

THE HISTORY OF ROBERT GROSSETESTE'S TRANSLATIONS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF *ARISTOTELES LATINUS*

LA HISTORIA DE LAS TRADUCCIONES DE ROBERTO GROSSETESTE EN EL CONTEXTO DE *ARISTOTELES LATINUS*

Lisa Devriese

KU Leuven

Abstract

Among his many accomplishments, Grosseteste is known for translating Greek philosophical, theological, and glossarial treatises into Latin, making them available for Latin readers. Three of these translations are nowadays studied for the *Aristoteles Latinus* project, which aims at making critical editions of all Greek-Latin medieval translations of Aristotle's oeuvre. The goal of this contribution is to give an overview of the history of Robert Grosseteste's translations of Aristotelian texts within the context of *Aristoteles Latinus*. The first part is devoted to previous research on these translations and to a *status quaestionis* of current scholarship. The second part turns its focus to Grosseteste's characteristic translation method. It offers new insights into the usual translation of certain smaller Greek words (such as particles and conjunctions) into Latin by Grosseteste, and what can set this translator apart from other medieval translators.

Keywords

Aristoteles Latinus; Robert Grosseteste; Translation; Translation Method; Aristotle

Resumen

Entre sus muchos logros, Grosseteste es conocido por traducir tratados filosóficos, teológicos y glosarios griegos al latín, poniéndolos así a disposición de los lectores latinos. Algunas de estas traducciones se estudian actualmente para el proyecto *Aristoteles Latinus*, que realiza ediciones críticas de todas las traducciones medievales greco-latinas de la obra de Aristóteles. Esta contribución tiene como objetivo dar una visión general de la historia de las traducciones de textos aristotélicos de Roberto Grosseteste en el contexto de *Aristoteles Latinus*. La primera parte

está dedicada a investigaciones previas sobre estas traducciones y a dar un *status quaestionis* de la erudición actual. La segunda parte se centra en el método de traducción característico de Grosseteste. Ofrece nuevos conocimientos sobre la traducción habitual de ciertas palabras griegas más pequeñas (como partículas y conjunciones) al latín por Grosseteste, y lo que puede diferenciar a este traductor de otros traductores medievales.

Palabras clave

Aristoteles Latinus; Roberto Grosseteste; traducción; método de traducción; Aristóteles

Introduction

The richness of Robert Grosseteste's oeuvre is immense: like some of the great thinkers before him, his field of vision was not limited to one area of study, but covered disciplines such as theology, natural philosophy, mathematics, physics, medicine, and many more.¹ Besides writing original treatises and commentaries, Grosseteste is also known for his translating activities. During his episcopacy, he translated Greek treatises into Latin and made them available to Western scholarship. This contribution will focus on Grosseteste's Greek-Latin translations, and more specifically, the Greek-Latin translations of philosophical treatises – and not taking into account his translations from theological and glossarial works – and his place within the *Aristoteles Latinus* project.²

¹ Or, to use Franceschini's praise: "Fu scrittore assai fecondo in quasi tutti i campi dello scibile umano; esegeta biblico fra i più copiosi del Medio Evo, oratore valente in latino ed in inglese; culture appassionato di studi filosofici, di matematica, di medicina, di scienze naturali; esperto di agricoltura ed economia domestica, abile giurista, consigliere ed educatore; traduttore dall'ebraico e specialmente dal greco e acuto postillatore e commentatore delle sue e delle altrui traduzioni: tale la complessa opera del vescovo di Lincoln." Ezio Franceschini, *Roberto Grossatesta, vescovo di Lincoln, e le sue traduzioni latine* (Venezia: Ferrari, 1933), reprinted as a book chapter in Ezio Franceschini, *Scritti di filologia latina medievale* (Padova: Antenore, 1976), II, 415-416. For an overview of Grosseteste's works, see Samuel Harrison Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1235-1253* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940).

– I am grateful to Pieter Beullens, Clelia Crialesi, and the two reviewers for their useful comments in the preparation of this article.

² Mercken divided Grosseteste's Greek-Latin translations into three categories according to their subject matter: theological works, philosophical works, and glossarial works. The theological Greek-Latin translations consist of the writings of John Damascus, St. Ignatius of Antioch, pseudo-Dionysius, St. Maximus Confessor, the *Testamenta XII patriarcharum* and *De vita monachorum*, the philosophical works consist of (pseudo-)Aristotelian texts, and the glossarial translations are extracts from the *Suda*. See Henry Paul F. Mercken, introduction to *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, edited by

The *Aristoteles Latinus* project was founded in 1930 under the auspices of the International Union of Academies and currently has its seat at the Institute of Philosophy, KU Leuven.³ This international project aims to produce critical editions of the medieval Greek-Latin translations of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, and to study the various ways in which these works came to be known in the West. The works cover a period of almost 800 years, starting with the translations by Boethius around 500, up to the end of the thirteenth century; however, the majority of the Greek-Latin translations belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Among the translators responsible for this output, we count the twelfth-century translators James of Venice, Burgundio of Pisa, Henricus Aristippus, and David of Dinant, and the thirteenth-century translators Robert Grosseteste, Bartholomew of Messina, and William of Moerbeke.

Grosseteste was not the only, nor the most important translator within these translating activities, but he played a significant role in the rediscovery of Aristotelian texts and in the assimilation of these newly acquired texts in the Latin West. As a translator of Aristotelian treatises, his name can be linked to the *Ethica Nicomachea*, *De caelo*, *De lineis insecabilibus*, and *De passionibus*. In this contribution, I will only focus on his translating activities, which is the core business of *Aristoteles Latinus*, and not dwell upon Grosseteste's commentaries on Aristotelian texts. The contribution is divided in two parts: in the first part, I will give an overview of past research on Robert Grosseteste within *Aristoteles Latinus* and related projects. In the second part, I will focus on his translation method, which follows the standard but rigorous word-for-word translation method used in the Middle Ages, but which is unique in the sense that Grosseteste sometimes gives explanatory notes to defend certain choices in translation.

1. History of Research on Grosseteste Within *Aristoteles Latinus*

In this section, it is not my aim to mention all publications that have appeared on Grosseteste's translations of Aristotelian works, but rather to give an overview of the major steps in the history of this research.

The interest in the medieval Latin translations of Aristotle did not start with the *Aristoteles Latinus* project in 1930, but was perceptible long before this. Especially

H.P.F. Mercken, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VI,1* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 36*-38*.

³ Before the project moved to Leuven in 1973, it had its seat at the University of Oxford under the direction of Lorenzo Minio-Paluello. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello's impact on the project is very tangible: he is the editor of, or connected to, many of the (mainly logical) editions made in the first decades of the project, and has set the tone for all the following editions in terms of methodology. For a recent history of the *Aristoteles Latinus* project, see Pieter De Leemans, "Aristoteles Latinus: *Philologia ancilla philosophiae?*", *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 77 (2015): 533-556. For more information on the *Aristoteles Latinus* project, see its website <https://hiw.kuleuven.be/dwmc/research/al>.

