

INTRODUCTION

During the night of May 26th, 1328, Michael of Cesena, Minister General of the Franciscan Order, accompanied by several members of his order including William of Ockham, left the court of pope John XXII at Avignon,¹ motivated by the belief that John had become a heretic and had therefore ceased to be pope. Michael and his associates met the emperor Ludwig in Italy and went with him when he returned to Germany in 1330; Ockham remained in Munich for the rest of his life.² Sometime during 1332 or 1333, in a space of three months, Ockham wrote the *Opus nonaginta dierum*. It is a reply to John XXII's *Quia vir reprobus*, which was a reply to Michael of Cesena's attack on documents in which John rejected certain ideas and practices that the Franciscan's regarded as essential to their religious life. It is a "recitative" work, that is, one in which Ockham does not say what he himself thinks but "recites", that is, reports, what others say; OND reports what John's attackers say in answer to *Quia vir reprobus*.

John had referred to Michael as "this heretic". OND reports the attackers' argument to prove that John himself was a heretic and not Michael. The notion of heresy and the question how someone can be shown to be a heretic thus became important to the controversy. The argument is summarised at the end of OND (chapter 124). Holding certain heresies is not enough to make a person a heretic, since a heretic does not merely hold a heresy but holds it "pertinaciously". What are the signs of pertinacity? John is pertinacious in his heresies because he has defined them as to be held by all Catholics, he has tried to compel others to defend these heresies pertinaciously, and so on. Behind the argument there is a comprehensive theory of heresy and heretics. The purpose of Part 1 of the *Dialogus* is to discuss that theory thoroughly.

In its literary form the OND is rather clumsy. It is an attack on an answer to an attack, and it contains *Quia vir reprobus* complete, which quoted Michael of Cesena's attack complete, which quoted Pope John's decretals. The point of full quotation was to assure the reader that none of the adversary's strong points was being concealed.³ In the *Dialogus* Ockham organised his material more informally as a conversation in which a student questions a master on various matters. The student (a senior student in theology and not at all diffident)

1. Baudry **, p. 114. 2. Baudry, p. 123. 3. *Other examples of this genre. Hobbes, Locke, Chillingworth, Arnauld (and many French 17th century controversialists), up to Marx and Engels.*

determines what questions are discussed and decides when to move on; it is as if the master is an expert witness under examination. The inquiry is about “the controversy over Catholic faith and many related matters now taking place among Christians”.⁴ The student presents himself as “a most sincere and zealous supporter of the same lord highest pontiff [John XXII] and a keen abominator of his opponents and their collaborators.”⁵ He asks the master not to indicate which opinions are his own⁶ (though they should be included among those discussed)⁷ and asks him to conceal his own name and to refer to John and others involved in the controversy by their initials.⁸ The dialogue format made it possible to produce a work that argues Ockham’s opinions without alarming copyists or readers and without incurring censorship.

Ockham seems to have begun writing the *Dialogus* before the death of Pope John XXII⁹ in December 1334, but after 1332,¹⁰ perhaps soon after completing OND.¹¹ He planned the *Dialogus* in three parts (or “tracts”, to use what seems to have been Ockham’s original term)¹², to be entitled “On heretics”, “On the teachings of John XXII”, and “On the deeds of those disputing about orthodox faith”. The first part was completed. The second seems never to have been written. The third was apparently never completed; two “tracts” have come down to us, both incomplete.

The present volume includes the first five of the seven books that comprise Part 1 of the *Dialogus*. [Summary]

The text-tradition of 1 Dial. 1-5

4. Prologus.4-5. In 1 Dial. 6.1, the student says: “I wanted this work to be composed principally on account of the discord between the Most Holy Father and Lord, the Lord Pope John XXII, and certain persons who are spreading rumours of his heretical wickedness”. **Knysh translation?***
5. Prologus 2.39-40 **6.** Prologus 2.11-12, 42-3. This point is often mentioned. See also 1 Dial. 7.48.45-50. **7.** Prologus 2.13-14. *Refer to Knysh* **8.** Prologus.2. 22-32. **9.** 1 Dial. refers to John XXII as reigning pope and makes no reference to his successor Benedict XII. See Prologus 2.30-31 (“dominum I”), 1 Dial. 5.3.256 (“Iohannem 22 ... fuit vel est modo hereticus”), 1 Dial. 7.10 (“Dominum summum pontificem nunc Dei providentia in cathedra sancti Petri sedentem, Dominum videlicet Iohannem 22”).

file://localhost/C:/Users/Public/Documents/Documents/1dWorking/OckIntro/Chronology.html

10. The *Dialogus* refers to sermons on the beatific vision that John gave in 1332 at 4.11.17-20, 5.2.139-41. There are allusions at 6.93.9-10, 6.100.484, 7.8.24, 7.67.67 **line numbers provisional** **11.** On the dates of OND and 1 Dial. see Baudry, p. 150-3, 159-63.; Miethke, pp. 82-7; Offler, OP, vol. 12, p. 288, vol. 3, pp. xvii-xviii. OND was also written before John’s death (John is referred to as living at OND, Prolog. 21-22, Epilog. 469-71) and after the sermons on the beatific vision (referred to at OND 124.246-254). **12.** *tractatus/pars. “tract” for subdivision of tertia pars*

The text of Part 1 of the *Dialogus* has come down through 32 manuscripts and three early printed editions.¹³ The text of 1 Dial. 1-5 comes to over 80,000 words. To read and transcribe all the witnesses right through would have been a heavy labour not justified by any likely improvement in the text. We therefore tried to get a sense of the quality and affinities of the witnesses by collating some sample sections, viz. the whole of Book 1 and the first five chapters of each of Books 3 and 4. Our colleague, George Knysh, drew our attention to certain passages in Book 5 that contain placenames that differ from one set of manuscripts to another; analysis of these passages supported the conclusions drawn from the sample collations.¹⁴ On the basis of these studies we chose a selection of witnesses representing various strands of the manuscript tradition to transcribe completely and a sub-set of these to report in the apparatus. For some puzzling passages we have read witnesses we have not otherwise transcribed. It remains possible, of course, that authentic readings exist in witnesses we have not read through.

The witnesses to 1 Dial. 1-5 form five families, which we call A, B, C, D, and E:

- A: We((OxAv)(VcVf))Br
- B: ToEs(BaDi)
- C: Bb(FiAnCe)
- D: CaKo(UnVd)(LcNa)LaAxFr
- E: PaLbVb(VgPc)(Ko¹⁵SaPbAr)(PzLyGs)Va¹⁶

Brackets indicate special closeness. The evidence for our grouping can be seen by scanning the apparatus;¹⁷ there are also collations and some studies posted on the project website.¹⁸

The alphabetical order of the group names does not reflect any particular theory of the transmission history but rather our assessment of the quality of their text: the readings of group *A* seem to us more likely than those of group *E* to be what Ockham wrote. However, the grouping is based not on reliability but on the sharing of clearly significant variants.¹⁹ Individual manuscripts belonging

13. See on the website sigla.html#which. One of the manuscripts, **Br**, contains only two of the seven books and a couple of others are incomplete. **14.** See Placenames.html **brief summary** **15.** Ko changes from D to E*** **16.** For more information see sigla.html. *** move this note, refer to section of printed volume** **17.** For example*****Group E 5.24.126 Romana Group E: 5.2.101 WITNESSES.698 monstrandum **18.** See MSRlns1d1.html, ms1d3frm.html, w1d4acl.html and ms1d7frm.html **19.** Our apparatus does not report insignificant variants (see below**), but many even of those reported are not significant for purposes of classification, for example omissions, which can easily be shared by coincidence.

a generally reliable group may be less reliable than others within generally less reliable groups (for example, **To**, **Ce** and **Ax** are much inferior to **Pa**). Each family contains manuscripts dating from various times through the second half of the 14th century to the end of the 15th. There does not seem to be a good correlation between date and reliability.

The traditional idea of a stemma can not easily be applied to this manuscript tradition. There is evidence of “contamination”²⁰ even at the level of the hyparchtypes.²¹ Medieval scholars regarded it as important to correct their text and to check against other witnesses if possible,²² which for widely circulated texts might make contamination the rule rather than the exception. The editorial efforts of medieval scholars may have considerably improved some manuscripts.²³ They may have made their amendments²⁴ sometimes by consulting other manuscripts, sometimes by consulting a manuscript of Gratian or Aristotle or some other source quoted, sometimes by conjecture. In some cases an author may have amended, or had someone amend, some copy or copies of a work already in circulation, though we do not believe that this happened with the *Dialogus*.²⁵

Many of our manuscripts show marginal or interlinear emendations; **Es**, **Pa**, **Lb**, and **Vg** have been amended thoroughly. None of our manuscripts is a copy of **Es**, **Pa**, **Lb**, or **Vg**, but some (we can’t know which) may descend from some heavily amended manuscripts no longer extant. In some places there are

20. That is, the incorporation into a manuscript of readings taken from some witness other than its exemplar. “Contamination” is a pejorative term. Medieval scholars who tried to improve their text were doing what a modern editor does except in two respects: they did not say which amendments were conjectures and which came from another manuscript, and when the source was a manuscript they did not say which it was. 21. See MSRIns1d1.html#contam 22. See M.A. Rouse and R.H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses* (Notre Dame, 1991), pp. 304-5, 317-8, 428-30. 23. “Among the MSS from which our MSS of the ninth and following centuries are derived, some were perhaps even more corrupt than these are, and our ninth-century MSS are revisions, which have improved on their sources by the comparison of one with another. For, viewed comprehensively, the transmission of MSS has, after all, depended not only on ignorant monkish scribes, who merely multiplied mistakes from generation to generation, but also at certain periods—and the Carolingian revival was one of them—on scholars of considerable learning and ability who were able in great measure to correct the errors of the past. No doubt they have thereby made it impossible for us to arrange the MSS in neat families, but they have preserved many a correct reading and eliminated perhaps the majority of the errors which had come to them”; Maurice Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian’s Treatises* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 130-1. Bévenot’s book is a study of a highly “contaminated” manuscript tradition. 24. I use “amendment” without implying that the change does actually mend an error. I mean that the corrector believed he was correcting the text, even though he may have been corrupting it. 25. Ockham did amend his *Ordinatio*; **see editor’s introduction** Scotus provided detailed directions for amending his *Ordinatio*.

