition of Dux neutrorum I, 1-59*, Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln im Fach Philosophie, Digitalpublikation KUPS, 2016, pp. XCII-CXI.

⁷ M. Steinschneider, "Kaiser Friedrich II. über Maimonides," *Hebräische Bibliographie* VII (1864), 62-66, p. 65. For the Jewish sources on Frederick II, see C. Sirat, "Les traducteurs juifs à la cour des rois de Sicile et de Naples," in G. Contamine (éd.), *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Age* (Paris: CNRS, 1989), pp. 169-191.

⁸ Cf. Perles, "Die in einer Münchener Handschrift," pp. 80-81.

⁹ Cf. G. Sermoneta, *Un glossario filosofico ebraico-italiano del XIII secolo* (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1969), pp. 40-42.

¹⁰ Cf. L. Thorndike, *Michael Scot* (London: Nelson, 1965), pp. 28-29.

¹¹ Cf. G. Freudenthal, "Pour le dossier de la traduction latine médiévale du Guide des égarés," *Revue des études juives*, 147 (1988), pp. 167-172, p. 171.

¹² Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches," pp. 32-34.

Parisian origin.

Recently, I showed that the manuscript tradition bears some traces of a vernacular language that was used in the translation process.¹⁴ The geographical origin of these linguistic traces is difficult to identify indubitably, but some elements seem to be connected to Spanish. This would only be the mark of the language spoken by the translator, which does not necessarily correspond to the place where the translation was actually made.

Today, the *Dux neutrorum* is transmitted in thirteen manuscripts and the printing made by Agostino Giustiniani in 1520.¹⁵

While the *Liber de parabola* and the *Liber de uno Deo benedicto* had limited circulation¹⁶, the reception of the *Dux neutrorum* was more widespread. In the first part of this contribution, a general overview of its fortune will be given; the second part will focus on the earliest quotations. It is generally assumed that William of Auvergne was the first author to cite Maimonides, although no explicit quotation from the *Dux neutrorum* has yet been found. Furthermore, no proper attention has been given to the question whether William quoted from

¹³ G. Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses: Studien zum Bild von Moses Maimonides im Lateinischen Westen vom 13. bis zum 15. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004), pp. 123-124. Y. Schwartz, "Authority, Control, and Conflicts in 13th Century Paris: The Talmud Trial in Context," in E. Baumgarten, J. Galinsky (eds.), *Jews and Christians in 13th Century France* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), pp. 93-110, p. 103, evokes the hypothesis that the Talmud trial in Paris around 1240-1244 could have been connected to the Maimonidean controversy.

¹⁴ Cf. D. Di Segni, "Traces of a vernacular language in the Latin translation of Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*," *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, 83(1) (2016), 21-48.

¹⁵ For the manuscript tradition, see: [A] Città del Vaticano, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Ottoboniano Latino Ms. 644; [B] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. fonds latin 15973 (Sorbonne 173); [E] Paris, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Ms. 601, foll. 21ra-103vb; [C] Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque de l'agglomération, Ms. 608; [D] München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7936b; [F] Cambridge, University Library, Ms. Ii. I.19 (1711), foll. 1r-183r; [G] Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. II.482, foll. 16va-98rb; [H] Todi, Biblioteca comunale "Lorenzo Leonj," Ms. 32; [I] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Bodl. 437; [K] Città del Vaticano, BAV, Cod. Vaticano Latino, Ms. 1124; [L] Città del Vaticano, BAV, Cod. Vaticano Latino, Ms. 4274; [N] Kassel, Landes- und Murhardsche Bibliothek, 2 Ms. theol. 67; [M] Cambridge, Trinity College, Ms. O.8.37, foll. 1r-229v. For the printed edition, see Rabi Mosei Aegyptii *Dux seu director dubitantium aut perplexorum*, ed. Augustinus Iustinianus (Parisiis, 1520). The critical edition of *Dux neutrorum* I, 1-59, is provided in my doctoral dissertation: Di Segni, *Moses Maimonides and the Latin Middle Ages*.

¹⁶ The *Liber de parabola* was known to William of Auvergne (see *infra*), while the *Liber de uno Deo benedicto* was quoted by Albert the Great, cf. C. Rigo, "Zur Rezeption des Moses Maimonides im Werk des Albertus Magnus," in W. Senner (ed.), *Albertus Magnus. Zum Gedenken nach 800 Jahren: Neue Zugänge, Aspekte und Perspektiven* [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001], pp. 29-66.

the *Dux neutrorum* or from another source. Inquiry into the question contributes to defining the window in which the *Dux neutrorum* started to circulate in Paris, and as a consequence establishes a time limit for its composition. Secondly, Maimonides' thought was received at an early stage by Moneta da Cremona in his *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses*. Little research into this text has been done, which is a crucial proof for the diffusion of the Latin Maimonides outside Paris. Until now, the earliest attestations of the *Dux neutrorum* have been found in the Parisian area, this being one of the main arguments in favor of a French composition. Pointing out a reception independent from that in Paris will contribute to a more precise image of the diffusion of Maimonides' Latin *oeuvre*.

The *Dux neutrorum*'s fortune in the Latin Middle Ages

The most common name with which Latin authors mention Maimonides is "Rabbi Moyses", an epithet that clearly refers to his religious affiliation. The authority of Maimonides is both philosophical, since he inherits the knowledge transmitted only in Arabic, inaccessible to Latin readers,¹⁷ and religious, as a source for information on Judaism and for interpreting the Bible. The fortune of the Latin Maimonides can be explained precisely through this double perspective: The Jewish philosopher opened the way to a non-radical Aristotelianism that could be reconciled with biblical teachings.

The *Dux neutrorum* was known and quoted mainly by Dominican authors, such as Albert the Great,¹⁸ Thomas Aquinas,¹⁹ and Meister Eckhart.²⁰ But it was diffused also among

¹⁷ Albert the Great clearly defines Maimonides as a 'philosopher', cf. for instance Albertus Magnus, *II Sent.*, d. 3, a. 16, ed. Paris., t. 27, p. 94b.

¹⁸ Albert mentions Maimonides about 120 times (according to Rigo, "Zur Rezeption," p. 36). On the reception of Maimonides in Albert, cf. M. Joel, *Verhältniss Albert des Grossen zu Moses Maimonides: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie* (Breslau: Schletter'schen Buchhandlung, 1863); Rigo, "Zur Rezeption," pp. 29-66.