Aimable Jourdain and his son Charles Jourdain, and Martin Grabmann can be called pioneers in this study area. In the monograph *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scolastiques* (1819, revised in 1843), Aimable and Charles Jourdain list Robert Grosseteste as one of the medieval translators of Aristotelian treatises, and ascribe him the translation of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, as well as the commentaries written on this text.⁴ At that time, Grosseteste was not yet known to be the translator of other Aristotelian treatises. Martin Grabmann, in turn, devotes more attention to Grosseteste in his study *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristoteles-Übersetzungen des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (1916).⁵ He discusses the translation of the *Ethica* and the arguments *pro* to attribute this translation to Grosseteste. However, no headway was made regarding the other translations: the translations of *De caelo* and *De lineis* were at that time still unknown and anonymous, respectively.⁶

Substantial progress in this field of research is made with Ezio Franceschini (1933).⁷ His voluminous contribution “Roberto Grossatesta, vescovo di Lincoln, e le sue traduzioni latine” is devoted to the Latin translations of Grosseteste. After an introduction to Grosseteste’s life, the focus shifts to his translating activities, output, and method of translating. This research has been very influential and still has its value today.

One of the ambitious undertakings at the start of the *Aristoteles Latinus* project was mapping all preserved manuscripts that contain medieval Aristotle translations. The first catalogue (*pars prior*) includes a short description of each manuscript held in different libraries across the world and was published in 1939, the second one (*pars posterior*) in 1955, and the third (*supplementa altera*) in 1961. The text witnesses discovered after this date are collected in an online catalogue (*supplementa tertia*).⁸ In the first volume, George Lacombe remarks the existence of marginal notes in a manuscript held in the Vatican library, Vat. lat. 2088. This manuscript contains William

⁴ Aimable Jourdain, *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scolastiques* (Paris: Fantin, 1819); this work has been revised by his son Charles Jourdain and published under the same title in 1843. This revision has been consulted for the present contribution, p. 59-64.

⁵ Martin Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristoteles-Übersetzungen des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1916).

⁶ Grabmann, *Forschungen*, 174-177, 204, 220-237.

⁷ Franceschini, “Roberto Grossatesta”, 409-544.

⁸ Georges Lacombe e.a., *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, pars prior* (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1939). This volume contains the *codices americani, austriaci, batavi, belgici, bohemi, britannici, dani, gallici, gedanenses* and *germanici*. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, pars posterior* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955). This volume contains the *codices helvetici, hispanici, hungarici, italici, iugoslavic, lusitani, poloni, russici, suevici* and *vaticani*. Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, supplementa altera* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1961). Pieter Beullens, *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, supplementa tertia*, online <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5866423>.

of Moerbeke's Latin translation of *De caelo*, but seemed to contain alternative translations for a part of that text.⁹ The notes start in the middle of Book I, run until the beginning of Book III, and are introduced by the words "L" or "Lincoln". Until that moment, the *De caelo* was only known in the Arabo-Latin translation by Gerard of Cremona, the Arabo-Latin translation by Michael Scotus, who combined it with a translation of Averroes' long commentary, and a Greek-Latin translation by the hand of William of Moerbeke.¹⁰ Lacombe's discovery suggested that Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, could have made a translation of Aristotle's *De caelo* as well. This was further supported by the alternative translations offered in the Vatican manuscript, which are consistent with Grosseteste's usual translation method.¹¹

This finding was corroborated in 1950 by an article by Donald James Allan, who had discovered that manuscript Oxford, Balliol College, 99 contains Robert Grosseteste's partial translation of *De caelo*: in Book II and the beginning of III, the text corresponds with the marginal translations of the Vatican manuscript, and based on stylistic reasons, this translation could be attributed to Grosseteste. The other parts of the *De caelo* in this manuscript are Moerbeke's translation. To this date, only Book II and the beginning of Book III of Grosseteste's translation are preserved. He probably translated Book I as well: an indirect witness of the translation of a part of Book I are the marginal notes in the Vatican manuscript.¹²

Grosseteste's partial translation of *De caelo* is accompanied by the partial translation of Simplicius' commentary *In De caelo*, also translated by Grosseteste. Grosseteste's translation of the text and the commentary on *De caelo* do not seem to have had any impact on medieval scholarship: not only is it preserved in only one manuscript, but it also does not seem to have been used by medieval commentators. Very recently, however, Pieter Beullens has discovered the remains of a second manuscript containing this translation. This second manuscript is not extant in its original form anymore, but parts of this codex have been recycled and reused in other manuscripts. Beullens discovered that the end leaf and the pastedown of manuscripts Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1869 and Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 2000 are originating from the same manuscript and that they contain a fragment of book II of Simplicius' *In de caelo* in Grosseteste's translation. Although the fragments are relatively short and the quality of the text not exceptionally high, it nevertheless forces us to rethink the commonly accepted view that Grosseteste's translations of *De caelo* knew a (limited) circulation only in the academic (Franciscan) circles in Britain. We now have proof that at least another manuscript existed – although it was recycled very soon

⁹ Lacombe, *Codices, pars prior*, 53, 129.

¹⁰ For a clear overview of the different translations of *De caelo*, see Cecilia Panti, "Il *De caelo* nel medioevo: le citazioni e la *translatio* di Roberto Grossatesta", *Fogli di Filosofia* 12/2 (2019): 69-82.

¹¹ Donald J. Allan, "Mediaeval Versions of Aristotle's *De caelo*, and of the Commentary of Simplicius", *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1950): 85; Panti, "Il *De caelo* nel medioevo", 86-90.

¹² Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 82-120.

afterwards –, which shows that there was interest in this treatise beyond the British Franciscan circles and that it was available in continental Europe.¹³

William of Moerbeke's translation of *De caelo*, and his translation of Simplicius' commentary, in contrast, have been transmitted in their entirety and survived in many manuscripts. It is improbable that Moerbeke used Grosseteste's translation as a basis for a revision, and both translators seem to have had a different Greek source text as well.¹⁴ Moerbeke's translation of the commentary has been published by Fernand Bossier; an edition of his translation of *De caelo* has recently been taken up by Elisa Rubino for the *Aristoteles Latinus* series. Provisional editions of Grosseteste's translations of *De caelo* and *In De caelo* are available in the *Aristoteles Latinus* Database, but the publication of these editions has become uncertain due to Bossier's passing away in 2006.¹⁵

Concerning actually published editions in the *Aristoteles Latinus* series of Grosseteste's Greek-Latin translations of Aristotelian texts, most headway has been made with the ethical corpus. Robert Grosseteste made the first complete translation of the *Ethica Nicomachea* and a translation of a compilation of Greek commentaries on this treatise. To this body of texts, he added his own explanatory notes or *notulae*, incorporated in the translation of the commentaries or in the margins of the text. This *corpus ethicum* would turn out to play a major role in medieval moral philosophy, making it Grosseteste's most important translation in the field of medieval Aristotelianism.

Between 1972 and 1974, Father René-Antoine Gauthier critically edited the different versions of the *Ethica Nicomachea* for the *Aristoteles Latinus* series, and the result of this complex tradition and transmission has been published in no less than five volumes.¹⁶ The different versions in which the *Ethica* circulated are first the so-called

¹³ Pieter Beullens, "Robert Grosseteste's Translation of Simplicius's Commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo*: Tracking Down a Second Manuscript and the Greek Model", *Mediterranea* 8 (2023): 565-594.

¹⁴ Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 88 and 105; Panti, "Il *De caelo* nel medioevo", 86. See as well Fernand Bossier, "Traductions latines et influences du commentaire *In De caelo* en Occident (XIIIe-XIVe s.)", in *Simplicius. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie. Actes du colloque internationale de Paris (28 sept.-1er oct. 1985)*, edited by I. Hadot (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 1987), 289-293.

¹⁵ Simplicius, *Commentaire sur le traité du ciel d'Aristote, traduction de Guillaume de Moerbeke*, edited by Fernand Bossier, Christine Vande Veire and Guy Guldentops, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VIII,1* (Leuven: University Press, 2004). The *Aristoteles Latinus* database contains the unpublished editions of *De caelo II* translated by Grosseteste and as translated by William of Moerbeke (<http://clt.brepolis.net/ALD>).