“double” readings,²⁶ where a manuscript has the reading of one tradition together with the reading of another, because a scribe copied both text and amendment; but amendment may leave no such indication. If a manuscript has been amended from a manuscript of another family, a clean copy made from the amended manuscript might seem to have descended through the family from which the corrections were drawn, with puzzling minor agreements with another family — the minor variants would be readings the corrector overlooked or did not trouble to correct. If the revision was of only part of a manuscript, or if amendments were at first drawn from one manuscript but then later from another (for example, because the manuscript being used as a source of corrections had to be returned to its owner, or because another corrector took over, perhaps after an interval, using a different source), a copy of the corrected manuscript might seem to wander from one family to another.²⁷ **Ko** may be an example: in the early books of Part 1 it is close to **Ca**, in later books to **Vg**. George Knysh has suggested that the common ancestor of **OxAvVcVf** was a manuscript of the *E* family that had been thoroughly corrected against a manuscript resembling **We**; the evidence for this is that toward the end of Book 7 **OxAvVcVf** seem to belong to the *E* family, as if the corrector did not finish the job. If a great deal of cross-family correction had taken place, it might not have been possible to classify the witnesses into families. As it is, however, the family groups listed above are discernable, though some manuscripts (for example, **Fr, Lc, Na, Ko, Va**) are difficult to classify.

Within the five main families there are also sub-groups of witnesses that seem especially close. Some are so close that the question arises whether one is a copy of the other. One way to answer this question is to look for omissions they do not share.²⁸ Shared omissions do not tell us much about the descent of manuscripts, since such omissions can easily happen by coincidence (especially when due to homoioteleuton). But omissions not shared tell us that the manuscript from which the passage is omitted is not the (sole) exemplar or ancestor of any manuscript in which the passage is found. To justify this inference, the passage must be long enough that a copyist is unlikely to have been able to guess it word for word, it must not be a quotation from a commonly accessible source, and it must be an omission, not an addition (because a copy could contain additional text invented by the copyist). That the passage is an

26. For examples of double readings see ***** 27. “We may notice a little group of two or three repeated a number of times, and think we can safely assert interdependence for those two or three MSS; and then we find them parting company and each becoming equally friendly with some other MS or MSS, which are in turn mostly independent of each other”; Bévenot, *op. cit.* p. 124.

28. See the web site, [SignifOmissions.html](#)

omission and not an addition is more likely if it is found also in other witnesses, especially witnesses of several different families. The more examples there are of omissions not shared the surer the inference becomes.

Group A

The members of this family contain 1 Dial. only. **Br** contains books 1 and 2 only. Omissions not shared show that none of these manuscripts is a copy of any of the others.²⁹ There must have been an ancestor that is no longer extant for the whole group, another for **We**, another for the sub-group **OxAvVfVc**, and another for each of the pairs **OxAv** and **VfVc**.

Matthias Eifler dates **We** to about 1340-45.³⁰ This date would make **We** the earliest of the extant *Dialogus* manuscripts, copied while Ockham was still alive.³¹ Although this is the earliest manuscript and one of the ones we find most plausible, we do not regard it as infallible. Even if it was copied in Ockham's lifetime, he may not have supervised the copying closely or at all. We follow **We** other things being equal; we often follow **We** even against all or most manuscripts, but not always.

Ox, **Av**, **Vf** and **Vc** are closer to one another than any of them is to **We**. They all contain the same alphabetical *tabula* or index.³² **Ox** was copied some time before 1444, **Av** seems to date also from the first half of the 15th century.³³ Textually and in presentation **Ox** and **Av** are close. **Ox** has a brief summary at the top of each chapter, **Av** has the same summaries in 1 Dial. 1-3 inclusive and leaves a space for a summary from then onwards.³⁴ Perhaps the writer of **Av** knew that a document containing chapter summaries existed, or would become

29. **We** omits, the others have: 3.4.8-10, 5.4.29-30, 5.36.54. **Ox** omits, the others have: 1.11.25-7, 2.19.31-2, 3.5.39-41, 4.3.20-22, 4.33.19-20. **Av** omits, the others have: 2.10.34-5, 3.5.70-1, 4.13.72, 4.14.92-4. **Vf** omits, the others have: 3.9.69-71, 3.10.40-1, 4.9.11-12. **Vc** omits, the others have: 4.24.11-12. 30. See Matthias Eifler, *Katalog der lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek*, <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/projekt-Weimar-pdfs/Q-23.pdf> 31. For the date of Ockham's death, see Jürgen Miethke, "Zu Wilhelm Ockhams Tod", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 61 (1968), pp. 79-98 ("9. Mai 1348"); Gedeon Gal, "William of Ockham Died *Impenitent* in April 1347", *Franciscan Studies*, 42, Annual 20, 1982, pp. 90-5; G. Knysh, *Ockham Perspectives* (Winnipeg, 1994), pp. 27-8 ("9 April 1348"). 32. An edition of the *Tabula alphabetica* will be found on the website. In **Av**, **Ox** and **Vf** this index ends part way through the section "Rex". In **Vc** it has been continued in another hand to the end of the alphabet. (The shorter version does not seem to be a partial copy, since the first few entries of the continuation show some confusion and its general quality seems lower.***) 33. For information on the dates of these manuscripts and of others discussed in this introduction see below, p. ???, Descriptions. The descriptions also provide some information on the physical structure of the manuscripts. *****eliminate references to descriptions from other notes***** 34. A transcription of the chapter summaries of **Ox** will be found on the website, OxCapitula.html

available, and left space at the top of each chapter but never finished copying the summaries in. We do not know whether the maker of **Ox** did the same but completed the job, or whether the summaries were already in his exemplar. These chapter summaries are not found in any other manuscript.

Vf and **Vc** are also very close to one another textually and in presentation. **Vc** has impressive artwork at the beginning of each Book, but the corresponding folios of **Vf** were long ago removed; presumably they were taken because they also showed impressive artwork. Other features suggest that the both manuscripts were made by the same copyist, or at least in the same scriptorium, at about the same time. The handwriting seems the same, both are in two columns (**Ox** and **Av** are in one column), in both manuscripts “Jesus” is written at the beginning of each gathering, there is a similar treatment of catchwords and of the numbering of sheets within the gathering. **Vf** and **Vc** seem to date from the 1470s,³⁵ which makes them about contemporary with **Fr** and the first printed edition. Although **Vf** and **Vc** are close textually they do sometimes differ, and then **Vf** generally seems the better text.

In our apparatus we regularly report **We**, **Ox**, **Av**, **Vf** and **Vc**. The group siglum **A** is used for any three of these five witnesses.³⁶

Group B

The members of this family all contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. **Ba**, **To** and **Es** belonged to Dominican convents. **Di** belonged (at least in the late 15th century) to the monastery of Cîteaux; the binding for their library was done after 1495, as is shown by the fact that its last gathering (an integral part of the bound volume) includes material that must have been copied from the 1495 printed

35. See R. Scholz, *Unbekannte Kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327-1354)* (Rome, 1911), pp. 143-4; G.J. Etkorn, *Iter Vaticanum Franciscanum* (Leiden-New York-Köln, 1996), p. 211; Jürgen Miethke, “Marsilius und Ockham: Publikum und Leser ihrer Politischen Schriften im Späteren Mittelalter”, *Medioevo* 6 (1980), pp. 534-558, at p. 559, n. 54. Scholz dates **Vf** to the 15th century. Scholz and Etkorn both date **Vc** to the 14th century, but the evidence Miethke presents shows that **Vc** was completed in the 1470s. The similarities noted in the text suggest that **Vc** and **Vf** date from about the same time. The artwork in **Vc** is attributed to men who were active from the 1470s. The artwork of fol. 1r suggests ****who says?*** that the codex was a gift from Bartolomeo della Rovere OFM, bishop of Ferrara 1474-1494, to his uncle, Pope Sixtus IV, Francesco della Rovere OFM, pope 1471-1484. 36. If any of the five, say **Vc**, does not agree with the others, its disagreement is indicated thus: “A(-Vc)”.

edition (**Ly**).³⁷ **Bi** is a fragment containing only a few chapters of 1 Dial. 2 (from 2.4.119 to 2.7.13).³⁸

In 1 Dial. 1-5 the members of this group are close textually to the manuscripts of Group **A**, but in some places they have their own distinctive text.³⁹ For instance, all manuscripts of this group, and no others, refer to Gerard Odonis as “now” general of the Franciscan order, which suggests that their ancestor already existed before 1343 (and also that whoever introduced this remark did not share the dissident Franciscans’ view that Gerard was never legitimately head of the Order). **To** is a very faulty manuscript; **Es** in its original state was also faulty but was then thoroughly amended and in its corrected state is close to **Ba**; **Di** in some places seems close to **Ba**.⁴⁰ One might think that **Es** was copied from **To** and then corrected from a better manuscript, that **Ba** was either a fair copy made from **Es** after correction or else was itself the better manuscript from which **Es** was corrected, and that **Di** was a copy of **Ba** or vice versa. However, these hypotheses are ruled out by omissions in each manuscript of passages found in some or all of the others. **Es** before correction contains passages not found in **To**,⁴¹ and **To** contains passages not found in **Es** before correction,⁴² so one cannot be a copy of the other. Likewise **Ba** has passages not found (or found only incompletely or in a disordered state) in **Es** before correction or even after correction,⁴³ so that **Ba** is not a copy made from **Es** before it was corrected or after correction; some of the passages added by correction in **Es** are not found in **Ba**,⁴⁴ so **Es** was not corrected from **Ba** (at least, not from **Ba** alone). **Di** and **Ba** each omits passages found in the other,⁴⁵ so neither is a copy of the other.

In short, in 1 Dial. no member of the **B** family is a copy of any of the others. They independently represent an ancestor no longer extant. As the fragment **Bi** illustrates, there may have been other manuscripts of this family that have not survived; indeed relationships among the survivors imply that several others did

37. See description, below, p. xxxvii, and, with links to images, sigla.html#Di. **38.** Since the text is short, we cannot be sure of its affinities, but the following apparatus entries suggest that **Bi** belongs to group B: 2.4.122 videar, 2.5.8. argumento, 2.5.11 argumento, 2.5.18 intenderim, 2.5.18 istis, 2.5.18 amplius, 2.5.22 illis veritatibus, 2.5.28 comprehendi, 2.5.32 aliorum, 2.5.32 que. (Note: references including lemmata are to the apparatus.)* **39.** For readings characteristic of Group B see Prologus.40 Michaellem... Cesena, Prologus. 41 Othonis, 5.2.67 manifeste, 5.2.6.59 mendicatum. **others** **40.** See 5.7.118 parti, 5.8.11 dicas. **but close to Es at 5.9.33-4 valeret, potuit, fidelium** **41.** For example, 1.5.7-12, 3.8.3-4, 4.10.76-8, 5.35.38-40. There are many others. **42.** Prologus.59-60, 4.26.77, 5.13.31-2, 5.15.111-2. **43.** See 1.12.12-7, 2.29.19, 4.9.52-4, 4.30.6-7, 5.8.17, 5.24.105-110. **44.** See 5.24.61-3, 5.25.28-9. **45.** In **Di** and not **Ba**: 1.8.23-4, 2.4.47-9, 3.6.115-6, 4.19.19-20, 5.15.62-4. In **Ba** and not **Di**: 1.12.12-17, 3.1.49, 4.30.40-3, 5.3.144-5.

exist (the source of the corrections to **Es**, the intermediaries that explain similarities and differences between **Ba** and **Di**, **Es** and **To**). The ancestor of the group may have been a member of the **A** family, or it may have been copied from an ancestor of the **A** family, or it may have been copied from a manuscript of another family that had been corrected from a manuscript akin to the **A** group. **Ba** seems the best of the **B** group. It shares with **We** some significant variants not found in other members of the family,⁴⁶ suggesting perhaps that its ancestor had been corrected (or corrected additionally) from a manuscript similar to **We**.

