

INTRODUCTION

Ockham seems to have begun to write the *Dialogus* in the early 1330s, after 1332 and before the death of Pope John XXII in December 1334; apparently it was still unfinished when Ockham died, in 1347 or 1348.¹ The work is in three Parts, the second and third of which are each in two “tracts”. More than forty manuscripts survive that contain all or part of the *Dialogus*.² Of these some contain Part 1 alone, and these include the earliest, among them a manuscript now located at Weimar (for which we use the siglum We) and another held at Basel (siglum Bb). Two manuscripts contain Part 2 alone, but these are not early and not of good quality; the other manuscripts containing Part 2 contain Part 1 also. Only a few manuscripts contain the first tract of Part 3. Several manuscripts contain Part 3 Tract 2 alone, but most manuscripts that include that tract also include other parts of the *Dialogus*.³ Parts of the work are often bound up with other works by Ockham or other authors. The different affinities among the manuscripts of the various parts and tracts seem to indicate that the various components of the work were put into circulation under different circumstances.

All components were included in the one volume for the first time in the later fifteenth century, in a manuscript now located at Frankfurt-am-Main (siglum Fr) and in the first printed edition (Paris, 1476, siglum Pz). Both also contain Ockham’s *Compendium errorum Ioannis 22ⁱ*, and Fr also contains *Octo questiones*. The second incunabulum edition, printed by Johannes Trechsel (Lyon, 1494, siglum Ly), is the first volume to contain the *Dialogus* complete and by itself in its now familiar form. The *Dialogus* was printed for a third time in Melchior Goldast’s *Monarchia Sancti Romani Imperii* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1614, siglum Gs). The text of this edition is that of Trechsel’s edition with the abbreviations spelled out. Goldast’s edition has been the one usually cited by modern scholars.

1. For when *Dialogus* was begun, see Baudry, p. 161. 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”). 2. For information on these witnesses see the project website, <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/sigla.html>. Descriptions are not contained in this volume. 3. For an account of which witnesses contain which parts see the website, <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/sigla.html#which>.

Not much is known about the making of Pz.⁴ Comparison of the text with the text of other witnesses suggests that it was printed from some manuscript akin to the manuscript now found in La Bibliothèque de L'Arsenal (siglum Ar). The manuscripts used by early printers often did not survive the process, and no extant manuscript can be regarded as the direct source of Pz. Pz was the direct source of Ly,⁵ but the editors of Ly made many alterations that usually improve the sense. Iodocus Badius Ascensius, who contributed a dedicatory letter, tells us that Trechsel had the work "faithfully corrected by diligent and clever men of Paris University", which suggests several correctors; the same writer, in a dedicatory letter to Trechsel's printing of Robert Holcot's *Sentences*, tells us that Brother Augustine of Regensburg O.S.A. worked on the Ockham edition.⁶ Perhaps Augustine was one of a team, perhaps its leader, or perhaps the "diligent and clever men" were just one man; we do not know. For Part 1 of the *Dialogus* and perhaps for the second tract of Part 3 the editor(s) may have consulted some manuscript or manuscripts,⁷ but it seems that many alterations, and perhaps all of those in Part 2 and the first tract of Part 3, were conjectural. There is some material not found in any other witness, which most probably was written by an editor.⁸ Trechsel's editors had a sharp eye for gaps in the argument and for defects of grammar and sense, and we have been greatly helped by their work. However, from a modern viewpoint they were remiss in not signalling which parts of their text were conjectural. Readers of Gs and Ly have in some places taken as written by Ockham words actually written by someone else.

As it has come down to us, the *Dialogus* is, except for Part 1, incomplete. Part 2 seems never to have been written; the existing Part 2 is not the work Ockham planned and does not really belong to the *Dialogus*. Each of the two extant tracts of the extant Part 3 is incomplete; in addition, Part 3 should have included seven more tracts on the actions of various people. In his dedicatory letter Iodocus Badius suggests that the printer of the 1476 edition deliberately omitted some tractates ("industria et dedita opera a prioris impressionis artifice

4. See Dennis E. Rhodes, "The Printer of Ockham", *Library Chronicle* 40 (1974), pp. 118-123. See also Astrik L. Gabriel, "'Via Antiqua' and 'Via Moderna' and the Migration of Paris Students and Masters to the German Universities in the XVth Century", in *Antiqui und Moderni: Traditionsbewusstsein und Fortschrittsbewusstsein im späten Mittelalter*, ed. A. Zimmermann, *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 9 (1974), pp. 452-3. 5. For an illustration of this dependence, see <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/31d1msr.html#PzLyLm>. 6. See Miethke, *Ockhams Weg*, p. 118, n. 443, who quotes Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des œuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius*, t. 2 (Paris, 1908). 7. For 1 Dial. Trechsel's editors seem to have consulted a manuscript akin to Fr. See <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/MSRlns1d1.html#LyFr>. 8. See 3.1 Dial 2.11-12, part of 3.2 Dial 1.6 ("Discipulus: Ut expressius . . .", and the Master's answer). There are other instances.