¹⁶ Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea. Translatio Antiquissima libr. II-III sive 'Ethica Vetus', Translatio Antiquior quae supersunt sive 'Ethica Nova', 'Hoferiana', 'Borghesiana', Translatio Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis sive 'Liber Ethicorum'* (*Recensio Pura et Recensio Recognita*), edited by R.-A. Gauthier, 5 vols., *Aristoteles Latinus XXVI 1-3* (Leiden: Brill and Bruxelles: Desclée De Brouwer, 1972-1974). The edition is published in five volumes: the first contains the introduction; the second deals with

Ethica vetus, a translation of book II and III, transmitted in some 12th-century manuscripts; then the *Ethica nova*, a translation of only book I of which the manuscripts can be dated to the 13th century. The *Ethica Borghesiana* denotes fragments of book VII and VIII, extant in only one manuscript, and the *Ethica Hoferiana* denotes the translation of Grosseteste, contaminated with the *nova*, *vetus* and *Borghesiana*, also extant in only one manuscript. Gauthier discusses in detail the extant manuscripts, the relation between the manuscripts, and the transmission of these different versions, as well as the question of the translators' identities. All these versions are, according to Gauthier, anonymous; Fernand Bossier solved the anonymous authorship and convincingly demonstrated that the *vetus* and *nova* can be ascribed to Burgundio of Pisa.¹⁷

The fourth and most important version of the *Ethica* is the *translatio Lincolnensis*, i.e. the translation made by Robert Grosseteste, who probably finished it around 1246-7. It is the first complete translation of the entire text and became immensely popular in the Middle Ages – Gauthier lists 280 preserved manuscripts of this text. When making his translation, Grosseteste did not start afresh but used and revised the previous translations by Burgundio. Whether he made a complete revision of an earlier but lost *translatio antiquior*, or whether he made a partly new translation, is nevertheless difficult to determine with certainty. In any case, he did not only make use of the older translations but also consulted more than one Greek manuscript.¹⁸ Interestingly, Gauthier is the first editor within the *Aristoteles Latinus* project to recognize the importance of the *exemplar* and *pecia* tradition at the medieval University of Paris, and to include a study on the *pecia* in his edition.¹⁹ The last version of the *Ethica* was made by William of Moerbeke, who revised Robert Grosseteste's translation, and which also received wide circulation.²⁰

Around the same time as Gauthier's edition of the Latin translations of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, Paul Mercken edited Grosseteste's Latin translations of the Greek commentaries on this treatise in the series *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum*. This work, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the*

the *Ethica vetus*, *Ethica nova*, *Ethica Borghesiana* and *Hoferiana*; the third with Robert Grosseteste's translation; the fourth with the revision of Grosseteste's translation; and finally the fifth contains the Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek indices.

¹⁷ Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea*, I, CXXXVIII-CXLII; Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem and Marwan Rashed, "Burgundio de Pise et ses manuscrits grecs d'Aristote: Laur. 87.7 et Laur. 81.18", *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 64 (1997): 136-198; Fernand Bossier, "Les ennuis d'un traducteur. Quatre annotations sur la première traduction latine de l'*Ethique à Nicomaque* par Burgundio de Pise", *Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 59 (1998): 406-427.

¹⁸ Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea*, I, CXCv.

¹⁹ Pieter Beullens and Pieter De Leemans, "Aristote à Paris: Le système de la *pecia* et les traductions de Guillaume de Moerbeke", *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales* 75 (2008): 87-135, 98.

²⁰ This version was still considered to be anonymous by Gauthier; Jozef Brams, "The Revised Version of Grosseteste's Translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*", *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 36 (1994): 45-55.

Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (†1253), has been published in two volumes. The first volume, published in 1973, gives the edition and introductory study of Eustratius' commentary on Book I and the anonymous scholia on Books II, III, and IV; the second volume, published in 1991, consists of the anonymous commentary on Book VII, Aspasius' commentary on Book VIII, and Michael of Ephesus' comments on Books IX and X.²¹ This list of commentators shows the variety of the compilation of Greek commentaries translated by Grosseteste. It comprises five authors and eleven centuries: Aspasius from the second century, an anonymous commentator from the third century, Michael of Ephesus of the eleventh century, Eustratius from the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century, and finally another anonymous commentator who wrote after Eustratius.²² Contrary to the translation of the Aristotelian text, Grosseteste did not revise an older translation, but made it on the basis of one manuscript in which the different commentaries were already compiled.²³ By translating the commentaries and delivering an expanded version of the ethical corpus, Grosseteste elevated its impact and relevance in moral philosophy.

In 1977, Anne Glibert-Thirry published in the same series *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* her volume entitled *Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes «Περὶ παθῶν»: édition critique du texte grec et de la traduction latine médiévale*.²⁴ This volume offers a study and a critical edition of the Greek text and the Latin translation, made by Robert Grosseteste, of *De passionibus*. The Greek treatise is written by pseudo-Andronicus of Rhodes and consists of two parts: *De affectibus* and *De virtutibus et vitiis*. The second part, also called *De laudabilibus bonis* or *De virtute Aristotelis*, often circulated separately under the name of Aristotle.²⁵ Since the translation of *De passionibus*, which has survived in 15 manuscripts, was mainly attributed to Andronicus of Rhodes, it is not a part of the *Aristoteles Latinus* project. However, because of the nature of the text –

²¹ Eustratius and Anonymus, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, volume 1: Eustratius on Book I and the Anonymous Scholia on Books II, III, and IV*, edited by H. Paul F. Mercken, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* VI,1 (Leiden: Brill, 1973); Aspasius, Michael of Ephesus, and Anonymus, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, volume 3: the Anonymous Commentator on Book VII, Aspasius on Book VIII and Michael of Ephesus on Books IX and X*, edited by H. Paul F. Mercken, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* VI,3 (Leuven: University Press, 1991).

²² Eustratius, *The Greek Commentaries*, I, 3*.

²³ Eustratius, *The Greek Commentaries*, I, 4*, 45*.

²⁴ Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν: édition critique du texte grec et de la traduction latine médiévale*, edited by Anne Glibert-Thirry, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum* Suppl. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1977).

²⁵ The second part has the same title as a pseudo-Aristotelian treatise from the same period. Pseudo-Andronicus has used this pseudo-Aristotelian treatise but reworks it considerably, and supplements the text with other sources. See Glibert-Thirry's lengthy introduction to the edition for a discussion on the sources and parallel tradition, Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 5-29.

being a Latin translation, made by Grosseteste, of a text that was sometimes falsely attributed to Aristotle – it is nevertheless included in this overview. Moreover, there is reason to believe that Grosseteste was under the impression that he translated an Aristotelian text.²⁶

De passionibus consists of two catalogues with definitions of the passions, the vices, and virtues, and is a mix of stoic, peripatetic, and platonic influences.²⁷ In her volume, Glibert-Thierry discusses the history and the sources of the text, the possible author, the Greek text and its manuscript transmission, and, finally, the Latin translation. By the time of her research, it was generally accepted that Grosseteste was the translator of *De affectibus* based on internal and external criteria.²⁸ Glibert-Thierry uses Grosseteste's translation method in order to demonstrate that he is also the translator of the second part of the treatise, *De virtute*, and as such can be called the translator of the entire *De passionibus* of pseudo-Andronicus. I will return to this translation method in the second part of the article.

