

RQ-50132

Richard Rufus of Cornwall Project

Final Performance Report

Rega Wood
Principal Investigator

Stanford University
22 August 2009

Final Performance Report
Work Accomplished
July 2005-June 2009

1. Metaphysics: *Memoriale in Metaph. Aristot. (MMet)* & *Scriptum in Metaph. (SMet)*; formerly called *Dissertatio in Metaphysicam Aristotelis (DMet)*.

Wood & Martin read through and revised the proem and books 1-2, 7-8. and 11.1.1-8 of *MMet*. Wood wrote an introduction and submitted the manuscript for publication.

Wood prepared preliminary editions of books *SMet* 3, 4 and 7.

Lewis checked the text of *SMet* books 3-4.

Provisional editions of books *SMet* 3-4, and 7 are now ready.

Ottman revised and corrected Etzkorn transcriptions *SMet* book 3-4, & 7.

Ottman checked Buckfield parallels for book 3, 4, 5, 7.

Streijger prepared outlines of the introductory books (1-6) and book 7:

<http://rrp.stanford.edu/SMet01O.html>, <http://rrp.stanford.edu/SMet07O.html>

Streijger began work collating book 5.

We continued work on preparing a reliable edition of the translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by Michael Scot, on which Rufus commented. Based on our previous work comparing Rufus' citations with those of the manuscript readings listed in the editions by Darms and Ponzalli, we selected a manuscript to use in establishing, as far as possible, the text used by Rufus: Paris, Mazarin 3467 (M3467). Unfortunately, we found that collating Paris, Mazarin 3467 resulted in a text much more defective and farther removed from the original than Rufus'. Moreover, checking with the modern edition of book 9, we found that M3467 only twice shared a reading with Rufus that was not found in the 1473 Incunabulum (I1473); Rufus' text is much closer to the 1473 Incunabulum than to M3467. So for the present, we are using I1473 as our base text. We have ordered another manuscript from Paris (Nat. lat. 15453) in the hope that we can better establish where the Incunabulum differs from the text circulating at Paris in 1230.

M3467 for which we originally had such high hopes has been collated through book 10; only book 11 remains to be collated. The three modern editions for the books we hope to edit by 2011 have all been collated; only the Ruggerio edition of book 10 remains to be done. Similarly, books 1-9 of the 1473 Incunabulum has been collated. Rufus text has been collated for books 3, 4, and 7 and for all the books that have had modern editions, except book 10.

Our original schedule called for us to prepare preliminary editions of the first three books of the *Scriptum*. We revised that plan and worked instead on books 3, 4, and 7. Work began on books 3 and 4, on account of the discovery of a new manuscript, Salamanca, Univ. 2322, which begins at book 3. Our work with books 3 and 4 enabled us to determine the value of the new witness, which turns out to be our best manuscript. Making the switch from books 1-3 to books 3, 4 & 7 increased our work load by about 50%, since they are considerably longer, corresponding to 30 folios in the Vatican manuscript rather than 19.

2. Chemistry: *In De generatione et corruptione Aristot.*

Recommended for publication by the British Academy Texts Committee (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi) on July 7, 2004.
Committee contacted us again in June 2008.
We have begun rewriting the introduction again.

3. Psychology:

Redactio breviar, books 1 and 3 posted on the Rufus website:

<http://rrp.stanford.edu/DAnE1.html> and <http://rrp.stanford.edu/DAnE3.html>

No work done between July 2007 and June 2009.

4. Physics: *In Phys. Aristot.*

Edition published in December 2003.

TEI compliant version of the text posted on the web: rrp.stanford.edu/phys/TEI.xml

No work done between July 2007 and June 2008.

5. Theology: *In Sententias Petri Lombardi, Lectura Oxoniensis*

Description of principal manuscript prepared in Fall 2006.

Obtained reproductions of the principal manuscript, Balliol College, codex 62.

6. Codicology:

Streijger prepared and Wood revised a study of Salamanca 2322 that showed that it is a not a contaminated witness: <http://rrp.stanford.edu/Contamin.html>

Comparison with the Goals Set in the Work Plan

Jennifer Ottman began working on the project as a part time consultant in the summer of 2006 rather than a full-time collaborator, resulting in corresponding cuts in the work she accomplished, which are noted below. She was replaced for the academic year 2007-2008 by a new postdoc Michiel Streijger who accomplished some but not all of the work planned for her, in particular the hunt for parallels in Thomas of York was abandoned. It would be nice to have York parallels, but the Buckfield parallels are more important for the subsequent commentary tradition. Streijger concentrated on more essential tasks: preparing outlines, establishing manuscript relations, and working on getting a good text of the Michael Scot translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

Goals achieved:

- Complete transcription of the Vatican manuscript prepared by Etzkorn.
- Transcription partly checked by Ottman, to date she has checked prologue and bks 1-5, and 7, sometimes by reference to the manuscript and sometimes not.
- Buckfield parallels located by Ottman for books 1-4 and 7.
- Description of Oxford manuscripts prepared.
- TEI compliant edition of the Physics commentary prepared.
- Developed an exciting new format for posting a critical edition and posted two books of *redactio breviar* version of Rufus *De anima* commentary using that format.

Goals exceeded:

- Borrowings from Albert the Great located.
- Provisional edition of *DMet* book 7 prepared.
- Description of Salamanca manuscript prepared as well as a comprehensive study of its value as a witness.

Goals missed:

- Parallels with Thomas of York not located.
- Etzkorn transcription of books 8-11 not checked.

Work is ahead of schedule.

We consider ourselves ahead of schedule, since in the first two years of this grant period, we prepared provisional editions corresponding to 30 folios in the Vatican or 300 pages in a modern printed edition, something we had not expected to be able to accomplish in three years. We have also done more than we expected to be able to do to reconstruct the Michael Scot translation. We had thought that we might have to content ourselves with referencing the Luntina edition. Instead we have the far superior 1473 Incunabulum edition. We devised a sensible method for selecting manuscripts to allow us more closely to approximate the text circulating at Paris in 1230, and we have begun the process of collating those manuscripts.

Regarding the missed goals, York parallels will probably be completed as part of RQ-50326. There will be no difficulty checking Etzkorn transcriptions as we need them in the next grant period.

In sum we have edited more of Rufus and we are better prepared to show readers what text he was commenting on, so we have accomplished more than we thought we could.