Unlike the **A** and **C** families, which contain only 1 Dial., manuscripts of the **B** family also contain 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. The fact that each of the two earliest members of this family, **To** and **Es**, neither of which is a copy of the other, has the same handwriting throughout suggests that the three components were combined by some early member of this family before any of its extant examples was made. Textually the members of this family are close to one another in all three components.

For 2 Dial. **Ba** and **Es** are particularly close. Both of these, but not **To** and **Di**, include generally identical marginal summaries of the argument. Textually they are so close that in 2 Dial. (not, as we have argued above, in 1 Dial.) one might be a copy of the other. Omissions not shared show that **Es** was not a copy of **Ba**,⁴⁷ but we have not noticed any omissions proving that **Ba** could not be a copy of **Es**. Perhaps they both descend independently from a common ancestor. Since both have the displacement of text that seems to have originated in **Vb**, both manuscripts must post-date **Vb**.⁴⁸ **Vb** existed in 1413, but we do not know when it was written or how long afterwards **Ba** and **Es** were written.

The text of 3.2 Dial. in **Es** ends with the remark, “Hic est finis istius doctoris quia non reperitur plus parisius”, which suggests either that **Es** was copied at least partly in Paris (according to a note on the front of the manuscript it was copied in Toulouse), or that the copyist had made inquiries in Paris, or, more likely, that **Es** had a Parisian exemplar. (“Doctoris” is presumably an error for

⁴⁶. They both have two passages not found in any other witness (see 2.13.72 vel... simul; 4.39.34 censendus). They both share an error not found in any other witness (see 1.10.29 sanctiones). In three places (1.8.43 sed, 5.5.53 predecessorum, 5.15.38 ita) **Ba** has both the reading of **We** and the reading of other members of the **B** group. At 5.18 5.19 and 5.21 **We**, **Ba** and **Di** begin a chapter, **To**, **Es** and some other manuscripts do not. *check chapters* ⁴⁷. **Es** is not likely to be a copy of **Ba**. **in 2.1Dial **Es** has summary not in **Ba**, s 88. **Es** has passages not in **Ba**, s 208, 214. 2.2 Dial. s 260, 267, 293 (summary), 298/93 out of place in **Ba**, 314 (but **Es** may be wrong), 324, 327 ** ⁴⁸. The whole of **Es** must post-date **Vb**, since **Es** is in the same hand throughout. **Ba** changes hands just one folio before the end of 1 Dial.; perhaps someone completed its copy of 1 Dial., or replaced the last folio, before going on to copy 2 Dial., so its copy of 1 Dial. may be earlier than **Vb**. *what are the gatherings of **Ba**?*

“dialogi”, which suggests that the comment was copied from an exemplar.) Marginal corrections on the last page of 3.2 Dial. suggests that a corrector of **Es**, though not the scribes or editors of other members of this family, had access to a manuscript, not now extant, belonging to a different family for 3.2 Dial.⁴⁹ **Ba** may bind together two originally separate manuscripts, one containing 1 Dial. and 2 Dial., the other 3.2 Dial.

Thus it seems that for 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. **Es** may have some sort of priority over **Ba**, but for 1 Dial. **Ba** and **Es** as corrected are independent of one another.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Ba** and **Es**. The group siglum **B** is used for both **Ba** and **Es**.

Group C

Except for **Fi**, manuscripts of this group contain Part 1 of the *Dialogus* only. **Fi** also contains Part 2, but it is written in a different hand; the codex seems to bind together two manuscripts that were originally separate. The 1 Dial. part of **Fi** must have been made before 1372, **Bb** has been dated to mid-14th century; these are among the earliest of our witnesses. **Ce** was copied later, between 1452 and 1465.⁵⁰ Textually **Bb** stands somewhat apart from the other members of the group. **Fi** and **An** are so close that it seemed possible one might seem a copy of the other. However, omissions not shared show that neither is a copy of the other. **An** and **Fi** must both be faithful representatives of a non-extant ancestor; **Bb**, which omits passages found in the others, must have another ancestor again.

These manuscripts are distinguished from the **A** and **B** families mainly by shared omissions, many of which are found also in families **D** and **E** (which are distinguished by further omissions and other variants).

In our apparatus we regularly report **Bb**, **Fi** and **An**. The group siglum **C** is used for any two of these three witnesses.

Group D

La, **Lc** and **Ax** contain 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. only; **Ca**, **Vd**, **Un**, and **Na** contain 1 Dial, 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial (in **Na** each part was written by a different copyist). According to Gilbert Ouy **Ca** was written by a copyist who sometimes worked for Pierre d’Ailly. **Ca**, **Na** and **Ax** have been dated to the late 14th century and the others to the 15th century, **La** to late in the century.

⁴⁹. See sigla.html#EsEnd ⁵⁰. For dates of **Fi**, **Bb** and **Ce** see descriptions, below, p. xxxvi.

Among these manuscripts there is more textual diversity than there is among families *A*, *B* and *C*. Its members agree or differ without any apparent pattern.⁵¹ Their diversity may be due to “contamination”; perhaps some of them, or their particular ancestors, were copied from *D* group manuscripts that had been amended from of some other family, or from manuscripts of some other family that had been corrected by group *D* manuscripts. It is possible that this family descends from a manuscript of the *E* family that had been amended or somewhat rewritten conjecturally.

Ca and **Vd** seem to be reasonably good witnesses to the text. **Un** has lost folios from the beginning and from the end; textually it is close to **Vd**. **La** and **Lc** have many omissions. **Na** is damaged and in places illegible; it seems close to **Lc**. **Ax** has many omissions and implausible readings.

Fr contains 1 Dial., 2 Dial., *Compendium errorum*, 3.1 Dial., 3.2 Dial. and *Octo questiones*. Of **Fr** Offler remarks that “it is the work of a careless scribe, who often did not bother to ensure that what he wrote made sense; many of his blunders are too crass to warrant printing”. Perhaps the scribe was careful but worked from a faulty exemplar. In Book 4 **Fr** contains some long passages not found in other witnesses, not authentic, perhaps composed by an owner of some ancestor of **Fr**. Some of its variants seem to be paraphrase of the common text. **Fr** shows signs of borrowing from some witness belonging to the *A* or *B* groups. It has a number of marginal corrections, apparently derived from some other manuscript or manuscripts, which may include authentic readings. **Fr** contains a preface otherwise found only in **We** [on back of preliminary gathering, after a number of blank pages].

Fr often quotes more of the canon law text, sometimes thereby obscuring the point (e.g. see 5.3.60 non...). On the other hand, the Bible references often have the wrong numbers. There are many changes of word order, substitutions of synonyms, “vero” for “autem”, simplification of formule for introducing references (“ut habetur” or “ait enim” and the like often omitted, or replaced by “dicit sic”), occasional substitution of different argument or a different way of putting the argument, explanatory comments or words to fill out the logic of the argument: in short **Fr** (or its ancestor) has (or had) an idiosyncratic version of the text. (Note that **Fr** continues past *antistitem* without a change of hand.) See extra authority added at “*potestatem*” 5.20.11. **Fr** seems close to group *D*. It is regularly reported in our apparatus.

51. See 5.1.48 quia etsi, 5.2.17 valent, 5.2.22 allegationi.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Ca**, **Vd**, **La**, **Lc** and **Fr**. The group siglum **D** is used for any three of these five.

Group E

Pa, **Vb**, **Ko** and **Sa** contain 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. only; **Ar**, **Pb** and **Pc** contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial., and **Pz** and **Ly** contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. **Pz** also contains *Compendium errorum*. According to notes found in these manuscripts, **Pa** was completed on 11 May 1389 (which makes it one of the earliest of the manuscripts), **Lb** existed before 1444 and **Vb** before 1413. **Pb**, **Pc** and **Vg** have been dated by handwriting to the 14th century, the rest to the 15th.

Va is a member of the **E** group, but it seems that an ancestor was amended from an **A**-group manuscript, the emendations being incorporated in the text of **Va**; in some places there are “double” readings.⁵² **Va** often shares significant variants with other members of the **E** group,⁵³ perhaps especially with **Vg**,⁵⁴ when that group disagrees with group **A**. In other places, however, **Va** shares significant variants with members of group **A**,⁵⁵ perhaps especially with **Vc**,⁵⁶ and disagrees with the other members of group **E**.

One hypothesis to explain the inferiority of the text found in the members of group **E** is that they are copies of copies of copies, in which errors had accumulated. The early date of **Pa** suggests that the author’s text had deteriorated quickly. Another hypothesis is that, on the contrary, these represent the earliest version of the text, the one closest to Ockham’s original publication, while the **A** and **B** families, more plausible rather than more reliable, represent conjectural improvements made by editors working after Ockham’s time. Or perhaps the improvements were made by Ockham himself, when he realised that a faulty text was in circulation. There seems to be no way of choosing between these possibilities.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Pa**, **Vg**, **Va**, **Pz** and **Ly**. The group siglum **E** is used for any three of these five.

Combinations of Parts

52. *double readings in Va 53. *places where Va goes with E against A 54. *places where Va goes with Vg against A 55. *places where Va goes with A against E 56. *places where Va goes with Vc

Codices belonging to groups *A* and *C* contain only 1 Dial., but many codices of groups *B*, *D* and *E* include both 1 Dial. and 2 Dial., some include also 3.2 Dial., a few also 3.1 Dial.; some codices have other combinations. Let us call the various parts and tractates the “components” of the *Dialogus*.⁵⁷ For 1 Dial. there are five families we have called A-E. The witnesses to 2 Dial. fall into two families we may call X and Y.⁵⁸ The witnesses to 3.2 Dial. fall into three families we may call P, Q and R. For Part 3.1 there are too few witnesses to form families, but there are three versions of the text that we may call L, M and N. Codices containing several components may combine these families in various ways. For example, the codices **Ca** and **Un** both belong to the *D* family for 1 Dial., but for 2 Dial. **Ca** belongs to the X group and **Un** to the Y group; we can represent **Ca** and **Un** respectively as DX and DY. **Ar** and **Pz** can be represented respectively as EXR and EXMP. If two codices containing two or more components had been copied from beginning to end from the same exemplar, we would expect them to show the same combination: for example, a DX exemplar would beget DX copies. It is harder to understand how the combinations could be mixed (e.g. one DX, another DY).