Finally, the treatise that has received the least attention in scholarship on Grosseteste is *De lineis insecabilibus* (or *indivisibilibus*). This short pseudo-Aristotelian treatise is nowadays preserved in more than 70 manuscripts and had a relatively wide dissemination in the Middle Ages. Moreover, it has been commented upon by Albert the Great, who added his commentary (or rather paraphrase) between the sixth and seventh book of his *Physics*. The attribution of the Latin translation of *De lineis* to Robert Grosseteste has been put forward by Ussani based on an ascription in a manuscript, but there is still a need for in-depth studies on the Latin *De lineis*. This project has been recently taken up by Clelia Crialesi, who will make a critical edition of this treatise for the *Aristoteles Latinus* project.²⁹

²⁶ Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 143. About the medieval pseudo-Aristotelian treatises, see Pieter De Leemans and Lisa Devriese, "Translating and Reading Pseudo-Aristotle in the Latin West", in *Pseudo-Aristotelian Texts in Medieval Thought, Acts of the XXII Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, edited by M. Brinzei, A. Marinca and D. Coman (forthcoming).

²⁷ Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 2 and 34.

²⁸ Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 133. See as well Luigi Tropia, "La versione latina medievale del 'Περὶ παθῶν' dello Pseudoandronico", *Aevum* 26/2 (1952): 97-112.

²⁹ An edition of the text, based on a few manuscripts only, can be found in Albertus Magnus, *Physica, pars II, lib. 5-8*, edited by Paul Hossfeld (Münster: Aschendorff, 1993), 498-514. About the Greek model, also see Dieter Harlfinger, *Die Textgeschichte der pseudo-aristotelischen Schrift 'Peri atomôn grammôn': ein kodikologisch-kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Klärung der Überlieferungsverhältnisse im Corpus Aristotelicum* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971). For the ascription by Ussani, and for a *status quaestionis* on the research on *De lineis*, see Clelia Crialesi, "The Medieval Latin Reception of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *On Indivisible Lines*: Reassessing the State of the Art", *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* 29 (2022): 11-24.

2. Grosseteste's Translation Method

Much ink has been spilled over Robert Grosseteste's translation method, not in the least because he is mentioned by name in Roger Bacon's harsh criticism of the Greek-Latin and Arabo-Latin medieval translations: in Bacon's view, the translators failed to transmit a good translation because they did not have enough knowledge of the sciences and the languages involved; Boethius being an exception because of his linguistic fluency and Grosseteste being an exception because of his disciplinary mastery.³⁰ In addition, Grosseteste's translation style makes him unique and distinguishable among medieval translators, since the presence of many explanatory notes characterizes it. In this section, I will summarize Grosseteste's translation method, for the straightforward reason that studying idiosyncrasies has been a crucial component in studying Aristotelian translations.

2.1. "*Sine multa absurditate potest hoc fieri in latino*"

It is a known fact that the Latin medieval translations were made in the word-for-word translation method, allowing the translator to convey a translation as close as possible to the source text, and to change as little as possible to the content or way in which it was transmitted. However, it is possible to discern degrees in this literal translation technique: every modern scholar discussing Robert Grosseteste's translation method speaks of an extremely literal translation technique, much stricter than other translators applying the same *verbum de verbo* method.³¹ The Greek source text almost appears through his Latin translations to the extent Glibert-Thirry even speaks of "photography".³² James McEvoy, a prominent scholar in the field of Grosseteste studies, claims that Grosseteste "was persuaded that each and every element of language possesses a semantic value; that there is no particle of a word, nor any detail of syntax, however small, that lacks a meaning and fails to register a demand

³⁰ For a discussion of these criticisms, see Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 416-420; Eustratius, *The Greek Commentaries*, I, 33*-35*; Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, "On the Greek Studies of Robert Grosseteste", in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, edited by A.C. Dionisotti, A. Grafton, and J. Kraye (London: The Warburg Institute, 1988), 28; Nicola Polloni, "Disentangling Roger Bacon's Criticism of Medieval Translations", in *Early Thirteenth-Century English Franciscan Thought*, edited by L. Schumacher (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021), 261-282.

³¹ Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 424; Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 74; Bernard G. Dod, "Aristoteles Latinus", in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy from the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, and J. Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 67; Jozef Brams, *La riscoperta di Aristotele in Occidente* (Milano: Jaca Books, 2003), 85. Allan devotes a short paragraph to the comparison with Moerbeke when writing: "Both translators leave the Greek order undisturbed, and translate as far as possible word for word. But the invention of novel compound forms, the provision of alternative versions and of notes on derivation, and the literal representation of Greek syntax, are peculiar to Grosseteste." Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 92.

³² Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 74.

for a corresponding element in the translation.”³³ This conviction led Grosseteste to many difficult situations and bizarre renderings, but no translation was random or left to chance: every Latin word has been well thought-out and, where necessary, supplemented with a justification of his procedure. His strict translation method is therefore not an expression of a lack of knowledge of the languages or an inability to write a fluent piece of text in Latin, but is a result of his conviction that the Greek text must be followed in the strictest sense, and that the Greek text must be accessible via the Latin translation. The peculiarities of the Latin language are even inferior to those of the Greek language, and he is willing to sacrifice the rules of the Latin syntax if necessary.³⁴ Or, to quote Grosseteste, “this can be done in Latin without much absurdity”.³⁵ His usual translation method, in which he remains very faithful to the Greek source text, is also discernible in his translations of non-Aristotelian works, including the translation of passages from the Suda, and his translations of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, although his translation of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* exhibits a less literal translation method with no accompanying glosses or notes, since this text was meant to be read by a wider audience and not only by scholars.³⁶

Franceschini, who was one of the first to devote extensive attention to the Latin translations of Grosseteste, devotes some fifty pages to Grosseteste's translation method and substantiates his statements by quoting extensive passages from Grosseteste's commentaries on pseudo-Dionysius' treatises, and from his notes on the text of and on the commentaries on the *Ethica*.³⁷ In these works, Grosseteste shows his

³³ James McEvoy, “Language, Tongue and Thought in the Writings of Robert Grosseteste”, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 13/2 (1981): 588.

³⁴ Franceschini, “Roberto Grossatesta”, 485; Allan, “Mediaeval Versions”, 91-92; Eustratius, *The Greek Commentaries*, I, 65*; McEvoy, “Language, Tongue and Thought”, 585-592. Some of his characteristic translations are translating Greek articles with *qui*, following *deceat* and *sequitur* with a dative to mimic the Greek, and translating Greek compounds with Latin compounds or devising a similar structure.

³⁵ “sine multa absurditate potest hoc fieri in latino”, quote taken from Franceschini, “Roberto Grossatesta”, 486.

³⁶ Anna Carlotta Dionisotti, “Robert Grosseteste and the Greek Encyclopaedia”, in *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale: Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIVe siècle*, edited by J. Hamesse and M. Fattori (Louvain-la-Neuve and Cassino: Institut d'études médiévales, 1990), 337-353; M. de Jonge, “Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”, *The Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 119; James McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 117; Catherine Kavanagh, “The Translation Methods of Robert Grosseteste and Johannes Scottus Eriugena: Some Points of Comparison”, in *Robert Grosseteste: His Thought and Its Impact*, edited by J.P. Cunningham (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), 44-62; Tiziano Dorandi and Michele Trizio, “Editio Princeps del ‘Liber Qui Uocatur Suda’ di Roberto Grossatesta”, *Studia graeco-arabica* 4 (2014): 155.