¹⁹ Thomas explicitly mentions Maimonides 80 times, cf. C. Vansteenkiste, "Autori arabi e giudei nell'opera di San Tommaso," *Angelicum*, 37 (1960), pp. 336-401, pp. 372-393; this has been reviewed by R. Imbach, "Alcune precisazioni sulla presenza di Maimonide in Tommaso," in D. Lorenz and S. Serafini (eds.) *Istituto san Tommaso: Studi 1995* (Roma: Pontificia Università S. Tommaso d'Aquino,

Franciscans, especially Thomas of York.²¹ Some of *Dux neutrorum*'s arguments entered into the condemnation of 1277 and in Giles of Rome's *Errores philosophorum*.²² In what follows, an overview of the main topics connected to Maimonides' authority in the philosophical and religious fields will be given. Since it is impossible to give here a complete and detailed account, the presentation will be limited to some major topics and authors; for a more detailed treatment, see the bibliography provided in the notes.²³

1995), pp. 48-64. However, in numerous passages Maimonides' name is not explicitly mentioned. On the reception of Maimonides in Aquinas, see J. I. Dienstag (ed.), *Studies in Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Ktav, 1975); A. Wohlman, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maimonide: un dialogue exemplaire* (Paris: Editions Du Cerf, 1988); R. Imbach, "Ut ait Rabbi Moyses. Maimonidische Philosophie bei Thomas von Aquin und Meister Eckhart," *Collectanea Franciscana*, 60 (1990), pp. 99-116; A. Wohlman, *Maimonide et Thomas d'Aquin. Un dialogue impossible* (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1995); Imbach, "Alcune precisazioni"; G. K. Hasselhoff, "Anmerkungen zur Rezeption des Maimonides in den Schriften des Thomas von Aquino," in W. Kinzig and C. Kück (eds.), *Zwischen Konfrontation und Faszination: Ansätze zu einer neuen Beschreibung jüdisch-christlicher Beziehungen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002), pp. 55-73.

²⁰ Eckhart mentions Maimonides 117 times (cf. D. Di Segni, "'verba sunt Rabbi Moysis': Eckhart e Maimonide," in L. Sturlese (ed.) *Studi sulle fonti di Meister Eckhart*, vol. II [Fribourg: Dokimion, 2013], pp. 99-135). For the reception of Maimonides in Eckhart, see J. Koch, "Meister Eckhart und die jüdische Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters," *Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für Vaterländische Kultur*, 101 (1928), pp. 134-148 (rep. in: J. Koch, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. I [Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1973], pp. 349-365); H. Liebeschütz, "Meister Eckhart und Moses Maimonides," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 54 (1972), pp. 64-96; Y. Schwartz, "Zwischen Einheitsmetaphysik und Einheitshermeneutik: Eckharts Maimonides-Lektüre und das Datierungsproblem des 'Opus tripartitum'," in A. Speer, L. Wegener (eds.), *Meister Eckhart in Erfurt*, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 32, (Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 2005), pp. 259-279; Y. Schwartz, "Meister Eckhart and Moses Maimonides: From Judaeo-Arabic Rationalism to Christian Mysticism," in J. M. Hackett (ed.), *A Companion to Meister Eckhart* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 389-414; P. Heidrich, *Im Gespräch mit Meister Eckhart und Maimonides*, H. M. Niemann (ed.) (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2010); Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis".

²¹ On the English reception of Maimonides, see J. I. Dienstag, "Maimonides in English Christian Thought and Scholarship: An Alphabetical Survey," *Hebrew Studies*, 26 (1985), pp. 249-299. I am thankful to Fiorella Retucci and Marco Maniglio, who are preparing the critical edition of Thomas of York's *Sapientiale*, for letting me read their transcription of the passages in which Maimonides is quoted.

²² According to R. Hissette, *Enquête sur les 219 articles condamnés à Paris le 7 Mars 1277* (Louvain, Vander-Oyez, Paris: Publications Universitaires, 1977), the articles n° 185; 186; 205 might originate from Maimonides. Cf. also K. Flasch, *Aufklärung im Mittelalter?: Die Verurteilung von 1277* (Mainz: Dieterich, 1989), article n° 215. Chapters 12 and 13 of the *Errores philosophorum* deal with Maimonides, cf. Giles of Rome, *Errores philosophorum*, ed. J. Koch, trans. J. O. Riedl (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1944), pp. XLVII-LI. On the *Errores*, cf. also W. Kluxen, "Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism," in S. Pines, Y. Yovel (eds.), *Maimonides and Philosophy* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1986), pp. 224-232, pp. 226-229.

²³ For a general overview of Maimonides' Latin reception, see Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches"; W. Kluxen, "Maimonides und die Hochscholastik," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, 63 (1955), pp. 151-165; W. Kluxen, "Die Geschichte des Maimonides im lateinischen Abendland als Beispiel einer christlich-jüdischen Begegnung," in Wilpert (ed.) *Judentum im Mittelalter*, pp. 146-66;

One of the most famous arguments is related to the question of the world's eternity.²⁴ Latin authors saw in Maimonides an authority both reporting Aristotle's opinion and responding to him. Maimonides' answer to the problem received much attention: According to him, Aristotle considered the world's eternity a hypothesis that still must be proven by cogent demonstrations.²⁵ Maimonides thereby rendered the notion of the world's creation compatible with a scientific Aristotelian approach. It is interesting to note that Latin authors seem not to notice that Maimonides' position on the topic is not clear and that some of the *Guide's* chapters seem to contradict each other.²⁶ Furthermore, the terms used in the *Dux neutrorum* for creation and eternity, *antiquitas* and *novitas mundi* (which translate the Hebrew *kadmut* and *hiddush*) are also transmitted to Latin authors: For instance, they are present in Thomas Aquinas²⁷ and Thomas of York²⁸

Albert the Great mentions the seven arguments in favor of the world's eternity that Maimonides ascribed to Aristotle and the Peripatetics (*Guide* ii.14); moreover, Albert argues that these are not demonstrative proofs. In general, the entire presentation of the question

Kluxen, "Maimonides and Latin Scholasticism"; S. Pines, "Maïmonide et la philosophie latine," in S. Pines, *The collected works of Shlomo Pines*, vol. V (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1997), pp. 393-403; Hasselhoff, "The reception of Maimonides in the Latin world"; Hasselhoff, *Dicit Rabbi Moyses*; W. Kluxen, "Maïmonide et l'orientation philosophique de ses lecteurs latins," in T. Levy, R. Rashed (éd.), *Maïmonide philosophe et savant (1138-1204)* (Louvain-Paris: Peeters, 2004), pp. 395-409.

²⁴ See especially *Guide* i.73; ii.13-18; 26; 28. Cf. K. Seeskin, *Maimonides on the Origin of the World*, (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

²⁵ According to C. Dales, "Maimonides and Boethius of Dacia on the Eternity of the World," *The New scholasticism*, 56 (1982), pp. 306-319, this idea was introduced in the Latin world by Maimonides. On the contrary, L. Bianchi, *L'errore di Aristotele. La polemica contro l'eternità del mondo nel XIII secolo* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1984), p. 130, n. 62, is more cautious on the role played by Maimonides in diffusing this argument.