It seems that the various components of the *Dialogus* were first put into circulation separately from one other. Presumably Ockham put 1 Dial. into circulation by itself, soon after he finished it; at any rate, it circulated separately, as the A and C groups show. Neither 3.1 Dial. nor 3.2 Dial. was completed, it seems, and they seem at first to have circulated separately from one another and from the other components; this is shown by the fact that their manuscript affiliations are different. No one who had a separate copy of what has come to be 2 Dial. would have had any indication in the text that it was part of the *Dialogus*, but the Prologue to 1 Dial. would have alerted a copyist or reader to the likely existence of Parts 2 and 3, and the prologue to either tractate of 3 Dial. would have indicated that this was the third part of the work and that Part 3 had included at least one other tractate.⁵⁹ Thus anyone who had 1 Dial., 3.1 Dial. or

57. The two tracts of 2 Dial. may originally have circulated separately, but in all extant copies they go together and each belongs to a single family. 58. If a manuscript belongs to one family for one tractate, it will belong to the same family for the other: these two components seem never to have circulated separately. 59. Prologue to 1 Dial.: “I want it [this work] to be divided into three tractates, the first of which I want to be called, ‘On heretics’, the second, ‘On the teachings of John XXII’, and the third ‘On the deeds of those disputing about orthodox faith’. I consider that the whole work should be called ‘The Dialogue’.” Prologue to 3.1 Dial.: “Let us therefore turn our attention... to the third part of our dialogue, which from the beginning I have wanted to be entitled, ‘Of the deeds of those who are quarrelling about the orthodox faith’. I want it to be divided into nine tractates, each of which I believe should be divided into various books.” Prologue to 3.2 Dial.: “After the tract about the power of the pope and clergy, therefore, let there be added a tract on the

3.2 Dial. would have searched for, or kept an eye out for, other components of the work.

Suppose at some time there was a manuscript containing only 1 Dial. in the version of family D. Suppose some scholar using it or making a copy realised from the Prologue that there might be a Part 2 somewhere, went looking for it, and happened to find a copy of (what he wrongly assumed was) Part 2, in the version of family X. Suppose another possessor of 1 Dial. in version D made a search and found 2 Dial., this time in version Y. The outcome would be two combinations, one DX, the other DY. If the possessors of these manuscripts also went looking for Part 3, the outcome might be the combinations DXR and DYQ.

If the additional components found were separately existing manuscripts, the components might then be bound together into a codex in which there was a change of handwriting (cf. **Pc**, which contains 1 Dial., 3.2 Dial. and 2 Dial., in that order, in different hands).⁶⁰ If an additional component found was already part of another codex, the scholar who found it might copy it into his manuscript in his own hand, or he might arrange for another copyist to complete his codex with a copy of the additional component in a different hand. **Note that for 2 Dial. many MSS descend, directly or indirectly, from Vb (which had two scribes, one writing 1 Dial. 6 and 7 with 2 Dial.). What combinations do the descendants exhibit? The 1 Dial. components of these may belong to different traditions. **B** show BY, LbSaVaVb show Ey, AxLaLcUnNa show Dy. **

rights of the Roman Empire... to which [i.e. the remaining tracts] these first two tracts of the third part of our dialogue are preparations and preambles.”

⁶⁰ **Fi** may consist of two originally separate manuscripts, **Pc** of three. **Na**, **Pb** and **Un** may have been manuscripts containing 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. to which an originally separate 3.2 Dial. has been added. See the descriptions of these manuscripts, p. xxxi ff.

Displaced fragment: **Vb** seems to have been done by two copyists (a new hand and a new gathering at the beginning of 1 Dial. 6) but to have been a single project. (**Va** was made by a single copyist in two stages: 1 Dial. 7 and 2 Dial., then 1 Dial. 1-6.) See pp. xlvi, xlvii.

Some copies of 1 Dial. (e.g. **We**, and perhaps others not now extant) may have been made before the other parts were in circulation. Some scholars may not have made a search for other components or may not have found all of them. Only three codices contain 3.1 Dial., many do not contain 3.2 Dial., some contain only 3.2 Dial., and many (and the best) contain only 1 Dial. Some codices include the *Compendium errorum* (Ce), a more plausible candidate for inclusion as Part 2 than the existing 2 Dial.; for example, **Mz** has the combination LQCe. One manuscript and one early printing contain both 2 Dial. and Ce. **Fr**, for example, has the combination DYCeMR, **Pz** has in some copies EXCeNQ and in other copies EXNQCe.

The hypothesised activities of scholars seeking to complete their copy of the *Dialogus* is of a piece with their attempts to correct their manuscripts, as shown for example in the marginal and interlinear additions to **Pa** and **Lb**. It is also of a piece with attempts (e.g. by Simon de Plumetot) to gather together into their libraries, sometimes bound into single codices, several related works (e.g. **Mz**, **Ve**). We can also see such research in attempts to continue the text of 3.2 Dial. beyond the word “antistitem” (e.g. **Es**, **Di**, **Fr**). The attempts of scholars to find more of the *Dialogus* are attested also by the already-quoted copyist’s remark at the end of **Es**, “non reperitur plus parisius”, and by d’Ailly’s remark at the end of his *Abbreviatio*, “Et non plus de hoc notabili opere potui reperire” (Murdoch, p. 127).

SIGLA USED IN THE APPARATUS

See below**, “Witnesses to the Text”.

In addition:

A: All of **We**, **Ox**, **Av**, **Vc** and **Vf**.

B: Both **Ba** and **Es**.

-b: between the lines (e.g. “Esb” refers to something written between the lines in the manuscript **Es**).

C: All of **Bb**, **Fi** and **An**.

D: All of **Ca**, **Vd**, **La**, **Lc** and **Fr**.

E: All of Pa, Vg, Va, Pz and Ly.

Ed: Both of Pz and Ly.

-m: in the margin (e.g. “Esm” refers to something written in the margin of the manuscript Es).

S: The reading of the modern edition of a quoted text. (The edition is identified in the note on the passage.)

-s: inserted into the line of text, e.g. over an erasure (e.g. “Ess” refers to something inserted into the text of the manuscript Es).

W: All (or almost all) the witnesses we have collated, except any explicitly mentioned elsewhere in the same entry.

WITNESSES TO THE TEXT

John Kilcullen

With contributions by George Knysh, John Scott and Jan Ballweg. This is a somewhat condensed version of <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/sigla.html>. For the manuscripts of 2 Dial. see Jan Ballweg, <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/Wit2DialBallwegTr.html>

needs possible line breaks, widow/orphan, headers

An: Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, manuscript 197

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols 1r-155r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5r, 16v, 20v, 29v, 47r, 103r.

Published Information: Guiseppe Abate and Giovanni Luisetto, *Codici e manoscritti della Biblioteca Antoniana* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza Editore), 1975, pp. 219-220. Dates manuscript to fourteenth century. Quotes note in the bottom margin of fol. 1: “Magister Laurentius conduxit in Paduam 2 Aprilis 1409 m. sua.” See Gargan, L.: “Le note ‘conduxit’. Libri di maestri e studenti nelle Università italiane del Tre e Quattrocento”, in Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.), *Manuels, programmes de cours et techniques d’enseignement dans les Universités médiévales* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1994), pp. 385-400.

Ar: Paris, Bibliothèque de L’Arsenal, Lat. 517

Contents: Petrus de Alliaco (d’Ailly), *Abbreviatio* (fols. 1-15), 1 Dial., (fols. 17r-238r), 2 Dial. (fols. 238r-257r), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 257r-303v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 25v, 46v, 54r, 71r, 96v, 172v.

Published Information: Martin, Henry, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal*, t. I (Paris: Plon, 1885), p. 366. Dates manuscript to the 15th century.

According to Ian Murdoch, *Critical Edition of Pierre D’Ailly’s Abbreviatio Dyalogi Okan* (Thesis, Monash University, 1981), p. xlvi, the watermarks suggest that **Ar** was written “probably not before about 1430 and possibly not for thirty years or so later”.

In three legible hands. One scribe wrote fols. 17r to 69v (col. a, line 10), another took over briefly to 73r (col. a, line 9), the first scribe then resumed to 75v (col. b, line 8), and a third scribe finished the *Dialogus* and copied the *Abbreviatio*, which is bound at the front of the volume. 1 Dial. ends and 2 Dial. begins on the

same page (238r), 2 Dial. ends and 3.2 Dial. begins on the same page (257r); the three parts always made one MS.

Ar ends part way through 3.2 Dial. 3.17, at "hoc multis rationibus improbatum primo" (=Ly fol. 271v a53)

Au: Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale, MS. Lat. 252 (213)

Contents: 3.2 Dial. (fols. 88-140). Manuscript also contains "Tractatus de ecclesiastica potestate", by Alexander de Sancto Elpidio, "Determinatio compendiosa de jurisdictione imperii et auctoritate summi pontificis", by Tolomeo of Lucca, and "Tractatus de potestate regia et papali", by John of Paris.

Published Information: *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, t. VI: Auxerre (Paris: Plon, 1887), pp. 87-8. Dates manuscript to the 14th century. Seventeenth century note: "Monasterii S. Germani Autissiodorensis".

3.2 Dial. ends with the word "antistitem" (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Av: Bibliothèque municipale, Avignon, manuscript 324

Contents: Tabula (fol. 1r-12v); 1 Dial. (fol. 13r-311v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 21v, 43r, 51r, 69r, 105v, 218r.

Published Information: M. L.-H. Labande, *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, t. XXVII: Avignon, t. I (Paris: Plon, 1894), pp. 235-6. Dates manuscript to the first part of the 15th century. Quotes note on fol. 312v: "Frater Matheus Chenzeti, ordinis fratrum Predicatorum, conventus Avenionis". About Chenzeti nothing seems to be known.

Contains the same tabula as **Vc**. At the beginning of each chapter there is a summary, the same as in **Ox**, to the end of 1 Dial. 1-3 (50r); from the beginning of 1 Dial. 4 (51r) at the top of each chapter a space is left for a summary to be added later.

Ax: Bibliothèque Méjanes, Aix-en-Provence, manuscript Lat. 1463 (1329)

Contents: 1 Dial. (fol. 1-175), 2 Dial. (fol. 176-191r). ***Books of 1 Dial. begin***

Published Information: *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, t. XLV: Paris-Besançon-Aix, 2e

Supplément, (Paris: Plon, 1915), p. 478. Dates manuscript to 14th century. (Knysh: The possibility that this is a 15th century manuscript cannot be excluded.)

Gift of Auguste Pécoul, 1906. According to biographical information available in the Bibliothèque Méjanes, A. Pécoul spent time in the diplomatic service and had connections throughout Europe. See also H. Lemonnier, "Auguste Pécoul", *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, Année 1916, Volume 77 n. 77, pp. 388-390. We do not know where he acquired the MS or where it was written.