tractatulos aliquot pretermisissos”), and that the scholars consulted by Trechsel told him that the tracts omitted by the 1476 printer contained only defences and bitter accusations — implying that both the 1476 printer and Trechsel’s scholars had access to a manuscript that contained the missing tracts. No such manuscript has ever been found, and no medieval author ever reported anything of such tracts; the manuscripts (such as Ar) that are closest to the 1476 text are late manuscripts, and if any of them had contained the seven missing tracts there would surely have been some other trace in the manuscript tradition. Badius does not claim to have seen the tracts himself. The rest of his remarks offer justification for printing a work that has come down incomplete (that it will be valued, as Livy’s history is, despite its incompleteness), rather than justification for leaving out tracts that were available for printing.⁹ It seems more likely, then, that the seven missing tracts were never in circulation and were never written.

Besides conveying the text of the *Dialogus*, with various degrees of accuracy, the surviving manuscripts also tell us something of the reading public interested in the *Dialogus*¹⁰ and something of medieval book production. Several manuscripts were owned and annotated, and one was copied, by the canonist Simon de Plumetot, who also collected works of Marsilius and other “political” writers.¹¹ Two of the manuscripts (We and a manuscript held at Dijon, siglum Di) were copied by teams of about twenty, whose members worked simultaneously on different gatherings of their exemplar to make a copy quickly. One manuscript (Lambert) was a copy of Pz, another (Di) includes in its last gathering material copied from Ly; clearly, when printing began scholars did not immediately stop making manuscripts. Many of the manuscripts show signs of use, such as corrections, summaries and critical comments. Trechsel’s editors followed in the footsteps of medieval editors. Several manuscripts illustrate their methods.¹² For example, the manuscript now found in the library of El Escorial (siglum Es), written originally in Toulouse, has many corrections in several different hands, written between the lines, in the margin, over erasures or in spaces originally left blank. A number of people worked hard to correct this manuscript, perhaps consulting other manuscripts, perhaps making their own conjectures. Two other manuscripts (sigla Lb and Pa) show similar care.

9. For discussion see Scholz, *Streitschriften*, vol. 1, pp. 146-7; Baudry, pp. 210-211, Miethke, *Ockhams Weg*, pp. 118-20. 10. See Jürgen Miethke, “Marsilius und Ockham: Publikum und Leser ihrer politischen Schriften im späteren Mittelalter”, *Medioevo* 6 (1980), pp. 534-558. 11. See Gilbert Ouy, “Simon de Plumetot (1371-1443) et sa bibliothèque”, in P. Cockshaw *et al.* (eds.), *Miscellanea Codicologica F. Masai Dicata MCMLXXIX*, vol. 2 (Gand, 1979), pp. 353-81. 12. On the care medieval scholars took to correct their manuscripts, see M.A. Rouse and R.H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses* (Notre Dame, 1991), pp. 304-5, 317-8, 428-30.

Unlike modern editors, medieval correctors did not indicate the source of their readings, and a manuscript copied from a corrected manuscript would give no indication of its source. Another very clean manuscript (siglum Ba) may have been copied, in some sections of it, at least, from Es — or perhaps Es was corrected from Ba or from a manuscript akin to it. Despite the various cross-influences, the manuscripts of the *Dialogus* can be sorted into families, but any manuscript is likely to be “contaminated” by readings borrowed from manuscripts belonging to other families; by the same token, any manuscript, even one of generally poor quality, may contain authentic readings supplied by some corrector or reader with access to another manuscript.¹³

In making the present edition our aim has been, not merely to transcribe a single manuscript, or to record the readings of many manuscripts, but to go behind the readings of the extant witnesses to the author’s intended text. *Examination* or criticism is a traditional part of an editor’s job. If an aim in studying the *Dialogus* is to know what the author thought, then, at some places of obscurity or confusion, the editors, or if not the editors then readers, must try to guess what the author meant to say. Criticism and conjecture are therefore inescapable. The witnesses available for the texts edited in this volume are far from perfect, and indeed it is possible that the author never did produce a finished and accurate text. If after critical examination we think that all the witnesses are corrupt, we offer our own conjecture, or perhaps adopt a conjecture made by Trechsel’s editor or by some medieval scribe or corrector; if we think that most witnesses, including witnesses usually reliable, are corrupt, we may follow one or a few of the lower-ranked witnesses. Some readers may disapprove of such eclecticism and many will disagree with particular evaluations of the manuscript readings or with conjectures we adopt, but in every case the apparatus indicates the source of our text and offers other variants, giving readers the means of making their own judgments. A critical edition is an hypothesis as to an author’s intentions, and like other empirical hypotheses it is liable to revision.