²⁶ Cf. *Guide* i.71 in which God's existence is demonstrated on the basis of the world's eternity. On Maimonides' 'exoteric' position on creation, see for instance H. Davidson, "Maimonides' Secret Position on Creation," in I. Twersky (ed.), *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* (Cambridge [Mass.]: Harvard University Press, 1979), pp. 16-40. According to Albert the Great, Maimonides clearly stood for the creation of the world, cf. Albertus Magnus, *II Sent.*, d. 1, a. 10, ed. Paris, t. 27, p. 29a; *Ibid.*, d. 12, a. 1, p. 232a.

²⁷ Cf. for instance Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 46, a. 2 c.

²⁸ Cf. for instance Thomas of York, *Sapientiale*, II, c. 6.

follows Maimonides' method, arguments, and examples.²⁹ The structure of the argumentation in Thomas Aquinas also closely follows the *Dux neutrorum* but, surprisingly, the name of Maimonides does not appear, while in other passages the Jewish philosopher is explicitly mentioned.³⁰ Thomas' solution to the question, namely that it is not possible to demonstrate the world's eternity *demonstrative simpliciter*, clearly depends on Maimonides. Furthermore, Thomas used Maimonides' metaphor of an orphan to describe the human condition when dealing with the problem of the world's eternity (*Guide* ii.17), and in this context Maimonides' name explicitly appears.³¹ The same metaphor is recalled by Eckhart,³² who also mentioned Maimonides' opinion on the difference between Aristotle's teaching regarding the sublunary sphere and the heavens.³³ Moreover, Maimonides' authority on the topic is invoked at length in the second book of Thomas of York's *Sapientiale*.³⁴

Secondly, Maimonides' most famous elaboration of divine attributes and the resulting doctrine of negative theology received much attention among Latin thinkers.³⁵ In numerous

²⁹ Cf. A. Rohner, *Das Schöpfungsproblem bei Moses Maimonides, Albertus Magnus und Thomas von Aquin: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Schöpfungsproblems im Mittelalter* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1913). For the list of the passages in which Albert refers, explicitly or implicitly, to Maimonides' doctrine of creation, see Rigo, "Zur Rezeption," p. 53, n. 141.

³⁰ See Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 46, a. 1. According to Imbach, "Alcune osservazioni," pp. 60-61, the fact that Thomas 'concealed' his source is a proof that the relationship between Thomas and Maimonides cannot be considered as an 'exemplar dialogue' (cf. Wohlman, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide: un dialogue exemplaire*). Moreover, Thomas' source might have been Raymond Martini, who presents the same arguments but explicitly ascribing them to Maimonides (*Raymundi Marti Ordinis Praedicatorum Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos cum observationibus Josephi de Voisin, et introductione Jo. Benedicti Carpzovi* [Leipzig: Friederich Lanckis, 1687], I, c. 14, 3). The relationship between Aquinas and Martini has long been discussed by secondary literature, on the topic of world's eternity cf. J. I. Saranyana, "La creacion 'Ab aeterno': Controversia de santo Tomas y Raimundo Marti con San Buenaventura," *Scripta Theologica*, 5 (1973), pp. 127-174. Cf. also W. Dunphy, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Creation. A Critique of their Historians," in L. P. Gerson (ed.), *Graceful Reason, Essays in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy Presented to Joseph Owens* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1983), pp. 361-379; K. Seeskin, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Creation," *Medioevo*, 23 (1997), 453-472.

³¹ Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 1, q. 1, a. 5 resp.; *In symbolum Apostolorum*, n. 880.

³² Index, n. 55 in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis," p. 126.

³³ Index, n. 57, *ibid.*

³⁴ Cf. especially Thomas of York, *Sapientiale* II, 6.

³⁵ Cf. S. Feldman, "A Scholastic Misinterpretation of Maimonides' Doctrine of Divine Attributes," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 19 (1968), pp. 23-39. For Albert, see Albertus Magnus, *I Sent.*, d. 2, 3, 28.

chapters of the *Guide* (i.56; 58-61), Maimonides explains the impossibility of attributing anything positive to God, human language being inadequate to describe God. As a consequence, any analogical discourse is excluded, since any positive formulation about humans cannot be predicated of God. This doctrine is problematic for Christianity, since it presupposes equivocity of language and derogates the principle of the *analogia entis*, fundamental for Christian theology. Thomas Aquinas indeed criticized it for preventing any knowledge of God.³⁶ On the contrary, according to him, it is possible to know the cause through the effects, and since creatures are effects of God, they can then reach a certain knowledge of their Creator.

In Eckhart, the theory of negative theology is treated at length, being instrumental to the demonstration of God's preeminence.³⁷ Eckhart shares with Maimonides a theocentric view: The impossibility of positive statements on God leads to the subordination of human beings to the divine, and as a consequence to the leaning of people towards God. However, Eckhart does not exclude any positive attribution. Furthermore, Maimonides' theory on God's names, such as the Tetragrammaton, was treated by Eckhart.³⁸

Thirdly, Maimonides' prophetology (*Guide* ii.32-48), involving questions such as the natural disposition to prophecy, its definition, and the position of prophets with respect to the human species, had a reception in the Latin world. According to Maimonides, only a person

On God's names, cf. also *Super Dion. De div. nom.*, c. 1, ed. Colon., t. 37, 1, p. 39, 17-19; *Ibid.*, c. 13, p. 448, 63-64.

³⁶ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 13, a. 2 resp.; *I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3 resp.; *De potentia*, q. 7, a. 2 c. 2; *Ibid.*, q. 7, a. 5 resp.; *Ibid.*, q. 7, a. 7 resp.; *Ibid.*, q. 7, a. 10 resp.; *Ibid.*, q. 9, a. 7 resp.; *De veritate*, q. 10, a. 12 resp. Cf. C. L. Miller, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Naming God," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 28 (1977), pp. 65-71; D. B. Burrell, *Knowing the Unknowable God: Ibn-Sina, Maimonides, Aquinas* (University of Notre Dame Press, 1986); A. Broadie, "Maimonides and Aquinas on the Names of God," *Religious Studies*, 23 (1987), pp. 157-170; J. A. Buijs, "The Negative Theology of Maimonides and Aquinas," *Review of Metaphysics*, 41 (1988), pp. 723-738; N. Stubbens, "Naming God: Moses Maimonides and Thomas Aquinas," *Thomist*, 54 (1990), pp. 229-267; Rubio, *Aquinas and Maimonides*.

³⁷ For the list of Maimonides' quotations on the topic, cf. Index, n. 13; 14; 16; 17; 19; 21-27; 29; 31-39; 106 in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis," pp. 115-135.