Ba: Universitätsbibliothek Basel, A.VI.5

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 2r-349v), 2 Dial. (fols. 350r-379v), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 380r-427v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 11v, 35r, 43r, 62r, 102v, 230r.

"Iste liber est fratrum predicatorum domus Basiliensis" (fol. 1r). Three hands, with changes at 348v-349r (just one folio before the end of 1 Dial.) and 379v-380r. The library's handwritten description dates this manuscript to the 15th century.

3.2 Dial. ends at "antistem" (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Bb: Universitätsbibliothek Basel, B.VI.2

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 2r-225r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 7r, 21v, 27r, 40r, 66v, 154r.

Published Information: Gustav Meyer, Max Burckhardt and Martin Steinmann, *Die Mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Basel, Abteilung B: Theologische Pergamenthandschriften*, Band I (Basel, 1960), pp. 569-571. Dates manuscript to mid-14th century. A note at 225v says: "Iste liber est fratrum predicatorum domus Basiliensis et est de libris Magistri Iohannis de Effringen". We do not know when this note was written. If the information is correct, Bb is an early MS. (Ioh. de Effringen died in 1375). See also Miethke, "Marsilius und Ockham: Publikum und Leser ihre Politischen Schriften im Späteren Mittelalter", *Medioevo* 6 (1980), p. 551.

In the margins there are argument summaries in boxes (e.g. 10r, 28v, 29r). There is a critical comment at 3v.

Br: Stadtbibliothek Braunschweig, MS cxlviii

Contents: 1 Dial., books 1 and 2 only (fol. 96a-119b).

Published Information: Heinrich Nentwig, *Die Mittelalterlichen Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Braunschweig* (Wolfenbüttel, 1893), p. 132.

The codex, like many others described in Nentwig's Catalog originating from the Franciscan convent of Braunschweig, is a collection of short pieces or extracts (often incomplete) on miscellaneous topics written by various hands -- as if some librarian gathered up loose pieces and bound them into a volume.

Bi: Bischöflichen Zentralbibliothek Regensburg, Fragment I.3.16

This is a fragment containing 1 Dial. 2 part-way through c. 4 to the end of c. 7.

Benedikt Konrad Vollmann, *Fragmente der Bischöflichen Zentralbibliothek Regensburg: Nichtliturgische Fragmente—Theologische Abhandlungen und Varia* (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2009).

Ca: Bibliothèque Municipale Classée, Cambrai, manuscript Lat. 286 (271)

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-163r), 2 Dial. (fols. 163r-179r), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 179r-217v), and a list of chapters of 3.2 Dial. (fols. 218r-221r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5v, 16v, 21r, 31r, 50v, 109v.

Published Information: Auguste Molinier, *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, t. XVII: Cambrai (Paris: Plon, 1891), p. 109. Dates manuscript to 14th century. On fol 163r: "Explicit liber septimus prime partis Dyalogorum... J. Maurroy".

Unpublished letter from Gilbert Ouy to Ian Murdoch: Ca "est écrit vers la fin du XI^{ve} siècle"; Maurroy "devait travailler pour Pierre d'Ailly". Murdoch (*op. cit.*, p. xxxiv) suggests that this manuscript belonged to d'Ailly but was not the copy from which he made the *Abbreuiatio*.

All three parts are written in same hand. There is some difference in the rubrication of III.ii compared with first two parts.

3.2 Dial. ends at "antistem" (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Ce: Biblioteca Comunale Malatestiana, Cesena, Codice Malatestiano D. XIX 2

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1r-188v); from fol. 189r Michael of Cesena, "Dilucidatio super Psalmum Miserere". 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 6v, 20v, 26r, 38r, 61r, 133r.

Published Information: Description by Ilaria Maggiulli, <http://www.malatestiana.it/manoscritti/manus/D.19.2.htm>. R. Zazzeri, *Sui codici e libri a stampa della*

Biblioteca Malatestiana di Cesena (Cesena 1887), pp. 160-1. Albinia C. de La Mare, “Lo scriptorium di Malatesta Novello”, in Fabrizio Lollini and Piero Lucchi (eds.), *Libreria Domini: I manoscritti della Biblioteca Malatestiana: testi e decorazioni* (Bologna, 1995), pp. 34- 93, esp. pp. 60 and 92. According to de La Mare, this manuscript was written for the noble patron Malatesta Novello by two unnamed scribes (handwriting changes from 146v to 147r) sometime between 1452 and 1465.

Di: Bibliothèque Municipale, Dijon, manuscript 340 (249)

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-274v), 2 Dial. (fols. 274v-299v), 3.2 Dial (fols. 299v-377v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 9r, 27v, 33v, 52r, 91v, 189v.

Published Information: Auguste Molinier, Henri Auguste Omont, Etienne Bougenot and Philippe Guignard, *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Départements*, t. V: Dijon (Paris: Plon, 1889), pp. 92. Dates manuscript to 15th century.

Ballweg has drawn attention to the changes of handwriting in this manuscript. It consists of gatherings (beginning 2r, 22r, 40r, 64r, 88r, 108r, 126r, 146r, 166r, 184r, 200r, 220r, 245r, 265r, 285r, 303r, 323r, 345r, 365v) each written by a different hand. This suggests that the manuscript was produced quickly by taking its exemplar to pieces for simultaneous copying (cf. **We**).

What was apparently originally the last gathering ended (fol. 365v) at the equivalent of **Ly**, fol. 270 a23 (at the word “antistitem”, the point at which a number of other MSS also end). Just before the end two passages were omitted (= **Ly** fol. 269v b2-40, fol. 270r b17-55). The first of these omitted passages is not supplied. However, some time later the passage on 365v following the point at which the second omission (= **Ly** fol. 270r b56-270v a23) had been made was crossed out and text equivalent to **Ly** fol. 270r b17 to the end of **Ly** was copied in a new hand, continuing into what is now the last gathering (which begins on 366r). Before this change of handwriting, the chapter numbering in **Di** was one ahead of **Ly**, i.e. the chapter including the material deleted was ch. 17, whereas in **Ly** it is ch. 16. After the new hand takes over, the chapter numbering is the same as in **Ly**, and each chapter has a content summary identical with the summaries found in **Ly** and (as far as we know) in no earlier witness. The last sentence “Et hec de tertia parte dialogorum pro nunc tibi sufficiant”, is found otherwise only in **Ly** (not in **Pz**). These facts suggest that the last gathering of **Di** was copied from **Ly** (published 1494). Since the last gathering is integral to the manuscript as at present bound, the manuscript must have been bound after

the publication of **Ly**, though presumably the bulk of the volume had been copied some (undetermined) time earlier. Only the binding establishes any relationship between this manuscript and the Cistercian order and there is otherwise no indication of ownership. Since it was in their possession, it may well have been copied by or for a member of the order, but we cannot be sure.

Es: Escorial, Biblioteca privada de los padres Agustinos de El Escorial

Contents: 1 Dial. (fol. 1-175r), 2 Dial. (175r-192v), 3.2 Dial. (192v-232r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5v, 17r, 21v, 32r, 52r, 114v.

Published Information: Jose Maria Ozaeta, O.S.A., "Codice de los 'Dialogos' de Ockham en la biblioteca privada de los PP. Agustinos del Escorial", *Ciudad de Dios* 189 (1976), pp. 493-512. Dates manuscript to the late 14th or early 15th century. Cf. also ** *Collectanea Franciscana*, t. XIV, fasc. 3, n. 4255.

Contains emendations throughout, some in the margins, some between lines, some written into gaps in the text or over erasures, also notes ("Nota...") and other comments. These emendations were apparently not made by the original scribe. Some decoration of initial capitals, sometimes with vertical lines and two circles making a strange face. On the page on which 1 Dial. ends 2 Dial. begins (175r), on the page 2 Dial. ends 3.2 Dial. begins (192v): the three parts always made one MS.

A comment at the end of the main text (232r) after the word "antistitem" ("hic est finis istius doctoris quia non reperitur plus parisius deo laus et virgini intemerate") suggests either that Es was copied at least partly in Paris (a note opposite fol. 1r suggests it was copied in Toulouse) or that the copyist had made inquiries in Paris or, more likely, that Es had a Parisian exemplar. If "doctoris" is an error for "dialogi" the comment may have been copied from the exemplar.

Fi: Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Florence, ex. Biblioteca S. Crocis, Plut. XXXVI, dext., cod. 11

Available online at <http://teca.bmlonline.it/TecaRicerca/index.jsp>, search for Plut.36dex.11).

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-126v), 2 Dial. (fols. 127r-141v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 4v, 13r, 16r, 23r, 38r, 86r.

Published Information: A.M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, t. IV (Florence), cols. 716-7. "Saec. partim XIII. et partim XIV. binis columnis, duplici manu". On preliminary page (preceding 1r): Iste liber est ad usum fratris Ludovici de Nerlis, quem emit

parisius dum ibidem studens existerit anno domini mcccclxxii. According to Bandini, 2 Dial may have been written by Tedaldus da Casa.

1 Dial. and 2 Dial. are in different hands. It seems likely that 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. were written separately and later bound into one volume. We do not know when the note referring to Ludovico de Nerli was written. If the information is correct, the copy of 1 Dial. must have been made before 1372. If Bandini's identification of the scribe is correct, the copy of 2 Dial. must have been written in the late 14th or early 15th century (Tedaldus gave his books to S. Croce in 1406, and seems to have died a few years later).

Knysh: Though very close to **Bb**, **Fi** and **An** form a distinct sub-group for the textual tradition of 1 Dial., with West French affinities, as indicated by common place names (Tours, Nantes) in 1 Dial. 5.24. **Ce**, which keeps these place names, was evidently copied from an exemplar close to **An** or **Fi**.

Fr: Frankfurt-am-Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Lat. quart. 4

Contents: List of chapters of the *Dialogus* (fols. 1v-8v; fols 9-12r blank); Prologue otherwise found only in **We** (fol. 12v); 1 Dial. (fols. 13r-238r); 2 Dial. (fols. 238v-258v); *Compendium errorum Johannis XXII* (fols. 258v-272v); 3.1 and 3.2 Dial. (fols. 272v-396v); *Octo questiones* (fols. 397r-450v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 19v, 35v, 42r, 56v, 84r, 168v.

Published Information: Karin Bredehorn and Gerhardt Powitz, *Die mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Gruppe Manuscripta Latina in Kataloge der Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfurt am Main, 1979), pp. 7-9. Dates the manuscript to about 1460. See also Ockham, *Opera Politica*, ed. H.S. Offler, vol. 1 (edn. 2), p. 5 (F), and vol. 4, p. 8 (F), and G. Knysh, *Ockham Perspectives* (Winnipeg, 1994) pp. 15-17, 37.

