Final Performance Report
Work Accomplished
July 2003–June 2005


- Vatican, New College, and Prague manuscripts of *DMet* collated for short passages.
- Typesetting programs revised.
- New translation programs written that reduce the need for special coding; work on coding *MMet* postponed.
- Summary Exposition found in Erfurt Q290 transcribed

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

- Edition submitted to the British Academy.
- Further source work completed.
- Otttman checked all the notes to the edition.
- Introduction drafted.
- Text reread with Neil Lewis, Christopher Martin, and Jennifer Ottman.

3. Psychology

- Preliminary editions of books 1-3 completed.
- Prague *De anima* transcribed by G. Etzkorn
- Erfurt, Florence, and Madrid manuscripts read and reread.
- Ottman found that Prague was identical with a longer work preserved in Assisi 138 & New College 285; she transcribed parallel passages from Assisi.
- Ottman found parallel passages in 29 printed works listed below.
- Lewis prepared comments on preliminary editions of 1, 2, and 3.
- Provisional editions of books 1, 2, & 3 completed.


- Typesetting completed.
- Program for preparing HTML texts written; HTML version of the *Physics* posted at rrp.Stanford.edu.

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

- Parallels with *In DGen* and *In DAn* found.

- Visited Florence, prepared extensive manuscript description.
- Detailed study of Oxford hands in Erfurt Quarto 290 and Quarto 312.
- Detailed study of Vat. Lat. 4538.
- Examination of 200 manuscripts at Oxford for a study of incipient Anglicana

Comparison with the Goals Set in the Work Plan

Goals achieved:

- Work in Florence completed; Prague transcription completed.
- *De anima* manuscripts read and reread
- Preliminary edition of *De anima* completed.
- Provisional edition of *De anima* completed.

A preliminary resolution of the two redaction problem was reached. We have decided that the Erfurt redaction including only questions and brief divisions was probably prepared first. We find in the Florence redaction what appear to be deliberate revisions of Erfurt. Here we based our conclusions in part on the considerations suggested by A. G. Rigg, “The Long or the Short of it? Amplification or Abbreviation?, *Journal of Medieval Latin* 10 (200) 46-73.

Goals exceeded:

- Because we were able to fund additional work by Ottman, much more work was done on parallel passages for *De anima*.
- New translation programs have cut down on the time we need to spend coding. Programs for preparing HTML text have been prepared.
- Transcriptions of several anonymous *De anima* commentaries.
- Transcription of an anonymous commentary on Priscian’s *Institutes*.

Goals missed:

- Programs for preparing indices are somewhat inadequate; there are problems obtaining satisfactory images of Rufus’ Parisian theology lectures.
- Preliminary work on Rufus’ *Dissertatio in Metaph.* was not completed in the original grant period ending June 2005, but was finished in the extension period.
Discussion of Results

We found that we had to do a great deal more manuscript work on *De anima* than initially planned, because we found we needed to do a detailed studies of scripts and because we found many previously unreported commentaries from the period immediately after Rufus. For the printed works this did not present an insurmountable problem, but we were not able make up for the time required by the extra manuscript work. Below is the list of printed works we read for our annotations:

Albertus Magnus, *De anima*
Albertus Magnus, *De homine*
Alexander de Hales, *Glossa in quattuor libros Sententiarum*
Alexander de Hales, *Quaestiones disputatae ante quem esset frater*
Anonymus, *De anima et de potentiis eius*
Anonymus, *De potentiis animae et obiectis*
Anonymus, *In De anima, ed. Bazn (Bodleian)*
Anonymus, *In De anima, ed. Gauthier (Rome)*
Anonymus, *In De anima, ed. Vennebusch (Admont)*
Averroes, *In De anima*
Aviceena, *Liber de anima*
Costa ben Luca, *De differentia animae et spiritus*
Guillelmus de Auvergne, *De anima*
Guillelmus de Auxerre, *Summa aurea*
Guillelmus de Sancto Theodorico, *De natura corporis et animae*
Hugo de Sancto Caro, *Quaestio de anima*
Ioannes Blund, *Tractatus de anima*
Ioannes de Rupella, *Summa de anima*
Ioannes de Rupella, *Tractatus de divisione multipliciti potentiarum animae*
Petrus Hispanus, *In De anima*
Robertus Grosseteste, *Opuscula, ed. Baur*
Philippus Cancellarius, *Summa de bono*
*Summa duacensis*
*Summa halesiana*
Thomas Eboracensis, *Sapientiale*
*Trois commentaires anonymes sur le trait De l’me d’Aristote*