³⁸ Index, n. 36; 40-44, *ibid.* For God's name in Thomas, cf. Thomas Aquinas, *I Sent.*, d. 8, q. 1, a. 1s.c.

with a balanced disposition, a perfect imagination and a full intellectual capacity can attain prophecy. Furthermore, Maimonides underlines the uniqueness of Moses' prophecy with respect to the other prophets. Albert receives Maimonides' definition of prophecy, for instance his distinction between dream and prophecy, and the different stages of perfections in imagination and intellectual faculties.³⁹ Maimonides' relationship between intellect and imagination is received by Thomas too; however, he disagrees that prophecy is the result only of natural disposition: natural perfections are required for natural prophecy, but prophecy is ultimately a divine gift.⁴⁰

One Maimonidean argument received Aquinas' special attention: The five reasons that prevent people from beginning their studies with metaphysics (*Guide* i.34) were taken by Thomas as an argument proving the necessity of believing in God⁴¹. The same argument was received by Meister Eckhart, but with its original meaning⁴².

Other Maimonidean philosophical themes received by scholastic authors are: divine providence;⁴³ cosmological questions,⁴⁴ such as the motion of the heavens,⁴⁵ celestial

³⁹ Cf. Rigo, "Zur Rezeption," pp. 56-62. Cf. for instance Albertus Magnus, *De somno et vig.*, l. 3, tr. 1, c. 1, Ed. Paris., t. 9, p. 178a; *Ibid.*, c. 3, p. 180b-181b; *Ibid.*, c. 5, p. 183a-184a; *Ibid.*, c. 10, p. 190b-193a; *Ibid.*, c. 12, p. 195a-195b; *III Sent.*, d. 37, a. 2, ed. Paris., t. 28, p. 682a, 684a; *IV Sent.*, d. 1, a. 8, ed. Paris., t. 29, p. 21a, p. 22b; *Super Dion. Epist.*, 7, ed. Colon., t. 37, 2, p. 507, 4-9.24-28.

⁴⁰ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 12, a. 2, arg. 6; q. 12, a. 2, ad 6; q. 12, a. 5 resp.; *Ibid.*, q. 12, a. 12, arg. 6; q. 12, a. 12, ad 6; *IV Sent.*, d. 49, q. 2, a. 7, ad 2. On the requirement of natural perfections, see *De veritate*, q. 12, a. 4 resp. Cf. L. J. Elders, "Les rapports entre la doctrine de la prophétie selon Saint Thomas et le Guide des égarés de Maïmonide," *Divus Thomas*, 78 (1975), pp. 449-456; A. Altmann, "Maimonides and Thomas Aquinas: Natural or Divine prophecy?," *Association for Jewish Studies Review*, 3 (1978), pp. 1-19; A. Wohlman, "La Prophétie: Maïmonide et Thomas d'Aquin," in *Ibn Rochd, Maïmonide, Saint Thomas ou "la filiation entre foi et raison": Colloque de Cordoue, 8, 9, 10 mai 1992* (Paris: Castelnau-le-Fez, 1994), pp. 341-349.

⁴¹ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *III Sent.*, d. 24, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 1 resp.; *De veritate* q. 14, a. 10 resp.; *In Boethium de Trinitate*, q. 3, a. 1 resp.

⁴² Index, n. 12, in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis," p. 118.

⁴³ Cf. for instance Albertus Magnus, *Summa I*, tr. 1, q. 5, c. 4, ed. Colon., t. 34, 1, p. 21, 34-37; *Super Iob* 3, 1, ed. Weiss, 1904, Sp. 50, 39-43. Thomas Aquinas, *I Sent.*, d. 39, q. 2, a. 2 resp.; *ST*, I, q. 22, a. 2 resp.; *Ibid.*, I, q. 22, a. 2 ad 5; *De potentia*, q. 3, a. 17 resp.; *De veritate*, q. 2, a. 3 resp.; *Ibid.*, q. 5, a. 9 ad 4; *In threnos Hieremiae*, c. 3, l. 13.

⁴⁴ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De potentia*, q. 4, a. 1 ad 2; *Ibid.*, q. 4, a. 1 ad 5; *Ibid.*, q. 4, a. 1 ad 15. For creation, cf. Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 69, a. 1 ad 5; *Ibid.*, I, q. 74, a. 3 ad 3; *Ibid.*, I, q. 74, a. 3 ad 4.

⁴⁵ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *II Sent.*, d. 14, a. 6, ed. Paris., t. 27, p. 265b-266a; *Phys.*, l. 8, tr. 2, c. 8, ed. Colon., t. 4, 2, p. 607, 15-48; *Metaph.*, l. 11, tr. 2, c. 10, ed. Colon., t. 16, 2, p. 495, 52-73; *De causis et*

spheres,⁴⁶ astronomy;⁴⁷ matter and form;⁴⁸ motion;⁴⁹ angelology;⁵⁰ intellect.⁵¹ Moreover, Maimonides is sometimes considered an authority in reporting other philosophical doctrines⁵².

In the biblical field, Maimonides' authority was mainly invoked for hermeneutics.⁵³

Meister Eckhart devoted special treatment to his metaphorical interpretation of the Bible.⁵⁴

Finally, Maimonides is considered a source for biblical commandments and for the difference between *moralia*, *caerimonialia* and *iudicialia*.⁵⁵

proc. univ., l. 1, tr. 4, c. 7, Ed. Colon., t. 17, 2, p. 53, 68; p. 54, 87. Cf. also Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 14, q. 1, a. 1-2; *Ibid.*, d. 14, q. 1, a. 5; *ST*, I, q. 66, a. 1 ad 5.

⁴⁶ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *De IV coaeq.* (II red.), tr. 3, q. 16, a. 2, ed. Paris., t. 34, p. 440b; *De caelo et mundo*, l. 1, tr. 3, c. 10, ed. Colon., t. 5, 1, p. 76, 10-18. Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, I, q. 68, a. 1, ad 1; *SCG*, II, 92. For Eckhart, cf. Index n. 88; 89 in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis," p. 132.

⁴⁷ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *De causis et proc. univ.*, l. 1, tr. 4, c. 8, ed. Colon., t. 17, 2, p. 56, 84-90; *Summa II*, tr. 2, q. 10, ed. Paris., t. 32, p. 143a; *De caelo et mundo*, l. 2, tr. 2, c. 5, ed. Colon., t. 5, 1, p. 135, 62-66; *Ibid.*, tr. 3, c. 3, p. 147, 39-44; c. 4, p. 150, 13-20; c. 11, p. 169, 3-17.

⁴⁸ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *De IV coequevis*, t. 1, q. 2, ed. Paris., t. 34, p. 327a. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 3, q. 1, a. 1 resp. Cf. also Meister Eckhart, Index, n. 71-72, in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis," p. 129, for the metaphor of the matter as the adulterous woman (*Guide* iii.9).