³⁷ Grosseteste explains his translation method in the prolegomena of his retranslation and commentary on pseudo-Dionysius' *De celesti hierarchia*, see James McEvoy, “Robert Grosseteste's Own Mission Statement as a Translator from the Greek”, in *Yearbook of the Irish Philosophical Society*, edited by C. Kavanagh (Maynooth: The Irish Philosophical Society, 2006), 173-181.

cards and gives us a unique insight into his personalized translating procedure by making certain choices explicit. It is essential to realize that Grosseteste's translations and his commentaries on some of those texts cannot be seen separately. The commentaries were the ideal place not only to fill what he felt was lacking in content in the main text, and to give the reader all possible information he felt was necessary, but the notes and commentaries were also used to reflect on some of the translating problems where the strict word-for-word format did not allow for additional explanations.³⁸

In those explanatory notes, or *notulae*, Grosseteste gives all kinds of information that according to him was lacking in the text or commentaries, and explains his rationale for the translation. Mercken extensively studied the *notulae* of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, which accompany the translation of the text and of the commentaries. Overall, he distinguishes four types of *notulae*: (1) lexical and grammatical notes concerning Greek terms and their translation into Latin, which takes up most of the notes. These notes are meant to explain and justify a translation, to explain a transliteration or give an alternative rendering, to give information on phonetics or pronunciation and how to write Greek characters in the Latin script, to dwell on the etymology of a word, to note if a Greek term has different meanings, or to give a grammatical explanation; (2) discussions of Greek variants, if there are variant readings in different Greek manuscripts; (3) lexicographical information from Greek sources; and (4) comments on the substance of the translated text.³⁹

2.2. Particles, Adverbs, Pronouns, and Conjunctions

Within Latin Aristotle studies, the analysis of translation methods has already yielded many interesting results. Analyzing the entire translation indicates how a translator usually translates a particular Greek word, adjective or pronoun, and, if available, compares this with other translations by the same person. Based on a detailed study of the translation method, an editor can justify a specific choice in the edition and change a corrupt reading from the manuscripts, can put chronology into the translations and demonstrate a certain evolution in the translation method, or can use it as an argument to ascribe an anonymous translation to a particular translator.

Some of the Aristotelian translators have been the subject of a thorough analysis, and progress has also been made regarding Grosseteste. In his pioneering work on Grosseteste's Latin translations, Franceschini gives a list of 79 Greek nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, and particles, together with their Grossetestian counterpart, which he calls "formulario grossatetano", and with this gives the impetus

³⁸ Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 479-538; see as well Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 91-92.

³⁹ Eustratius, *The Greek Commentaries*, I, 45*-46*; see also Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 490-530 and Jean Dunbabin, "Robert Grosseteste as Translator, Transmitter, and Commentator: The 'Nicomachean Ethics'", *Traditio* 28 (1972): 466-472.

for further research.⁴⁰ Allan, subsequently, adds to his article on *De caelo* an appendix with 19 Greek words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and particles), with both their Latin common translation and the Latin translation by Grosseteste, allowing an easy comparison; these words are according to him the most characteristic and recurrent differences.⁴¹ Glibert-Thierry, furthermore, has used the preliminary results on Grosseteste's translation method as an argument to ascribe *De virtutibus* to Grosseteste. *De affectibus* could safely be attributed to Grosseteste, and *De virtutibus* had the mark of the same translator. She gives a list of correspondences in translation between *De affectibus* and *De virtutibus*, which consists of 20 "mots invariables", 5 "constructions caractéristiques", 31 "termes usuels" and 10 "mots de même famille" – where possible compared with Franceschini's results – in order to reach the conclusion that both parts were indeed made by the same translator.⁴² The first list of correspondences, dealing with "mots invariables", lists Greek prepositions, adverbs, and particles with their corresponding Latin translation.

Such lists of correspondences, without any indication of the frequency and possible alternatives for a certain translation, or other translators' practices, do not say much and can be misleading. For instance, Glibert-Thierry lists the translation of prepositions such as δία + gen. (= *per* + acc.), δία + acc. (= *propter* + acc.), ἐπί + dat. (= *in* + abl.), ἐπί + acc. (= *ad* + acc.), and notes that the Latin translation of these Greek words is the same in *De virtutibus* and *De affectibus*, using it as one of her arguments to claim that both parts are translated by the same author.⁴³ However, when looking at the translation method of other translators, such as William of Moerbeke and Bartholomew of Messina, we observe that the translation of these prepositions on her list corresponds to their translation method as well and is not characteristic of Grosseteste alone.⁴⁴ Therefore, this argument alone in the translation's ascription should be used with caution.

The analysis of translation methods should not so much focus on the translation of frequently used nouns, verbs, or prepositions – although they might certainly have their value, depending on the content of the text – since the strict word-for-word method leaves not much room for variation, but could make use of the smaller words, such as particles, adverbs, pronouns, and conjunctions. Each translator has its own preferred translation of these small words: because these words do not have a crucial impact on the content of the text, translators tend to follow their own preference or intuition for these seemingly unimportant words, which is precisely why and where differences between the translators can be seen and where personality among the

⁴⁰ Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 539-540.

⁴¹ Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 116-117.

⁴² Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 134-137.

⁴³ More examples can be found in Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 134-135.

⁴⁴ The same holds true for terminology under "termes usuels" and "mots de même famille". For a quick comparison between the translation methods, one can consult the indices in the printed *Aristoteles Latinus* editions.

medieval translators can be detected. Dod calls these words the “unconscious signature by the author”.⁴⁵

There is a need to develop a more detailed and complete “formulario grossatestano”, but an essential prerequisite is the availability of critical editions of Grosseteste’s translations, in order to pass an informed judgment. In what follows, I give an impetus and focus on some particles, adverbs, pronouns, and conjunctions. I do not only give the most common Latin translation of Grosseteste, but I also indicate possible synonyms. These are accompanied by numbers that indicate how many times a specific translation is used in a given text. As indicated above, the frequency of a certain translation is significant: the translator may translate a Greek word in two or three different ways, but it is precisely the predominance that is noteworthy and that gives us more insight into the translation style.⁴⁶ The list is not exhaustive, but will hopefully serve as a starting point for future studies, taking into account Grosseteste’s other translations as well.

The numbers for the *Ethica Nicomachea* are based on the indices of Gauthier’s edition.⁴⁷ It should be noted that Grosseteste revised the previous partial translations of Burgundio of Pisa when making his *Ethica* translation. This aspect might influence some of the numbers or translations below, since it is possible that he did not revise all the small words and that they are therefore remains from Burgundio’s style. The majority of the *Ethica*, however, is probably translated anew by Grosseteste, which is why the numbers are still very useful. The numbers for *De caelo* book II have been made by comparing the unpublished Latin edition by Fernand Bossier, available on the *Aristoteles Latinus* Database, and the Greek edition by Moraux, and more specifically manuscript J (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 100) from the critical apparatus.⁴⁸ The numbers for *De passionibus* are based on Glibert-Thierry’s edition, which offers both the Greek and the Latin text. Since this is a relatively short text on a very specific subject, only some of the words below are mentioned in this treatise. Finally, the numbers for *De lineis insecabilibus* are the result of comparing one Latin manuscript, Chantilly, Musée Condé, 280, ff. 244r-247r, with the Greek edition by Bekker.⁴⁹ An empty box means that a specific translation does not occur in this treatise.

⁴⁵ Dod, “Aristoteles Latinus”, 67.

⁴⁶ For example, Bartholomew of Messina translates οὐν with *igitur, ergo* and an omission, but we notice a predominance of *igitur* over *ergo*; σφόδρα can be translated with *vehementer* and *valde*, but in his translations we notice a preference for *vehementer* over *valde*, although both are correct renderings. See Aristoteles, *Physiognomonica. Translatio Bartholomaei de Messana*, edited by L. Devriese, *Aristoteles Latinus* XIX (Turnhout: Brepols, 2019), LXXXIV.