The works we read in manuscript include:

*Adam Buckfield, In De anima*
*Pseudo Adam Buckfield, In De anima*
*Anonymus, In De anima, Erfurt Exposition*
*Anonymus, In De anima, Erfurt Questions*
*Anonymus, Quaestiones de ente et anima (Assisi)*

We did this work, in part because Adam Buckfield is a very early witness, since he probably cited Rufus in 1243 or before. Part of his commentary is printed in an Oxford thesis by Helen Powell, from which we made the initial annotations, but in July 2005 we were still at work transcribing the sections Miss Powell did not attempt. That work has since been completed. Pseudo Adam Buckfield is important because he includes verbatim quotations from Rufus, sometimes ascribed to someone famous, “quidam famosus.”
For the anonymous Erfurt exposition, we tried unsuccessfully to establish its relation to Rufus, hoping to do this with comparative ease, since it appears in the same manuscript as Rufus' commentary. We were unsuccessful in part because there was so little overlap. The anonymous Erfurt exposition is much closer to Averroes than Rufus and includes none of his discussions of difficult questions. In the course of our work with Adam Buckfield, however, we found that large chunks of this anonymous exposition were quoted verbatim by Buckfield, so we were able to establish that relationship, if not the one we aimed at.

Finally the anonymous Quaestiones de ente et anima was a work we set out to explore in the Prague manuscript that also includes works by Rufus. Jerry Etzkorn transcribed Prague rapidly at the beginning of the grant period. We found, however, that the work in question was not really a De anima commentary, though it dealt with many of the same questions as Rufus and appears frequently in our annotations. More damaging for our timing, it turns out that Prague is not the only manuscript in which it is preserved. Since Prague's copy was defective, we also had to transcribe other manuscripts we found. First we found Oxford New College 285, and after struggling that for some time, we found a third manuscript of these questions, Assisi 138. Since the Assisi manuscript was the best, we had to redo our annotations from based on its text; effectively we transcribed this work three times.

Christopher Martin and Neil Lewis did the work that was planned for them. Jerry Etzkorn did not transcribe section of the Dissertatio preserved in Oxford, but he did transcribe both the anonymous Erfurt De anima questions and another anonymous commentary from the same manuscript. Jennifer Ottman and Rega Wood did not collate the Prague manuscript of the Dissertatio, but they did transcribe separately or together all or parts of three other commentaries.

Rega Wood spent less time on transcription and more time studying thirteenth century script; her transcription of book one of the Vatican manuscript of the Dissertatio was incomplete; it has since been completed by Etzkorn. Wood was spent her time instead on a detailed study of the hands responsible for Erfurt Quarto 290 and 312. She worked to determine their relationship to chancery hands in the period between 1220 and 1240. Wood completed her work on this project in March when she wrote up the result of six weeks study of manuscripts in situ at Oxford.

Our edition of De anima is nearly complete. It was examined by a distinguished group of scholars, including Dorothea Frede, Mark Smith, and Olga Weijers, as well as the editors themselves in March 2005, in connection with the meeting of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association. The research required for the introduction has been completed, though the introduction itself will be drafted closer to the time of publication.

How soon the edition will be printed, we do not know at present, since we have encountered unanticipated delays at the British Academy. Since we do not seem able to avoid these delays, we are now exploring the possibility of internet publication prior to book publication.

One thing is certain: the edition will be much more valuable to the reader than initially planned. We had hoped to improve on the source work found in R. Gauthier's edition of the anonymous De anima commentary offered as a series of lectures between 1245 and 1250. Following Gauthier's lead, we looked for other early lectures in this period, and found more closely related lectures on De anima in this early period than anyone expected. The results will richly illustrate for the reader the beginnings of the Western commentary tradition on De anima, and show its dependence of Richard Rufus' commentary.