⁴⁹ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 2, q. 2, a. 3 resp.

⁵⁰ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *I Sent.*, d. 37, a. 24, ed. Paris., t. 26, p. 265b-266a; *De IV coaeq.* (II red.), tr. 4, q. 59, a. 1, ed. Paris., t. 34, p. 625b-626a; *Super Dion. De cael. hier.*, c. 13, ed. Colon., t. 36, 1, p. 212, 17-26; *II Sent.*, d. 8, a. 2, ed. Paris., t. 27, p. 170a-170b; *De causis et proc. univ.*, l. 1, tr. 4, c. 8, ed. Colon., t. 17, 2, p. 58, 19-29. On the identification of angels and spheres, cf. Albertus Magnus, *II Sent.*, d. 3, a. 3, ed. Paris., t. 27, p. 64b-66a. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 3, q. 1, a. 3 resp.; *ST*, I, q. 50, a. 3 resp.; *Questio disputata de spiritualibus creaturibus*, a. 8, arg. 16; *De potentia*, q. 6, a. 7 resp.

⁵¹ Thomas Aquinas, *De anima*, a. 3, arg. 6.

⁵² For Arabic thinkers, cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 5, a. 9 ad 4; *SCG* III, 97; *De potentia* q. 3, a. 7 resp. For Aristotle, *III Sent.*, d. 12, q. 2, a. 1, ad 4.

⁵³ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *I Sent.*, d. 35, q. 1, a. 2 resp.; *De veritate*, 2, a. 3 resp.; *In Psalmos*, ps. 18. Cf. A. Funkenstein, "Gesetz und Geschichte: Zur historisierenden Hermeneutik bei Moses Maimonides und Thomas von Aquin," *Viator*, 1 (1970), 147-178; W. Z. Harvey, "Maimonides and Aquinas on Interpreting the Bible," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 55 (1988), 59-77; I. Dobbs-Weinstein, "Medieval Biblical Commentary and Philosophical Inquiry as Exemplified in the thought of Moses Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas," in E. Ormsby (ed.), *Moses Maimonides and His Time* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), pp. 101-120.

⁵⁴ See in particular Index n. 1; 3-6; 11; 71; 72; 51-54, in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis". Cf. Y. Schwartz, "Meister Eckharts Schriftauslegung als Maimonidisches Projekt," in G. Hasselhoff, O. Fraisse (eds.), *Moses Maimonides (1138-1204). His Religious, Scientific, and Philosophical Wirkungsgeschichte in Different Cultural Contexts* (Würzburg: Egon, 2004), pp. 173-208. The topic is also present in Thomas Aquinas, cf. for instance *IV Sent.*, d. 48, q. 2, a. 3, ad 6.

⁵⁵ Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *II Sent.*, d. 15, q. 3, a. 3, arg. 3; *III Sent.* d. 37, q. 1, a. 5, qc. 1 c. 2; *Ibid.* d. 37, q. 1, a. 5, qc. 1 resp.; *IV Sent.*, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3, qc. 1 resp.; *Ibid.*, d. 1, q. 2, a. 5, qc. 2 resp.; *Ibid.*, d. 33, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 3 resp.; *Ibid.*, d. 40 q. 1, a. 4 resp.; *Ibid.*, d. 42, q. 2, a. 2 resp.; *ST*, I-II, q. 101, a. 3 ad 3; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 3 ad 4; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 3 ad 6; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 3 ad 11; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 4 ad 2; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 5 ad 4; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 6 ad 1; *Ibid.*, q. 102, a. 6 ad 8; *Ibid.*, q. 105, a. 2 ad 12. On *caerimonialia*, *ST*, I-II, q. 101, a. 1, arg. 4. Cf. A. Schenker, "Die Rolle der Religion bei Maimonides

The earliest quotations from the *Dux neutrorum*

As already mentioned, the earliest appearance of the Latin Maimonides is found in William of Auvergne. However, there is no scholarly consensus over whether William was quoting from the *Dux neutrorum* or from the *Liber de parabola*.⁵⁶ A close inquiry of textual correspondences between William's work and the *Dux neutrorum* will help to date the first appearance of the complete Latin translation in Paris. More generally, even when verbatim correspondence is lacking, William's references to Maimonides' doctrines testify to the interest raised by the Jewish philosopher, also in the years before the *Dux neutrorum*'s composition. Secondly, inquiry into Moneta da Cremona's *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses* testifies to the reception of the Latin Maimonides at an early time outside Paris. This adds a further dimension to Maimonides' reception, since scholarly attention has so far been focused mainly on the Parisian reception.

In William of Auvergne's *De legibus* (probably composed around 1230), some arguments closely correspond to *Guide* iii, even though Maimonides' name is never mentioned. At the beginning of the *De legibus*, William of Auvergne approaches the question of the rational explanation of commandments and sacrifices.⁵⁷ In accordance with Maimonides, William maintains that biblical laws have multiple meanings besides the literal one.⁵⁸ Moreover, he states that the function of commandments is to prevent paganism;⁵⁹ in

und Thomas von Aquin," in A. Schenker, *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament* (Éditions universitaires de Fribourg, 2000), pp. 178-202. For Meister Eckhart, cf. Index n. 69; 100; 101; 120, in Di Segni, "verba sunt Rabbi Moysis".

⁵⁶ Cf. J. Guttmann, "Guillaume d'Auvergne et la littérature juive," *Revue des études juives*, 18 (1889), 243-255, considered that William was quoting from the *Dux neutrorum* and therefore hypothesized an earlier date of composition for the *Dux neutrorum*. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches," pp. 45-46, criticized Guttmann's arguments. Gilbert Dahan generally referred to a knowledge of the Latin Maimonides, cf. G. Dahan, "L'exégèse de la Bible chez Guillaume d'Auvergne," in F. Morenzoni, J.-Y. Tilliette, *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), pp. 237-270, p. 258.

⁵⁷ Guilielmi Alverni *De legibus*, Paris, 1674, I, c. 2, p. 29 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, c. 16, p. 47, col. 1.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, c. 1, p. 24, col. 1.

particular, the Bible intends to fight the Sabians.⁶⁰ He also reports an opinion, shared by Maimonides, about the building of the altar and circumcision.⁶¹ On the other hand, William disagrees with Maimonides on sacrifices, since he does not believe that they are a concession to paganism: “Non solum propter consuetudinem idolatriae, ut quidam opinati sunt.”⁶² The “quidam” might refer to Maimonides, since this doctrine corresponds to *Guide* iii.32; 46.