Text written in the same hand throughout, marginalia in a number of different hands. There are some corrections or additions to the text, some of which seem to be in the hand that wrote the text. **Fr** includes a "prologue" otherwise found only in **We** (written in **Fr** on the second column of the back of a folio (12v) preceded by several blank folios, facing the first page of the text—possibly a later addition). **Fr** also contains a number of passages not found in other MSS, apparently composed by the scribe or by someone earlier; see for example 1 Dial. 4.30.

In 3.2 Dial. 3.15 a passage is omitted (=Ly fol. 269v b2-40); this omission is not supplied. Another passage is omitted in 3.2 Dial. 3.16. After "antistitem" (=Ly fol. 270v a23), which is the end of many manuscripts of 3.2 Dial., there is a gap

of about 10 lines and the text continues (389r) with the second omitted passage (=Ly fol. 270r b17-56). At the end of this passage, after a small indent, the text continues (389va line 26) with the rest of the sentence following “antistitem” and goes on to the end of the text as found in **Mz**, **Pz** and **Ly**. Thus the text of chapter 16 is out of order, with only some white space to warn the reader. The text continues but (unlike **Di**) without the chapter summaries found in **Ly** and without the last sentence found in **Di** and **Ly**. It appears that the text originally ended at “antistitem” (or rather, since **Fr** continues with *Octo questiones*, the exemplar from which **Fr** got 3.2 Dial. originally ended “antistitem”) and that more material has been added, possibly from **Mz** or **Pz** or some kindred manuscript.

Gs: Goldast, Melchior: Monarchia Sancti Romani Imperii (Frankfurt/Main, 1614; repr. Graz, 1960), vol. 2, pp. 398-957

A reprint of **Ly**.

Ko: Köln, Stadtarchiv, GB fol. 76

Available online: <http://historischesarchivkoeln.de/de/lesesaal/4.1.1/Best.+7002/76?page=2>

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-275r), 2 Dial. (fols. 275v-297v); Petrus de Alliaco (d’Ailly), *Abbreviatio* (fols. 298r-313v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 9r, 28r, 35v, 52v, 84r, 182r.

Published Information: Joachim Vannebusch, *Die Theologischen Handschriften des Stadtarchivs Köln* (Köln, 1976), Teil 1, p. 59-61. Dates Ko to about 1470. Quotes comment of copyist (fol. 275r) on Part II: “Puto tamen quod tractatus ille qui sequitur non sit ille qui est 2a pars principalis huius operis, tum quia non procedit dialogando, tum quia non tractat de erroribus bullatis contentis in 4or constitutionibus Johannis 22i sed tantum de erroribus per eum predicatis quos tamen se tractaturum in hac 2a parte in precedenti tractatu pluries repromittit”.

Text written in the same hand throughout. Marginalia in various hands. Some corrections seem to be in the same hand as wrote the text, some in other hands.

La: London, British Museum [The British Library], Additional manuscript 33,243

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-259r) and 2 Dial. (fols. 259v-282v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 9v, 26v, 33v, 48v, 79v, 174v.

Published Information: *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the years 1882-1887* (London, 1889), p.p. 281-2. Written in Italy in the latter half of the 15th century. According to fol. 282v, this manuscript belonged to François de Ranchicort (cf. bottom margin, 1r), Canon of Arras, who presented it to the Celestines of Amiens in 1507.

Lb: London, British Museum [The British Library], Harlean manuscript 33

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1r-168v), 2 Dial. (fols. 168v-185v), tabula (fols. 186r-188v). 1 Dial. 2 begins at 7v, book 5 at 20r, 6 at 41r, 7 at 109r.

Published Information: Alfonso Sammut, *Unfredo Duca di Gloucester e gli Umanisti Italiani* (Padova, 1980), pp. 102-3. Dates manuscript to the 15th century. "Scrittura gotica corsiva inglese". Donated to Oxford university library by Humphrey Duke of Gloucester in 1443/4. The following references are from S. McKendrick per Ian Murdoch: A.C. de la Mare, "Manuscripts given to the University of Oxford by Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester", *Bodleian Library Record* 13 (1988), pp. 30-51, 112-121, at pp. 40-2; C.E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani. A study of the Sources of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts Preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1972), pp. 131, 200, 263. Murdoch (*op. cit.*, pp. xxxiv-xxxv) reports that Gilbert Ouy believed that Lb may have been copied for Pierre d'Ailly.

Part 1, book 2, chapter 30 up to book 4, chapter 27 is missing (the missing material, probably one gathering, would have gone between 18v and 19r). In the margins and between the lines there are many corrections Fol. 135r-135v (1 Dial. 7.32.141ff) is an insertion in another hand.

Collation of Part 1, book 1, shows that **Lb** was copied from a manuscript akin to **Vg** or **Pa**, then corrected from a manuscript akin to **Es** or **To**. Compare **Pa**, another manuscript extensively corrected from a manuscript akin to **Es** or **To**. In 2 Dial. **Lb** seems close to **Vb**.

Lc: London, British Museum [The British Library], Royal 7F.XII

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 2r-237v), 2 Dial. (238r-262v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 8r, 22v, 28r, 40v, 66v, 158r.

Published Information: G. Warner and J. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and Kings Collection*, vol. 1 (London, 1921), p. 205. Fifteenth century. Owned by William Grey (Bishop of Ely, 1454-1478), presented by him to Balliol College, Oxford (1v).

Ly: Guillelmus de Occam, Opera Plurima, vol. 1 (Lyons, 1494; repr. London, 1962)

Contents: 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial., 3.2 Dial.

Observations: According to the dedicatory letter by Iodocus Badius Ascensius that serves as preface, the printer (Treschel) had the work “faithfully corrected by diligent and clever men of Paris University”. The basis of the editor’s work was the previous printed edition, **Pz**.

Ly includes a number of helps to the reader: every chapter is headed by a summary, there is a table of questions discussed, there is an excellent “Tabula alphabetica” (index); this material seems independent of similar material found in some other witnesses and of d’Ailly’s *Abbreviatio*.

Knysch: Philippe Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius*, t. II, Paris 1908, pp. 55, 493, cites two letters of 1497 by Ascensius which identify Brother Augustine of Regensburg (OESA) as the scholar responsible for preparing **Ly** for printing. It would thus appear that Br. Augustine was the author of the additions at 3.1 Dial. 2.10-11 and 3.2 Dial. 1.6 found only in this edition. Br. Augustine was a “baccalarius formatus” of the University of Paris. It is unclear whether he had anything to do with the earlier edition of the *Dialogus* (**Pz**) printed in that city.

Ly gives a longer text for 3.2 Dial. than the MSS that end with “antistitem”, but a shorter text than is found in **Na** and **Ve**.

Mw, Mz: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, manuscript 3522 (478)

Contents: *Somnium Viridarii* (fols. 1-95v); Table of contents of *Somnium Viridarii* (fols. 96r-103v); Ockham, *Octo questiones* (fols. 104r-148v); Ockham, 3.2 Dial. (ending with 3.16) (=Mw) (fols. 149r-199r); fols. 200r-297r: Ockham, 3.1 Dial. (ends at 246), 3.2 Dial. (=Mz); Ockham, *Compendium erroris* (fols. 298r-310r); List of contents of the volume (fol. 310r).

Published Information: Auguste Molinier, *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine*, t. III (Paris: Plon, 1890), p. 120. In the top margin of fol. 298r: “Olkam [perhaps “Okham”], ordinis fratrum Minorum, scriptus a fratre R. Stopford”. Dates manuscript to 14th century. Items 5 and 6 in the same hand, different from the others. Manuscript held formerly in the library of Saint Victor. See also Ockham, *Opera Politica*, ed. H.S. Offler, vol. 1 (ed. 2), p. 5 (M), and vol. 4, p. 7 (M). See also L. Baudry, *Guillaume d’Occam* (Paris, 1949), pp. 257-9.

Knysz: C. Samaran, R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine, portant des indications de lieu ou de copiste*, t. I, Paris: Centre National de Recherche Scientifique, 1959, p. 422, note that two distinct complexes were bound together: (1) fols. 1-199 (including **Mw**), of the 14th century, and (2) fols. 200-310 (including **Mz**), of the 15th century.

Unpublished notes by Elizabeth Pellegrin and Françoise Hudry, “Renseignements généraux concernant le MS. Paris, Bibl. Mazarine 3522(478)”, available at l’Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes, Paris, give a full description. Dates manuscript to late 14th century. Draws attention to the comment on 199v (see below).

Comment on the bottom of fol. 199v (“Usque hic habetur in alio volumine... que secuntur non habetur”) suggests that the present contents of this codex were already bound together when that comment was made. Otherwise it seems possible that items 5 and 6 were originally a separate codex. The absence of annotations by Simon de Plumetot in 5 and 6 is consistent with the hypothesis that when he used it the codex did not contain 5 and 6. **Mw** (but not **Mz**) contains annotations in the hand of Simon de Plumetot.

Knysz: The author of the comment on the bottom of fol. 199v was Claude de Grandrue, librarian at St. Victor from 1502 to 1520: see L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la bibliothèque nationale*, t. II, Paris 1874, p. 229. On the career of Grandrue, see A. Franklin, *Histoire de la bibliothèque de l’abbaye de Saint-Victor à Paris, d’après des documents inédits*, Paris 1865, pp. 29-30; F. Bonnard, *Histoire de l’abbaye royale et de l’ordre des chanoines réguliers de St Victor de Paris*, t. I, Paris 1904, pp. 466-468. Comments similar to that of fol. 199v were composed by Grandrue during his preliminary inventory (1502-1508) of the abbey’s manuscripts. My studies of the evidence, including careful comparisons of many extant St Victor manuscripts, indicate that it is Grandrue who supervised the blending of the two components into a single volume (the final page number sequences of today’s Ms. 3522 are in his hand, as is the intermediate numbering of Mz [a1 a2 etc.: cf. Mz fol. 200, 201 etc.] much of which was cut in the binding process.) See also remarks concerning Pe below.

Na: Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, Naples, manuscript Nat. VII.C.31

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-129r), 2 Dial. (fols. 129v-139v), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 141r-187v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5r, 14r, 18r, 26r, 41v, 90v.

Published Information: Cesare Cenci OFM, *Manoscritti francescani della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli*, vol. 1, Quaracchi: Typographia collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1971, p. 406. Two hands, not Italian, 14th century.

1 Dial. is water damaged and in some places illegible. 1 Dial. ends on 129r and 2 Dial. begins on 129v, with no blank space separating the two parts, in the middle of a gathering (121r-132v); thus 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. were never separate manuscripts. 2 Dial. ends part way through 139v, fol. 140rv is blank, 141r begins 3.2 Dial. and a new gathering, in different handwriting. It is possible that the codex binds a copy of 1 and 2 Dial. with an originally separate copy of 3.2 Dial.