⁴⁷ Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea*, fasciculus quintus.

⁴⁸ Aristote, *Du ciel*, edited by P. Moraux (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1965). The *Aristoteles Latinus* Database can be consulted via the website of Brepols (<http://clt.brepols.net/ALD>).

⁴⁹ This manuscript is probably an independent manuscript outside the *pecia* tradition, and is available online: <https://portail.bibliissima.fr/ark:/43093/mdata6908d13322f80c1da059df38066>

When possible, the translation is compared with Franceschini's, Glibert-Thirry's, and Allan's results, and the method of the other thirteenth-century translators Bartholomew of Messina and William of Moerbeke.⁵⁰

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
ἄν	utique	390	85	1	20
	om.			1	2

According to Franceschini, *utique* is the only translation for ἄν, although we notice three cases where this word is not translated. Bartholomew shares the translation of *utique*, but much more regularly than Grosseeste omits this word, around one-fifth of the cases.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i> ⁵¹
γάρ	enim	1392	206		53
	autem	3	1		2
	om.		2		3

940cd963dc24; Aristoteles, *Aristotelis Opera: Περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν*, edited by I. Bekker (Berolini: apud Georgium Reimerum, 1831), 968-972.

⁵⁰ For Grosseteste, I have compared the results with Franceschini, "Roberto Grossatesta", 539-540; Allan, "Mediaeval Versions", 116-117; and Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν*, 134-137. To compare with Bartholomew of Messina, I have used Aristoteles, *Physiognomonica*, LXXXIII-LXXXV and Pieter Beullens, *A Methodological Approach to Anonymously Transmitted Medieval Translations of Philosophical and Scientific Texts: the Case of Bartholomew of Messina* (KU Leuven: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2020), 31-39. To compare with Moerbeke, I have made use of Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, "Guglielmo di Moerbeke traduttore della *Poetica* di Aristotele (1278)", *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 39 (1947): 1-17, repr. in id., *Opuscula. The Latin Aristotle* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1972), 40-56 and Fernand Bossier, "Méthode de traduction et problèmes de chronologie", in *Guillaume de Moerbeke. Recueil d'études à l'occasion du 700^e anniversaire de sa mort (1286)*, edited by J. Brams and W. Vanhamel (Leuven: University Press, 1989), 257-294. For a study of the translation method of the 12th-century translator Burgundio of Pisa, see Fernand Bossier, "L'élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique chez Burgundio de Pise", in *Aux origines du lexique philosophique européen. L'influence de la latinitas*, edited by J. Hamesse, Textes et études du Moyen Âge 8 (Louvain-la-Neuve: FIDEM, 1997), 81-116.

⁵¹ The Chantilly manuscript transmits one *quoniam* and one *igitur* as well, but these might be copyist's errors in the manuscripts. Future research on *De lineis* should include all manuscripts of this text in order to judge these cases.

Franceschini mentions *enim* as the only translation for γάρ; we see that *autem* and an omission are also possible, albeit in very low numbers. Bartholomew varies much more: *enim* is the usual rendering, but it can also be translated by *namque*, *autem*, *vero*, *ergo*, *igitur* or omitted. Moerbeke also prefers *enim*, but *nam* and an omission might occur.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
δέ	<i>autem</i>	1750	318	182	93
	<i>vero</i>	36		4	
	<i>om.</i>		6	7	11
	<i>enim</i>	4			1
	<i>sed</i>	4			
	<i>quidem</i>		1	1	1
	<i>tamen</i>		1		
	<i>et</i>			1	

Franceschini gives *autem* as translation for δέ, Glibert-Thierry specifies by giving *autem* and *vero*. This table shows a predominance of *autem* over *vero*, but the translation can also be omitted, as well as be translated by occasional variants. Bartholomew prefers *autem* over *vero*, and has some other occasional variants, but the translation of *vero* still occurs between 2 and 36% of the cases, which is much more than Grosseteste. Moerbeke usually translates it with *autem*, but there is an occasional omission or *vero* (though less than Bartholomew).

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
δή	<i>utique</i>	225	12	1	5
	<i>autem</i>	4			
	<i>om.</i>		3		
	<i>igitur</i>	1			

Franceschini gives *utique* as only translation, even though the comparison shows us that *autem*, *igitur* and an omission could be possible as well. Bartholomew prefers *utique* as well, and very occasionally renders it with *autem*, *iam*, *vero* or an omission. Moerbeke translates δὴ with both *itaque* and *utique* (and rarely *autem* and *etiam*); *itaque* is characteristic for Moerbeke's translation method.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i> ⁵²
ἐπει(δὴ)	quia	67	22		2
	quoniam	4			

Franceschini only gives *quia* as translation, although *quoniam* occurs in the *Ethica Nicomachea* as well. Bartholomew and Moerbeke stick to the translation of *quoniam*.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
οἷον ⁵³	puta	162			1
	velut	6	16	2	
	utputa	10			
	ut	1		2	
	quemadmodum	1			
	quasi	1			

Franceschini mentions *velut* as “formulario grossatestano”; the same goes for Allan, who mentions that *puta* is the common version, in contrast with *velut* for Grosseteste. These statements do not hold true: we see a variety of translations, with a preference for *puta* in the *Ethica Nicomachea*. Bartholomew renders this word with *ut* and to a lesser extent with *sicut*, which distinguishes the two translators from each other. Moerbeke chooses for *puta*, *velut*, and *utputa*, and sometimes *sicut* and *ut*.

⁵² The Chantilly manuscript transmits two times *quare* as well, but they might be palaeographical mistakes.

⁵³ When οἷον is followed by τε, the translation changes into *possibile*.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i> ⁵⁴
ὅτι	quoniam	284	66		10
	quia	3			
	quod				1

Franceschini only gives *quoniam* as translation, although – albeit very rarely – we come across *quia* and *quod* as well. Bartholomew translates ὅτι with *quia*, *quod* and *quoniam*. Moerbeke uses *quod* and *quia*, but rarely *quoniam*.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
οὖν	igitur	324	44	9	6
	om.	2	2	5	1

Franceschini mentions only *igitur*, but in all texts this word can be omitted as well. Bartholomew has a preference of *igitur* over *ergo* and can occasionally leave it out as well.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
ὡσπερ	quemadmodum	175	31		3
	ut	5			
	quasi	1			
	velut		1		

According to Franceschini, ὡσπερ is always translated as *quemadmodum*. Although this is almost always the case, we do come across an occasional *ut*, *quasi* and *velut*. Bartholomew always translates this with *sicut*, which distinguishes the two translators. Moerbeke renders ὡσπερ with *quemadmodum*, *sicut*, *ut*, *velut*, *itaque*, *quasi*, *tamquam*, and rarely with (*ut*)*puta* and *ac*.

⁵⁴ The Chantilly manuscript transmits one *quem*, one *quam* and one *quicumque* as well, but future research should judge whether these are palaeographical mistakes.

Greek	Latin	<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	<i>De cael. II</i>	<i>De pass.</i>	<i>De lin.</i>
ὥστε	quare	82	37	1	27
	ut	12	9		
	propter	2			
	quapropter	1			
	velut	1			

Franceschini notes *quare* as translation for ὥστε. The table shows that other variants can occur as well in Grosseteste's translating method. Bartholomew mainly uses *quare* too, but has used *quod* and *ita quod* as well. Moerbeke also has a preference for *quare*, but uses *itaque* as well.