The references found in *De legibus* correspond to *Guide* iii, which is also the section of the text that was summarized in the *Liber de parabola*. Moreover, the fact Maimonides is never named, while other authorities are explicitly mentioned,⁶³ is a clue that he used the *Liber de parabola* rather than the *Dux neutrorum*. The *Liber de parabola* did not contain any information about its authorship, while in the *Dux neutrorum* the author is explicitly called “Rabbi Moyses”. Notwithstanding, the content of the *Liber de parabola* clearly shows its Jewish background. Considering these elements, and the fact that the *De legibus* was probably composed around 1230, it is plausible that at that time William of Auvergne knew the *Liber de parabola* but not the *Dux neutrorum*.

The case of the *De universo* (1231-1236) is more complicated, since William discusses opinions that are not present in the *Liber de parabola*. In one passage, William reports an opinion taken from the *Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer*, and the response of a “quidam ex aliis eorum philosophus.”⁶⁴ The discussion follows exactly *Guide* ii.26, and the opinion mentioned in the answer is that of Maimonides:

William of Auvergne, <i>De universo</i> , I, pars 1,	<i>Dux neutrorum</i> ii.27 (ms. A, fol. 134rb; ms.
--	--

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, c. 6, p. 36, col. 2.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, c. 2, p. 31, col. 1; *Ibid.*, c. 3, p. 33, col. 1.

⁶² *Ibid.*, c. 2, p. 29, col. 2.

⁶³ For instance, Avicbron is explicitly mentioned, cf. Guilielmi Alverni *De universo*, Paris, 1674, I, pars 1, c. 25, p. 621, c. 2.

⁶⁴ Guilielmi Alverni *De universo*, I, pars 1, c. 36, p. 631, col. 2.

c. 36, p. 631, col. 2	B, fol. 108ra; ms. C, fol. 60rb)
<p>Et fuit quidam, quem Hebraei reputant philosophum, qui dixit, quod Deus splendore pallii sui fecit coelum, terram vero de nive, quae erat sub throno eius. Et quia sapiens apud Hebraeos reputatus est, cum iuxta planum suum sermo iste manifeste erroneus sit, quidam ex aliis eorum philosophus non aliud eum intellexisse in sermone isto exposuit, nisi quod per eum aliam fuisse materiam coeli, aliam vero terre insinuare voluit per sermonem illum.</p>	<p>Dixit enim, quod celi creati sunt de luce vestimenti eius. Accepit Creator et extendit sicut pannum, et protrahebantur et expandebantur sicut dixit David: ‘Amictus lumine sicut vestimentum, et extendens celum sicut pellem’. Dixit etiam: unde creata fuerit terra? Scilicet de nive, que est sub throno glorie sue... Appone igitur cor tuum et vide quomodo revelavit tibi sapiens iste, quod materia eorum, que sunt in terra, scilicet omnium eorum que sunt sub sphaera lune, est una communis eis. Et dixit, quod materia celorum et omnium, que sunt in eis, est alia materia, que non est sicut illa.</p>

The content of the passage in William of Auvergne is the same as the corresponding text in the *Dux neutrorum*; however, no literal correspondence is found. For instance, William speaks of the “splendor pallii”, while in the *Dux neutrorum* the expression “lux vestimenti” is found. It must be noted that this interpretation might have been already famous; it is said to have been discussed mentioned by Frederick II.⁶⁵

Secondly, William refers to an argument according to which Aristotle’s opinions are only true for the sublunary world; the same position is maintained by Maimonides in *Guide*

⁶⁵ Cf. Sirat, “Les traducteurs juifs,” pp. 172-173.

William of Auvergne, <i>De universo</i> , II, pars 2, c. 150, p. 998, c. 2	<i>Dux neutrorum</i> ii.23 (ms. A, fol. 129ra-b; ms. B, fol. 104ra; ms. C, fol. 58rb)
Tu autem audivisti nonnullos ex nobilioribus philosophis dixisse Aristoteli credendum esse de his que sunt sub circulo lune; de altioribus sive superioribus nequaquam, quoniam in eis non profundavit usque ad perfectum.	Quicquid dixit Aristoteles in omnibus entibus, que sunt a sphaera lune usque ad centrum terre, verum est sine dubio... Quicquid vero locutus est Aristoteles de hiis, que sunt a sphaera lune superius, est verisimile... et sunt in eis deceptiones multe et dampnum manifestum cunctis gentibus, et multiplicantur contraria, nec est inducta demonstratio super illis.

It is difficult to establish whether this argument results from a direct knowledge of the *Dux neutrorum*, since no explicit quotation has been found. Kluxen leaned towards explaining these passages through an oral account.⁶⁷ The fact that William of Auvergne, when treating the eternity of the world, did not make any reference to Maimonides is for Kluxen evidence that he had no direct knowledge of the *Dux neutrorum*. Precisely this question is absent in the *Liber de parabola*, while it is prominent in the *Dux neutrorum* and received in general great attention by Christian authors. However, two elements must be taken into consideration: First of all, the eternity of the world was treated by William in the *De trinitate*, which was

⁶⁶ Guilielmi Alverni *De universo*, II, pars 2, c. 150, p. 998, c. 2.

⁶⁷ Cf. Kluxen, "Literargeschichtliches," pp. 44-45.

composed in 1223, and there is no textual evidence that the *Dux neutrorum* had already been translated at that early date. Secondly, it has just been shown that, in *De universo*, the Maimonidean argument that Aristotle did not intend to demonstrate anything about the celestial world is evoked. Precisely this argument is characteristic of Maimonides' treatment of the problem of the world's eternity.

Certainly, William of Auvergne had sources other than the *Liber de parabola* (and possibly the *Dux neutrorum*) for information on Judaism. In *De universo*, he criticizes the "fables of the Jews", meaning the *midrashim*. Some of the *midrashim* he reported are also found in the *Dux neutrorum*⁶⁸:

William of Auvergne, <i>De Universo</i> , I, pars I, cap. 59, p. 676, col. 1.	<i>Dux neutrorum</i> ii.31 (ms. A, fol. 148ra; ms. B, fol. 118va; ms. C, fol. 66rb)
Unum est autem ex deliramentis eorum, quod arbor, sive lignum vitae in altitudine habeat iter quingentorum annorum, quapropter grossities eius, hoc est trunci vel stipitis eius, maior erat grossitie totius terrae.	Arbor vite iter quingentorum annorum et omnes species prime distinguuntur sub ipsa, et ostenderunt in hoc, quod mensura ista est profunditas stature sue, non capitis sui, neque latitudinis ramorum.

Both passages refer to the same *midrash* (*Bereshit Rabbah*, 15), but no literal correspondence is found, especially for terms such as "arbor", "statura", "caput" and "latitudo", while in William other terms are found, such as "arbor sive lignum", "altitudo", "truncus vel stipes".