Na and **Ve** have the most complete and most plausible text of 3.2 Dial.

Ox: Oxford, St John's College Library, manuscript LXIX

Contents: Chapter list (fols. 1r-7v), 1 Dial. (fols. 8r-293r), Tabula (fols. 293v - 303). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 16v, 37r, 44v, 62r, 94r, 200v.

Published Information: O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, Pars I, 1852. Fifteenth century. According to note on fol. 293r, the manuscript was bought from Eli the Jew by Cardinal de Varambone in 1444. According to note on fol. 2r, it was given to St John's College by John Fisher, bishop of Rochester (d. 1535).

Observations: There are summaries at the beginning of each chapter, and there is a table of these at the beginning of the manuscript. The summaries show no particular resemblance to d'Ailly's *Abbreviatio* or to the chapter summaries of **Ly**. There are some lengthy marginal annotations; some supply omissions, some give additional references or quotations from authorities, and some are criticisms of the argument (e.g. 17r, 31v, 32r, 34v, 35r, 37r, 42r, 45v, 54v); cropping of the edges of pages makes some of these difficult to follow. Ox also includes the alphabetic tabula found also in Av, Vf and Vc, beginning at 293v, possibly in different writing.

Pa: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, manuscript Lat. 14313

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-156r), 2 Dial. (fols. 156v-170v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5v, 16v, 21r, 30v, 49v, 108r.

Published Information: None. See <http://archivesetmanuscripts.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000075081>

The whole codex was written by the same scribe throughout, S. de Portis, who signs, 11 May 1389 (170v). Extensive corrections of 1 Dial. in the hand of Simon de Plumetot. The corrections seem to be drawn from some manuscript akin to **Es** and **To**. Compare **Lb**, another manuscript extensively corrected from a similar source.

Pb: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, manuscript Lat. 15881

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-163v), 2 Dial. (fols. 163v-184r), 3.2 Dial. (fol. 185r-229r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 4v, 15r, 19r, 28v, 48v, 110r.

Published Information: None. See <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000076394>

According to an unpublished letter from Gilbert Ouy to Ian Murdoch, **Pb** was written at about the same time as **Ca** (toward the end of the 14th century). “Il est écrit... par plusieurs mains dont deux au moins me paraissent familières: il s’agit presque certainement de copistes qui travaillaient pour Pierre d’Ailly”.

1 Dial. may have been written by several hands (there seem to be changes at fols. 30rb, 156v-157r); 2 Dial. continues on the same page (163v) without a change of copyist. These two parts were never separate manuscripts. 2 Dial. ends on 184r, 184v is blank, 3.2 Dial. begins a new gathering on 185r in another hand. It seems possible that 3.2 Dial. was originally a separate manuscript. Ownership stamp Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne.

In 3.2 Dial. **Pb** ends with “antistitem” (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Pc: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, manuscript Lat. 3657

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-208r), 3.2 Dial (fols. 210r-287r), and 2 Dial. (fols. 289r-321r) (3.2 before 2). Material missing at beginning (begins part way through 1 Dial., 1.2). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 4v, 17r, 21v, 31r, 50v, 126r.

Published Information: Bibliothèque Nationale, *Catalogue général des Manuscrits Latins*, t. VI (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1975), pp. 468-9. Dates manuscript to end of 14th century. Several hands. Some marginal corrections. Apparently belonged to Cardinal Pierre de Luna before his election [in 1394, during the great schism, as Benedict XIII in the Avignon line]; passed by means of Cardinal Pierre de Foix to the Collège de Foix at Toulouse.

Part of page used for text on fols. 234-270 is shorter. There is a gap (but no loss of text) between 95v and 97r (=Ly 94rb 17).

The three parts could originally have been separate manuscripts. 1 Dial. ends on 208r, which is the fifth folio of a 6-folio gathering; 208v is blank, and so is the sixth folio (209rv), except for probationes penna. 3.2 Dial. begins on 210r, the first folio of a new gathering. 3.2 Dial. ends on 287r, which is the fifth folio of a 6-folio gathering; 287v is blank, and so is the sixth folio (288rv). 2 Dial. begins on fol. 289r, the first folio of a new gathering. 3.2 Dial. is written in a new hand (210r); 2 Dial. may be in a new hand (289r). The three parts are out of order, with 3.2 Dial. before 2 Dial.

Pc ends at “antistitem” (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Pe: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, manuscript Lat. 14619

Contents: 3.2 Dial. (fols. 122r-159v). The manuscript also contains Marsilius of Padua, *Defensor Pacis*, and a list of the errors of J. Wyclif. It includes a catalog of Ockham’s works, fol 121v, which mentions 3.1 Dial. and gives incipit (“3a pars incipit Salomonis utcumque sequendo vestigia et dividitur in 9 tractatus primus tractatus est de potestate pape et cleri et habet 4 libros”).

Published Information: <http://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ead.html?id=FRBNFEAD000075370>. Written and annotated by Simon de Plumetot. See R. Scholz, Marsilius von Padua *Defensor Pacis*, “Einleitung”, pp. xv-xvi.

Pe ends with “antistitem” (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Knysh: The original volume was given by Plumetot to the library of St Victor at Paris sometime between 1428 and 1436, since Simon is described as “domini nostri Regis in sua camera pallamenti consiliarius” (fol. 169r), a title which, according to Ouy, Plumetot received in 1428 from Henry VI of England, whose occupation of Paris ended in 1436. The note on fol. 121v is in a different, and later, script. It is not by Claude de Grandrue (who composed the “Que secuntur hic habentur” note on fol. 168v), and is therefore prior to 1502. It is posterior to the annotations in St. Victor volumes left by scribes working under prior (then abbot) Jean Lamasse, who died in 1458. The same scribe who penned the notice on fo. 121v also added the list of Wycliffe’s “errors” on fol. 167-168. His mention of 3.1 Dial. and *Compendium errorum* strongly suggests that **Mz** was available at St. Victor by his time. This anonymous scribe (who, unlike Grandrue, attributed the *Defensor Pacis* to Ockham) correctly believed that 3.1 Dial. and *Compendium errorum* were distinct works. Grandrue on the other hand (in his “Catalogus Typographicus” of 1514, preserved in Ms. Lat. 14767 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) considered *Compendium errorum* to be a part of the otherwise lost segments of 3 Dialogus [“tocius tercie partis desunt

septem alii tractatus... de horum habetur solummodo ab eodem Okam compendium errorum papae Johannis XXII...”, MS. cit., fol. 125r]

Pz: Paris, 1476 edition

Contents: 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial., 3.2 Dial; *Compendium errorum*.

Published Information: Ockham, *Opera Politica*, ed. H.S. Offler, vol. 4, p. 8 (ed.). According to Offler, in some copies the elements are bound in the order 1 Dial., 2 Dial., *Compendium errorum*, 3.1 Dial, 3.2 Dial.

Ian Murdoch (op. cit., p. xl) notes that the *Tabula aurea* contained in **Pz**, though not attributed to him, is for the most part is d’Ailly’s *Abbreviatio*, expanded to cover 3.1 Dial and 3.2 Dial. 3.17-23, which were not known to d’Ailly.

Sa: Biblioteca universitaria Salamanca, manuscript 1971

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 3r-276r), 2 Dial. (fols. 276r-299r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 12r, 37v, 46r, 66r, 104v, 200v.

Published Information: The library has supplied a description. Dates manuscript to 15th Century. Notes a change of hands from fol. 124v to 125r.

On this witness, especially in relation to 2 Dial., see also Ballweg. Though Ballweg includes Sa in his “Group B”, it does not have the displacement of text characteristic of Group B. See fol. 280vb line 14, where the text is as in MSS of Group A.

To: Bibliothèque Municipale, Toulouse, manuscript 221

Contents: 1 Dial. (1r-218v), 2 Dial. (218v-238v), 3.2 Dial. (238v-289v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 7v, 25v, 32r, 47r, 74r, 153r.

Published Information: Auguste Molinier, *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques des Départements* [quarto series], t. VII, Toulouse-Nîmes (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1885), Bibliothèque de Toulouse, pp. 140-1. End of 14th century. Belonged to the Dominicans.

There is unexpected blank space on 224v. **To** is in the same handwriting throughout; it was always one MS.

To ends 3.2 Dial. at “antistitem” (=Ly fol. 270v a23).

Knysh: The possibility that this is a 15th century ms. cannot be excluded.

Un: Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Paris, manuscript Univ. 226

Contents: 1 Dial., (fols. 1-168v), 2 Dial. (fols. 169r-187v), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 189r-212v). 1 Dial. books 3-7 begin at 5v, 10v, 22v, 42v, 110r.

Published Information: *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France: Université de Paris* (Paris: Plon, 1918), pp. 68-9. Dates manuscript to 15th century. On fol. 187v [in reference to 2 Dial.]: “Per manum Yvonis de Vico Croceo, dyocesis Leonensis oriundi”. [On spine] Collegium Trecorense, [fol. 35r] Collegium Ludovici Magni.

1 Dial. and 2 Dial. are in one hand, 3.2 Dial. in another. Material was missing before the manuscript was foliated. The text begins part way through 1 Dial. 2.22, it ends part way through 3.2 Dial., 2.18; the last verso (212v) has a catchword (“absque iudicio”), suggesting that the exemplar had not run out. Between 29v and 30r about two folios worth of text is missing.

1 Dial ends on 168v and 2 Dial. begins on 169r, with no blank space separating the two parts, part way through a gathering (166r-177v); 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. were never separate manuscripts. 2 Dial. ends at 187v, after which there is the stump of a half-sheet--this folio would have completed the gathering that began at 178r. Fol. 188rv is blank, 189r begins 3.2 Dial. and a new gathering, in different handwriting. It is possible that the codex binds a copy of 1 and 2 Dial. with an originally separate copy of 3.2 Dial.

Va: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 4001

Contents: 1 Dial. (1r-172r), 2 Dial. (172r-187v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 6r, 18r, 23r, 33r, 53v, 121r.

Published Information: R. Scholz, *Unbekannte Kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327-1354)* (Rome, 1911), p. 143.

It seems (see comment by Knysh) that 1 Dial. 1-6 was written after the rest of the manuscript. 1 Dial. 6 begins at 53v and ends at 116v, with fols. 117, 118, 119, 120 left blank; 1 Dial. 7 begins at 121r, which begins a new gathering. The incipit for 1 Dial. 6 was written in afterwards, there is no incipit for book 7.

Knysh: Same hand throughout, except for some very minor textual adjustments by a verifier. 1 Dial.7 and the two treatises of *De dogmatibus* (“Dial.2”) were completed by 5 June 1437 (fol. 187v). The twelve gatherings (fol.1-120), which contain the first six books of 1 Dial., were filled through fol. 116v, with the final 4 folios of the last gathering left blank. There is a verification date of 14 September 1437 on fol. 116v. For the text of 1 Dial., **Va** is basically a manuscript of the same large family which evolved into the printed editions of

1476 and 1494, but it has been frequently corrected (and the corrected readings fully incorporated into its basic text rather than left as marginalia) by reference to textual traditions akin to **Ba** and **Vc** (see introduction to 1 Dial. 6.1-15).