This material shows that there is no fixed one-on-one relationship between the Greek and the Latin as previous research led to believe. Nevertheless, it is clear that Robert Grosseteste is still a very strict and literal translator who hardly deviates from his choices. Occasional alternatives are possible, yet we notice a very high degree of uniformity and more so than with other translators. Mercken even compared Grosseteste's translation method with a word processing program: in his article, he checked to what extent Grosseteste's translations can be reproduced with a program that follows some basic rules. The result is very striking, as almost 88% of Grosseteste's translation in question could be reproduced with such a program. The other 12% were mostly alternative translations that differed from the most commonly used form. If more than one Latin equivalent is possible, the program cannot predict the translator's decision and sticks with the most commonly used one (which is of course one of the limits of the program).⁵⁵ Exactly these limits have been exemplified by the tables above: Grosseteste, although following his strict method, for one reason or another very occasionally decided to render the Greek word with another Latin translation than the one he usually used. It is very important to keep track of these words in order to avoid getting into a vicious circle.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ H. Paul F. Mercken, "Robert Grosseteste's Method of Translating: a Medieval Word Processing Programme?", in *Tradition et traduction. Les textes philosophiques et scientifiques grecs au Moyen Âge latin. Hommage à F. Bossier*, edited by R. Beyers, J. Brams, D. Sacré, and K. Verrycken (Leuven: University Press, 1999), 349.

⁵⁶ If one editor believes that γάρ is always translated as *enim*, then (s)he might be inclined to add an *enim* in cases where the Latin manuscript tradition does not have one but when a γάρ is available in Greek. By doing so, subsequent studies might assume that γάρ is always translated and never omitted, which affects the next edition, and so on.

This preliminary study on Grosseteste’s translation method can immediately be put into practice and applied to the *Quadratura per lunulas*. This short mathematical treatise discusses the quadrature problem and is a fragment of Simplicius’ commentary on the *Physica*. Only a part of Simplicius’ commentary has been translated into Latin in the Middle Ages and this fragment’s translation seems to go back to the thirteenth century. The Latin translation of the fragment is extant in two distinct versions, the first being a literal translation, and the other a paraphrase of that translation. The name of Robert Grosseteste has been put forward as the translator of this short treatise, and since Grosseteste discussed similar issues pertaining to the quadrature of a circle in his commentary on the *Analytica Posteriora*, he was familiar with this mathematical problem. However, modern scholarship disagrees on the authenticity of the ascription.⁵⁷

The editor of the first literal version, Clagett, mentioned Grosseteste as translator since the fragment ends with “Hanc demonstrationem inveni Oxonie in quadam cedula Domini[?] Linco[lniensis]”, but nevertheless suggests that Grosseteste’s usual style of translation should be compared with this treatise.⁵⁸ To this end, I have compared his edition of the Latin literal translation with the Greek edition of Simplicius’ commentary made by Diels.⁵⁹ Since this is a short fragment on a mathematical topic, not all words from the tables above occur, but these are the results:

ἄν	<i>itaque</i> 1
γάρ	<i>enim</i> 5 – <i>quia</i> 1
δέ	<i>vero</i> 4 – <i>quoque</i> 2 – <i>om.</i> 2 – <i>iam</i> 1 – <i>itaque</i> 1 – <i>autem</i> 1
ἐπεί	<i>quia</i> 2
ὥστε	<i>sicque</i> 1 – <i>sic itaque</i> 1

⁵⁷ See Celina A. Lértora Mendoza, “La obra ‘De quadratura circuli’ atribuida a Roberto Grosseteste”, *Mathesis* 3 (1987): 394-395. The author also offers a discussion on the quadrature of a circle and a transcription of the text, which corresponds to Clagett’s second version. On Grosseteste’s commentary on the *Analytica Posteriora*, see Pietro Rossi, “Tracce della versione latina di un commento greco ai *Secondi Analitici* nel *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum libros* di Roberto Grossatesta,” *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 70 (1978): 434.

⁵⁸ Marshall Clagett, “The *Quadratura per lunulas*: a Thirteenth-Century Fragment of Simplicius’ Commentary on the *Physics* of Aristotle”, in *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Austin Patterson Evans*, edited by J.H. Mundy, R.W. Emery, and B.N. Nelson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 99-101.

⁵⁹ Simplicius Cilicius, *Simplicii in Aristotelis physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria*, edited by Hermannus Diels, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* IX (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1882), 56-57. The edition of the Latin fragment can be found in Clagett, “The *Quadratura per lunulas*”, 102-105. Since the second version is a paraphrase and not made in the word-for-word translation method, it has not been taken into account.

Comparing these results with the tables above, one immediately notices that the two translation methods are different. For his Aristotelian translations, at least, Grosseteste did never translate *äv* with *itaque*; the renderings of *δέ* are entirely different than one would expect from Grosseteste; and also the translations of *ὄστε* did never occur in the tables above. Moreover, when comparing the Latin translation with the Greek source text, one notices a more free way of translating, since the order of the words are followed less strictly than one would expect from Grosseteste. Therefore, based on this preliminary study of his Aristotelian translations alone, I would suggest that Robert Grosseteste is not the translator of the first, literal, version of the fragment *Quadratura per lunulas*.

Conclusion

This contribution aimed at offering an overview of Robert Grosseteste's place in the *Aristoteles Latinus* project. This chronicle demonstrated that essential steps have already been made in the study of Grosseteste's translations of Aristotelian treatises, but at the same time showed that we are still faced with unfortunate gaps.

Robert Grosseteste has earned his spot next to the other famous thirteenth-century translators of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. It is therefore to be hoped that, with the preparation of new critical editions, we will be able to examine his way of thinking and tackling a translation in more detail, and how his efforts to produce reliable translations were put into practice.

Lisa Devriese
lisa.devriese@kuleuven.be

Fecha de recepción: 31/01/2023
Fecha de aceptación: 20/05/2023

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Chantilly, Musée Condé, 280
Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2088
Oxford, Balliol College, 99
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1869
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 2000
Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 100

Primary Sources

- Albertus Magnus, *Physica, pars II, lib. 5-8*, edited by P. Hossfeld (Münster: Aschendorff, 1993), 498-514.
- Aristote, *Du ciel*, edited by P. Moraux (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1965).
- Aristoteles, *Ethica Nicomachea. Translatio Antiquissima libr. II-III sive 'Ethica Vetust', Translationis Antiquioris quae supersunt sive 'Ethica Nova', 'Hoferiana', 'Borghesiana', Translatio Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis sive 'Liber Ethicorum' (Recensio Pura et Recensio Recognita)*, edited by R.-A. Gauthier, 5 vols. (Leiden: Brill; Bruxelles: Desclée De Brouwer, 1972-1974).
- *Aristotelis Opera*, edited by I. Bekker (Berolini: apud Georgium Reimerum, 1831).
- *Physiognomonica. Translatio Bartholomaei de Messana*, edited by L. Devriese, *Aristoteles Latinus XIX* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2019).
- Aspasius, Michael of Ephesus, and Anonymus, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, volume 3: the Anonymous Commentator on Book VII, Aspasius on Book VIII and Michael of Ephesus on Books IX and X*, edited by H. Paul F. Mercken, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VI,3* (Leuven: University Press, 1991).
- Eustratius and Anonymus, *The Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle in the Latin Translation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, volume 1: Eustratius on Book I and the Anonymous Scholia on Books II, III, and IV*, edited by H. P. F. Mercken, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum VI,1* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).
- Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes, *Περὶ παθῶν: édition critique du texte grec et de la traduction latine médiévale*, edited by A. Glibert-Thirry, *Corpus Latinum Commentariorum in Aristotelem Graecorum Suppl. 2* (Leiden: Brill 1977).
- Simplicius, *Simplicii in Aristotelis physicorum libros quattuor priores commentaria*, edited by H. Diels, *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca IX* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 1882).