Moreover, in William's work other *midrashim* not present in Maimonides are

⁶⁸ Cf. Guilielmi Alverni *De universo*, I, pars I, cap. 59, p. 676, col. 1.

quoted.⁶⁹ It is known that William took part in the controversy surrounding the Talmud in Paris in the 1240s;⁷⁰ on that occasion he gained access to other sources about Judaism, and possibly about Maimonides too. It is therefore not necessary to presuppose a direct knowledge of the *Dux neutrorum* for the arguments not present in the *Liber de parabola*. The lack of literal correspondence and the absence of Maimonides' name seem to exclude a direct

In these same years, Maimonides' reception is also attested in Northern Italy, since Roland and Moneta of Cremona mention his text. In his *Summa theologica* (around 1230), Roland of Cremona refers to Maimonides as "philosophus hebreorum"⁷¹ and to a book "against the eternity of the world".⁷² It is not clear whether this title refers to the *Dux neutrorum*; on the one hand, it is true that in *Dux neutrorum* II, 13-27 Maimonides treats the problem of the world's eternity, and that on this question he was widely referenced; on the other, the quotation does not correspond to the *Dux neutrorum*:

diximus enim in superioribus, quod trecenta et XLVIII precepta sunt in lege secundum numerum ossium, que sunt in homine ... et hoc tradidit rabi mose in libro suo quem fecit contra antiquitatem mundi⁷³.

Besides the mistaken enumeration of the precepts — due certainly to the paleographic resemblance between the two digits — in the *Dux neutrorum* the number of commandments is compared to "numerus membrorum" and not to "numerus ossium".

⁶⁹ Cf. for instance Guilielmi Alverni *De legibus*, cap. 26, p. 81, col. 2: "Et idolatria quidem ignis in Caldaea vigeat tempore Abrahae patriarchae, quem iuxta traditiones Hebraeorum Babilonii vivum exurere volentes in ignem miserunt pro eo, quod ignem colere detestabatur, unde illaesus eum omnipotens Deus servavit et de igne liberavit, utpote cultorem sanctissimum suum, et hoc est quod aiunt quod iam crebro legitur in sacra scriptura, quod Abraham liberavit Deus de Hur Caldaeorum. Hur enim interpretatur ignis, expresse autem dicit Esdras in nono et Neemias in oratione sua ad Deum: Tu ipse, domine Deus, qui eligisti Abraham et eduxisti eum de igne Caldaeorum" (Cf. *Bereshit Rabbah*, 39).

⁷⁰ Cf. L. Smith, "William of Auvergne and the Jews," *Studies in Church History*, 29 (1992), pp. 107-117.

⁷¹ Cf. Roland of Cremona, *Summa Theologica*, Ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Cod. lat. 795, fol. 31b, quoted according to E. Filthaut, *Roland von Cremona O.P. und die Anfänge der Scholastik im Predigerorden: ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte der älteren Dominikaner* (Vechta i. O.: Albertus-Magnus-Verlag, 1936) p. 72.

⁷² *Ibid.*, fol. 73b.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

The expression “*numerus ossium*” is found in the *Liber de parabola*.⁷⁴ The discrepancy between the information about the book “against the eternity of the world” and the quotation corresponding to the *Liber de parabola* (which did not include the chapters from *Guide ii*) might be evidence of an indirect source or for an oral account of Maimonides’ text.

Both the cases of William of Auvergne and Roland of Cremona show that there was an interest in Maimonides before the complete Latin translation appeared and that some information must have been circulated before the completion of the *Dux neutrorum*.

The first unquestionable dependence upon the *Dux neutrorum* is found in the *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses* (1241-1244) by Moneta da Cremona.⁷⁵ Here the authority of Maimonides is introduced through the expression “*quidam iudeus dictus Rabbi Moyses*”.⁷⁶ As Kluxen noted, such a general formulation suggests that Maimonides was, at that moment, unknown.⁷⁷ Besides this explicit mention, the *Dux neutrorum* is often implicitly quoted, for instance when Moneta treats the question of the world’s eternity. An example of this literal correspondence is given in the following table (literal quotations appear in bold; paraphrases appear in italic):

<p>Moneta of Cremona, <i>Adversus Catharos et Valdenses</i>, pp. 477-478</p>	<p><i>Dux neutrorum</i> ii.14 (ms. A, fol. 111ra-112ra; ms. B, fol. 88va-89va; ms. C, fol. 50rb-51ra)</p>
--	---

⁷⁴ “Et aliter processerunt dicta et sermones in mandatis Dei, sicut dicam in capitulis mandatorum, et circa mandata sexcenta et XIII: ducenta et XLVIII preceptorum et affirmatoria, et tot sunt ossa in homine, et trecenta sexaginta V prohibitoria, iuxta numerum dierum in anno,” ms. E, fol. 1ra.

⁷⁵ *Monetae Cremonensis Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T. A. Ricchini, Roma, 1743.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 483b.

⁷⁷ Kluxen, “Literargeschichtliches,” p. 33.

<p>Opiniones hominum de eternitate vel novitate mundi apud homines qui credunt, quod Deus est, sunt tres.</p> <p>Prima est catholicorum virorum et recte credentium, et est, quod totus orbis et omnia, que in ipso sunt per Creatorem, habuerunt esse <i>post non esse absolutum</i>, idest non ens simpliciter, idest tam actu quam potentia materiali sive passiva. Et quod solus Deus sit ens eternum sine causa et sine initio et sine inchoatione essendi; sed omnia alia duplicem habuerunt originem, scilicet causalem et initialem...</p>	<p>Opiniones hominum in antiquitate vel novitate mundi apud omnes qui credunt, quod Deus est, sunt tres.</p> <p>Prima est sententia omnium, qui tenent legem Moysi, et est, quod universum mundum, scilicet omnia entia preter Creatorem, fecit ipse esse <i>post privationem veram et absolutam</i>, et quod Creator ipse fuit ens eternus solummodo, et non fuit preter ipsum nec angelus, nec celum nec aliquid quod est infra celum...</p>
<p>Secunda opinio est sententia philosophorum, qui dicunt, quoniam vanum est credere, quod Creator faciat aliquid ex nihilo. Secundum quos non potest aliquid corrumpi in nihilum; hoc est dicere, quod nihil sit ex privatione simpliciter et absoluta ipsius materie, nec convertitur ad privationem simplicem et absolutam eiusdem materie. Privationem absolutam dicunt privationem esse actualis, et possibilis possibilitate materiali. <i>Dicunt enim,</i> quod hoc idem esset, ac si crearet quadratum, cuius</p>	<p>Similiter non est abbreviatio potentie Creatoris, si non potest facere aliquid de nichilo. Istud enim est de universitate impossibilem...</p> <p>Secunda opinio est sententiam philosophorum, quorum sensum et verba vidimus, qui dicunt, quia vanitas est, quod Creator faciat aliquid ex nichilo. Sic etiam secundum eos non potest aliquid corrumpi in nihilum. Hoc est dicere, quod non convenit, ut fiat aliquid ens constans ex materia et forma ex privatione simplici et</p>