Vb: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 4096

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-171v), 2 Dial. (fols. 171v-188v); Conclusions of J. Wyclif (fol. 189r); Tabula of 1 Dial., 1-5 (fols. 189v-190v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5v, 17v, 22v, 33r, 51r, 117r.

Published Information: Scholz *Unbekannte*, p. 143; G.J. Eitzkorn, *Iter Vaticanum Franciscanum* (Leiden-New York-Köln, 1996), pp. 87-8. Eitzkorn dates this manuscript to the 14th century. He notes a change of handwriting from 50v to 51r. He quotes a scribe's note to the reader, fol. 47r, on the disorganisation of the text.

A note on fol. 191r states that the codex was lent to Master Bernard Boerius (?), Ord. Carm., in June 1413, who returned it to the author of the note on 26 Jan. 1414. In gatherings of 12 folios, except the third (10), fourth (4, which ends 1 Dial. 5), and the eleventh (6, which ends 1 Dial. 6). Thus each of 1 Dial. 6 and 1 Dial. 7 begin new gatherings, but 2 Dial. does not. 1 Dial. 1-5 inclusive were written by one scribe, 1 Dial. 6 and 7 and 2 Dial. by another (50v51r). It seems likely that **Vb** was always a single manuscript, though it was made in two separate stages by two copyists.

Beside the beginning of 2.1 Dial. (fol. 183r) a marginal comment reads, "Forte tractatus tercius", but in the bottom margin there is a comment "Tractatus iste non est tractatus tercius"; this does not imply that the author of the latter comment had seen 3 Dial., since he could have known from the preface to 1 Dial. that 3 Dial. would be about the rights of the Empire.

In 2 Dial. there is a displacement of material. The word "intellexerunt" is divided, the "in" at the end of 174v and "tellexerunt" at the beginning of 176r, with fol. 175rv intruding. (See William of Ockham, *Dialogus Part 2*, 2.1 Dial. 4.45 "intellexerunt" (p. 34). The intruded passage begins at 5.86 "posset per eas probari" (p. 40) and ends at 7.12 "in regnum dei intrabunt" (p. 45).) The same text displacement (but with the marooned "in" omitted and "tellexerunt" changed to "intellexerunt"), unrelated to the physical structure of the MS, occurs in the manuscripts that Ballweg classes as "Group B", i.e. **Ax, Ba, Es, Fi, Kg, La, Lb, Lc, Na, To, Un** and **Va**. These facts suggest that for 2 Dial. **Vb** is an ancestor of all the other members of Group B. (It may also perhaps be an ancestor of **Di** and **Fr**, which do not have the displacement but otherwise have a

similar text—possibly they had an intermediate ancestor in which the displacement was noticed and corrected).

Vc: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 4097

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-152v). Alphabetic Tabula of 1 Dial. (fols. 153r-160v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5r, 16r, 20r, 30r, 47v, 103v.

Published Information: See Scholz, *Unbekannte*, p. 143; Etzkorn, *Iter*, pp. 88-9. Scholz dates Vc to the 15th century, Etzkorn to the 14th. According to Miethke, “Marsilius und Ockham”, p. 559, n. 54, the illuminations in this volume are the work of either Antonio Maria Sforza or Martino da Medina, who were active from the 1470s; the border of fol. 1r includes in the bottom margin the della Rovere coat of arms, and the initial letter shows a Franciscan handing a book, i.e. this volume, to a pope—the donor has been identified as Bartolomeo della Rovere OFM, bishop of Ferrara 1474-1494, and the recipient as his uncle, Pope Sixtus IV, Francesco della Rovere OFM, pope 1471-1484. Thus Vc was probably produced in the 1470s.

The first page of the work and the first page of each other Book (e.g. 1r, 5r, 16r, 20v, 30r) are elaborately decorated. Vc and Vf appear to be written by the same scribe (see Vf below). Vc resembles Vf in the treatment of catchwords and beginnings of gatherings.

The “Tabula” contained in this manuscript is also contained in Vf, O_x and Av.

Vd: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 4098

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1-102v), 2 Dial. (fols. 102v-111r), 3.2 Dial. (fols. 111v-132r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 4r, 11v, 14v, 21v, 34v, 73r.

Published Information: Scholz *Unbekannte*, p. 144; Etzkorn, *Iter*, p. 89. Both date Vd to the 15th century.

Observations: Text in same hand throughout. Copyist has made some marginal corrections. Other marginalia in the one hand (different from text hand) throughout; they include some corrections but are mostly chapter numbers, statements of questions under discussion and indications of stages of argument (“Contra secundum” etc.). Some material is out of order. On fol. 110v the copyist writes: “Adverte hic diligenter quia columpne tres immediate sequentes spectant ad tractatum precedentem. Nescio enim in quo loco seu qua carta locari debeant. Relinquo quoque illud domino et preceptorio meo”). The three columns (110vb line 1 to last line 111rb) correspond with Ly 168vb40-170ra45. This text should follow the last line of 104vb. At that point someone has written:

“Require in ultimo col. huius quinternii qui incipit ‘promittitur anime’“. The annotator who numbered the chapters of 2 Dial. has supplied chapter numbers for the displaced text. The gathering that begins on 111r, which contains 3.2 Dial. 1, is also disordered. Its folios have been renumbered after binding as follows: 115, 113, 114, 112, 119, 117, 118, 116, 120. If the folios are read in numerical order the text will be in the correct sequence.

3.2 Dial. 2 ends earlier than “antistitem”, at a point corresponding to **Ly** fol. 270v a6, in the middle of a word, only part-way through a page--evidently its exemplar had lost the text following.

Ve: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 4115

Contents:

(1) Opicini de Canistris *De preheminentia spiritualis imperii* (fols. 1r-25v); (2) 3.2 Dial. (fols. 27r-133r); (3) *An princeps* (fols. 135r-156v); (4) “Sermo pro defunctis” (fols. 159r-227); (5) “Contra Michaelistas” (fols. 231r-265v); (6) John XXII, *Quia vir reprobus* (fols. 267r-300v); (7) Boniface VIII, *Unam sanctam* (fols. 301rv); (8) John XXII, *Quorundam exigit* (fols. 303r-305v); (9) John XXII, *Cum inter nonnullos* (fols. 306r).

Published Information: Ockham, *Opera Politica*, ed. H.S. Offler, vol. 1 (edn. 2), p. 223 (his siglum is V). Scholz, *Unbekannte*, p. 144.

Items 2-6 inclusive of the contents (not the others) are in the one hand. This copyist has apparently identified himself on fols. 265v and 300v as Alphonsus Petri of Compostella and gives dates of completion -- 1410 for item 6, 1411 for item 5. Someone with bold handwriting has annotated all items except 4. The copyist has made some corrections to the text of the *Dialogus*, the bold annotator and at least two other readers have written corrections and other marginalia.

Ve and **Na** have the most complete text of 3.2 Dial.

Vf: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, manuscript Vat. Lat., 7196

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 2-162r); Alphabetic tabula (fols. 162v-168v).

Published Information: See Scholz, *Unbekannte*, p. 144; Etkorn, *Iter*, p. 211. Both date manuscript to the fourteenth century.

Observations: **Vf** includes the tabula also found in **Vc**, **Ox** and **Av**. The first folio of each Book is missing (i.e. fols. 1, 5, 17, 22, 32, 57, 111), and also fol. 65. Corresponding folios of **Vc** are elaborately decorated, so it is possible that

the missing folios of **Vf** were so too and were removed (stolen?) because of their value as artwork. **Vc** and **Vf** appear to be the work of the same copyist or the same scriptorium--the writing, materials, text are similar; in both MSS "Jesus" is written at the beginning of each gathering; there is a similar treatment of catchwords and of the numbering of sheets within the gathering. Scholz and Etkorn both date **Vf** to the 14th century; however, it must be almost contemporary with **Vc** and must therefore date from the 1470s.

Knysh: A note on fol. 1r indicates that the volume was owned by Luis Gomez (1484-1543), Spanish curial canonist and bishop of Sarno from 1534.

Vg: Rome, Vat., Regin., Lat. 370

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 1r-188r). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 5v, 17v, 22r, 33r, 57r, 127r. The manuscript also contains works by Ioannis de Hanvilla (beginning on 189r) and Bernard Silvestris.

Published Information: Andreas Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses Latini*, t. 2 (In Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1945, p. 358-61). Owned in the 14th century by St Denys in France. A 15th century hand made many corrections and additions. Also see Scholz, *Unbekannte*, p. 144.

The text is in the one hand throughout. There are corrections in various hands. There are long marginal additions (e.g. 84r, 95r). The catchwords (e.g. 16v, 24v, 40v) are decorated distinctively, often with a fish. The top line of a column is often decorated with a head (e.g. 16v). The codex consists of gatherings of 8 folios (6 from 121r to 126v, then 8 again from 127r). 1 Dial. 5 ends at 56ra; 56rb and 56v are blank. 1 Dial. 6 begins with a new gathering at 57r and ends at 126v with "explicit secunda pars istius libri / incipit tercia", followed by a blank page. (A later hand has crossed out the references to the second and third parts.) 1 Dial. 7 begins with a new gathering on fol. 127r.

We: Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek Q23

Contents: 1 Dial. (fols. 2r-214v). 1 Dial. books 2-7 begin at 9r, 23v, 30r, 43v, 63r

Published Information: Matthias Eifler, *Katalog der lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek* (<http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/projekt-Weimar-pdfs/Q-23.pdf>). Eifler dates the manuscript to about 1340-45, making it the earliest of the extant *Dialogus* manuscripts, made while Ockham was still alive. Knysh: This is not

conclusively established: cf. “Preliminary comment” to 1 Dial. 6.1-15 ([http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/Preliminary%20comment1%20\(3\).pdf](http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/Preliminary%20comment1%20(3).pdf)).

Every gathering is written in a new hand (the third by several hands). Presumably the exemplar was in pieces and the gatherings were copied simultaneously by a team of writers (cf. **Di**). The paper used for the first two gatherings is smaller than the rest. The codex begins with the same “preface” as is found in **Fr**. Previous ownership: Collegium universitatis Erfordiae.

Knysh: P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge*, Bd.2, München 1928, p.148 (n. G 17), noted that the manuscript had been given to the Faculty of Arts at Erfurt University by “Dominus Doctor Wilhelmus de Aquisgrano”; G. Knysh, *Fragments of Ockham hermeneutics*, Winnipeg 1997, pp. 155-156; J. Miethke, *De Potestate Papae*, Tübingen 2000, p. 278.