Secondary Sources

- Allan, Donald J., “Mediaeval Versions of Aristotle’s *De caelo*, and of the Commentary of Simplicius”, *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies 2* (1950): 82-120.
- Beullens, Pieter and Pieter De Leemans, “Aristote à Paris: Le système de la *pecia* et les traductions de Guillaume de Moerbeke”, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales 75* (2008): 87-135.
- Beullens, Pieter, *A Methodological Approach to Anonymously Transmitted Medieval Translations of Philosophical and Scientific Texts: the Case of Bartholomew of Messina* (KU Leuven: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2020).
- “Robert Grosseteste’s Translation of Simplicius’s Commentary on Aristotle’s *De caelo*: Tracking Down a Second Manuscript and the Greek Model”, *Mediterranea 8* (2023): 565-594.
- Bossier, Fernand, “Traductions latines et influences du commentaire *In De caelo* en Occident (XIIIe-XIVe s.)”, in *Simplicius. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie. Actes du colloque internationale de Paris (28 sept.-1er oct. 1985)*, edited by I. Hadot (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 1987), 289-325.
- “Méthode de traduction et problèmes de chronologie”, in *Guillaume de Moerbeke. Recueil d’études à l’occasion du 700e anniversaire de sa mort (1286)*, edited by J. Brams and W. Vanhamel (Leuven: University Press, 1989), 257-294.
- “L’élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique chez Burgundio de Pise”, in *Aux origines du lexique philosophique européen. L’influence de la latinitas*, edited by J. Hamesse, *Textes et études du Moyen Âge 8* (Louvain-la-Neuve: FIDEM, 1997), 81-116.
- “Les ennuis d’un traducteur. Quatre annotations sur la première traduction latine de l’*Ethique à Nicomaque* par Burgundio de Pise”, *Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie 59* (1998): 406-427.

- Brams, Jozef, "The Revised Version of Grosseteste's Translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*", *Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale* 36 (1994): 45-55.
- *La riscoperta di Aristotele in Occidente* (Milano: Jaca Books, 2003).
- Clagett, Marshall, "The *Quadratura per lunulas*: a Thirteenth-Century Fragment of Simplicius' Commentary on the *Physics* of Aristotle", in *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought: Presented in Honor of Austin Patterson Evans*, edited by J.H. Mundy, R.W. Emery, and B.N. Nelson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 99-108.
- Crialesi, Clelia, "The Medieval Latin Reception of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *On Indivisible Lines*: Reassessing the State of the Art", *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* 29 (2022): 11-24.
- De Jonge, M., "Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 115-125.
- De Leemans, Pieter, "Aristoteles Latinus: *Philologia ancilla philosophiae?*", *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 77 (2015): 533-556.
- De Leemans, Pieter and Devriese, Lisa, "Translating and Reading Pseudo-Aristotle in the Latin West", in *Pseudo-Aristotelian Texts in Medieval Thought, Acts of the XXII Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'étude de la Philosophie Médiévale*, edited by M. Brinzei, A. Marinca and D. Coman (forthcoming).
- Dionisotti, Anna Carlotta, "On the Greek Studies of Robert Grosseteste", in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*, edited by A.C. Dionisotti, A. Grafton, and J. Kraye (London: The Warburg Institute, 1988), 19-39.
- "Robert Grosseteste and the Greek Encyclopaedia", in *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale: Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au XIVe siècle*, edited by J. Hamesse and M. Fattori (Louvain-la-Neuve and Cassino: Institut d'études médiévales, 1990), 337-353.
- Dod, Bernard G., "Aristoteles Latinus", in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy from the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, and J. Pinborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 45-79.
- Dorandi, Tiziano and Trizio, Michele, "Editio Princeps del 'Liber Qui Uocatur Suda' di Roberto Grossatesta", *Studia graeco-arabica* 4 (2014): 145-190.
- Dunabin, Jean, "Robert Grosseteste as Translator, Transmitter, and Commentator: The 'Nicomachean Ethics'", *Traditio* 28 (1972): 460-472.
- Franceschini, Ezio, *Scritti di filologia latina medievale* (Padova: Antenore, 1976).
- Grabmann, Martin, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristoteles-Übersetzungen des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1916).
- Harlfinger, Dieter, *Die Textgeschichte der pseudo-aristotelischen Schrift 'Peri atomôn grammôn': ein kodikologisch-kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Klärung der Überlieferungsverhältnisse im Corpus Aristotelicum* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971).
- Jourdain, Aimable and Jourdain, Charles, *Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote et sur des commentaires grecs ou arabes employés par les docteurs scolastiques* (Paris: Joubert, 1843).
- Kavanagh, Catherine, "The Translation Methods of Robert Grosseteste and Johannes Scottus Eriugena: Some Points of Comparison", in *Robert Grosseteste: His Thought and Its Impact*, edited by J. P. Cunningham (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2012), 44-62.
- Lacombe, Georges e.a., *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, pars prior* (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1939).
- Lértora Mendoza, Celina A., "La obra 'De quadratura circuli' atribuida a Roberto Grosseteste", *Mathesis* 3 (1987): 389-400.
- McEvoy, James, "Language, Tongue and Thought in the Writings of Robert Grosseteste", *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 13/2 (1981): 585-592.
- *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

- “Robert Grosseteste’s Own Mission Statement as a Translator from the Greek”, in *Yearbook of the Irish Philosophical Society*, edited by C. Kavanagh (Maynooth: The Irish Philosophical Society, 2006), 173-181.
- Mercken, H. Paul F., “Robert Grosseteste’s Method of Translating: a Medieval Word Processing Programme?”, in *Tradition et traduction. Les textes philosophiques et scientifiques grecs au Moyen Âge latin. Hommage à F. Bossier*, edited by R. Beyers, J. Brams, D. Sacré, and K. Verrycken (Leuven: University Press, 1999), 323-370.
- Minio-Paluello, Lorenzo, “Guglielmo di Moerbeke traduttore della *Poetica* di Aristotele (1278)”, *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 39 (1947): 1-17, repr. in id., *Opuscula. The Latin Aristotle* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1972), 40-56.
- *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, pars posterior* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955).
- *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, supplementa altera* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1961).
- Panti, Cecilia, “Il *De caelo* nel medioevo: le citazioni e la *translatio* di Roberto Grossatesta”, *Fogli di Filosofia* 12/2 (2019): 67-106.
- Polloni, Nicola, “Disentangling Roger Bacon’s Criticism of Medieval Translations”, in *Early Thirteenth-Century English Franciscan Thought*, edited by L. Schumacher (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021), 261-282.
- Rossi, Pietro, “Tracce della versione latina di un commento greco ai *Secundi Analytici* nel *Commentarius in Posteriorum Analyticorum libros* di Roberto Grossatesta”, *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* 70 (1978): 433-439.
- Tropia, Luigi, “La versione latina medievale del ‘*Περὶ παθῶν*’ dello Pseudoandronico”, *Aevum* 26/2 (1952): 97-112.
- Vuillemin-Diem, Gudrun and Rashed, Marwan, “Burgundio de Pise et ses manuscrits grecs d’Aristote: Laur. 87.7 et Laur. 81.18”, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 64 (1997): 136-198.