<p>diameter esset equalis lateri. Et dicunt, <i>quod sicut non est ex impotentia Creatoris, si id non facit, ita non est ex impotentia eiusdem, si non potest facere aliquid de nihilo. Istud enim est de universitate impossibilium.</i></p>	<p>absoluta illius materie, neque corrumpetur, ut convertatur in privatione illius materie simplicem et absolutam. <i>Dixerunt etiam,</i> quod potentia Creatoris in hoc est, sicut eius potentia super coniunctione duorum contrariorum in eadem hora, vel quod creet similem sibi, vel quod faciat se corpus, vel quod creet quadratum, cuius diameter sit equalis lateri, et impossibilia similia istis. Quod autem intelligit ex verbis ipsorum est, quod dicunt, <i>quia non est diminutio potentie Creatoris, si non facit impossibilia esse...</i></p>
<p>Ista autem opinio duplex est: una Platonis et sequacium eius. Ipse enim posuit materiam antiquam sive coeternam Deo, unde posuit, quod caret principio inchoationis, sed non principio causalitatis. <i>Ipse enim Deus est causa eius,</i> ut sol radii, nec praecessit materiam per moram aliquam temporis vel eternitatis, sed tantum per modum cause, et ipsa est ei sicut argilla figulo, et Creator quandoque creavit de illa celos et terram, quandoque alia. Ipse etiam posuit, quod celi sunt generabiles et corruptibiles, sed non sunt generati de nihilo absolute, imo de</p>	<p>Omnes autem isti credunt, quod materia est antiqua, sicut et Creator, nec ipse est sine ea, nec ipse sine eo, neque credunt, quod est sicut gradus eius in sua essentia. <i>Sed ipse est causa essentiae suae,</i> et ipsa est ei per viam similitudinis, sicut argilla figulo et ferrum fabro, de quo facit, quod sibi placet, sic et Creator quandoque creat de materia illa celos et terram et quandoque creat alia. Homines vero huius sententiae credunt, quod celi sunt generabiles et corruptibiles, sed non sunt generati de nichilo, neque corrumpentur in nichilum, sed sicut singularia</p>

<p>materia praeiacente.</p>	<p>animalium generatur ex materia ente, et corrumpuntur in materia ente, sic et celi generantur et corrumpuntur et generatio et corruptio illorum est sicut generatio et corruptio ceterarum rerum...</p>
<p><i>Contra hanc opinionem disputavit Aristoteles, ut patet in libris naturalibus. Invenitur autem illa Platonis sententia in libro, qui dicitur Timeus.</i></p>	<p>Platonis etiam ista est sententia et invenies, quod Aristoteles locutus est contra eum in libro de Auditu. Et dixit quod Plato credit quod celi sunt generabiles et corruptibiles. Invenies etiam sententia Platonis in libro qui dicitur Tymeus...</p>
<p><i>Alia fuit opinio Aristotelis et sequacium eius et eorum, qui exposuerunt libros eius. Ipse namque dixit materiam coeternam Deo, non sine forma, sed sicut nunc distincta est per varias rerum species. Et posuit, quod celi non cadunt sub generatione et corruptione. Hoc autem satis potest concedi, scilicet quod non fuerunt generabiles et corruptibiles proprie, sumpto nomine generationis et corruptionis, ut sumitur in Philosophicis. Dicit ergo, quod mundus sicut modo est fuit coeternus Deo, et quod motus celi et tempus sunt eterni esse.</i></p>	<p>Tertia opinio est sententia Aristotelis et sequacium eius et eorum, qui exposuerunt libros ipsius. Ipse namque dixit, sicut dixerunt illi, quorum premisimus mentionem, quod non erit constans ex materia de non materia omnino. Adiecit etiam super hoc, quod celi non communicant cum generatione et corruptione ullo modo. Depuratio vero huius sententiae est quod, dixit, quia <i>universum esse secundum quod est, non desiit nec desinet esse, sicut est</i>, et quia illud firmum, quod non cadit sub generatione et</p>

	corruptione, quod est celum, non desinet esse sicut est, et quod tempus et motus sunt sempiterni esse , nec sunt generabilia, nec corruptibilia.
--	--

Moneta's use of Maimonides demonstrates that the *Dux neutrorum* was known very early in Northern Italy. It is difficult to say whether this diffusion is independent from the knowledge circulating in Paris. Moneta of Cremona could have known Maimonides through Roland of Cremona but, as mentioned above, in Roland there is no trace of a direct knowledge of the *Dux neutrorum*. Moneta studied at the Dominican *studium* of Bologna, and there is no evidence that he ever went to Paris, but the *studium* in Bologna was in contact with the Parisian *studium*.⁷⁸ However, had Maimonides' text been brought by Parisian Dominican masters to Bologna as an authority to study, one would expect a more deferential formulation rather than "quidam iudeus dictus Rabbi Moyses". Therefore, it seems plausible that Moneta would have read the *Dux neutrorum* independently of the Parisian authors;⁷⁹ in any case, Moneta's quotations surely demonstrate that manuscripts of the *Dux neutrorum* were circulating as early as between 1241 and 1244, not only in Paris but also in Northern Italy.

In Paris, the first explicit quotations from the *Dux neutrorum* date back to the 1240s and appear in Albert the Great's work. Caterina Rigo discovered an early version of *De IV coaequaevis* (1241), in which Albert displays no knowledge of the *Dux neutrorum*, while in a

⁷⁸ Cf. G. B. Melloni, *Atti o memorie degli uomini illustri in Santità nati o morti in Bologna raccolte e illustrate da Giambattista Melloni (1713-1781)*, A. Benati and M. Fanti (eds.) (Roma: Multigrafica, 1971), p. 61.

⁷⁹ It must be noted that Moneta could have had contacts with Southern France, since his *Summa* is directed against French heretical movements.

later version (1246) of the same writing he does quotes it.⁸⁰ Furthermore, Albert certainly knew the *Dux neutrorum* in 1244, since it is cited in his commentary to *Sentences* I.

In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the earliest clearly identifiable quotations from the *Dux neutrorum* date back to the years 1241-1244 for Moneta of Cremona and between 1241-1246 for Albert the Great. The circulation in Northern Italy might have depended upon Paris, but no chronological argument can be formulated in favor of this hypothesis, since quotations are attested in the two places at the same time. Considering Albert's prominent position in his contemporary cultural context, it is highly probable that he learned of such a significant book as soon as it became available. There is no reason therefore to suppose that the work circulated in Paris any earlier than in Northern Italy.

⁸⁰ Cf. Rigo, "Zur Rezeption," pp. 31-35.