Another traditional part of an editor’s task is to identify the sources our author referred to or used. We have, we believe, identified all, or nearly all, of the sources explicitly referred to, but the identification of sources used without explicit reference is another matter. In Munich Ockham worked as part of a team, other members of which included Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia of Bergamo, Heinrich von Thalheim and Franciscus de Marchia (de Esculo), and

13. On editing a text with a “contaminated” tradition see Maurice Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian’s Treatises* (Oxford, 1961).

there may have been others we have not heard of. These dissident Franciscans seem to have practised a kind of intellectual communism, borrowing one another's ideas and words freely without explicit acknowledgement, caring about their common cause and not about their reputation as authors. There were others, outside the Franciscan circle and outside Munich, with whom Ockham and his confreres had intellectual exchanges, sometimes in writing, sometimes *viva voce*. The academic convention at the time was that contemporaries should not be mentioned by name. To identify the "quidam" to whom an opinion is ascribed, or to recognise material borrowed without signal from a colleague or contemporary, would often require a comprehensiveness of learning that we cannot claim. We leave much, how much we cannot estimate, to the work of other scholars.

Conventions

"1 Dial.", "2 Dial.", "3 Dial." refer to the three Parts of *Dialogus*, "2.1 Dial.", "2.2 Dial.", "3.1 Dial." and "3.2 Dial." refer to the tracts into which the 2 Dial. and 3 Dial. are divided. Following the reference to part or tract, we may give book, chapter and line numbers (separated by ".") thus: "3.1 Dial. 3.4.5", refers to line 5 of chapter 4 of book 3 of 3.1 Dial. We refer to Ockham's other works in a similar way. Thus "OQ 3.12.224", refers to *Octo questiones*, question 3, chapter 12, line 224, and "Brev. 2.14.31", refers to *Breviloquium*, book 2, chapter 14, line 31.

We will assume (except when the witnesses show otherwise) that references to other writings and their parts are in the ablative, in apposition, rather than partly in the genitive (i.e. not like references to Thomas, *Summa*, 1^a 2^{ae}), for example "1^a ad Timotheum c. 6^o", "*Ecclesiastica historia* lib. 3^o c. 21^o", "dist. 19^a, c. 1^o". However, the witnesses show that the genitive is used for the titles of Aristotle's writings (e.g. "Ait enim Aristoteles, 3^o *Politicorum*, c. 8^o"), in references to the parts of *Dialogus* (e.g. "tractata est aliquantulum diffuse libro 6^o prime partis istius dialogi capitulo 3^o"), and in names of books of the Bible consisting of a single word (e.g. "Proverbiorum 3^o", "Matthei 5^o").

Unless more information is provided, a cross reference in the notes is to the same book; thus "above, 4.92" occurring in a note to book 4 of 3.1 Dial. refers to line 92 of chapter 4 in book 4 of 3.1 Dial; "above, 3.4.92" would refer to book 3, chapter 4, line 92 of 3.1 Dial. Usually we do not provide cross references to another part of the same chapter, but if we do the reference takes the form "above, line 92". If we need to refer to some part of the *Dialogus* not

contained in this volume, we may refer to the 1494 edition by folio, column and line.

Punctuation follows modern English conventions; for example, we do not put a comma before a defining clause. Capitalisation is more sparing than in English: we capitalise only proper names and their equivalent (e.g. “Apostolus” when it means Paul), and the first word of a title (e.g. *De civitate dei*). In spelling we follow the practice of the majority of the manuscripts of 1 Dial.

For an account of the manuscripts and early editions used in the preparation of this edition see “Witnesses to the text: sigla and descriptions” on the project web site. There is a list of sigla below, at p. xix.

Generally the apparatus entries are negative (i.e. mention only disagreements with the text), but sometimes we list witnesses that agree, putting their sigla after the lemma and before a colon. Thus “spes] Ar Ha Ed: fides W” indicates that Ar, Ha and the incunabula agree with the reading “spes” while all, or most, of the other witnesses (“W”) read “fides”. But note that we have not made it possible to infer the reading of an individual witness not explicitly mentioned — “W” and certain other generalising sigla do not mean absolutely every witness in the class, and we do not report insignificant variants. The entry quoted above therefore does not rule out the possibility that some witnesses have neither “spes” nor “fides”. Information on particular witnesses can be found on the website in the collations and in the transcriptions of witnesses.

Conjectural substitutions are not specially marked in the text but are indicated in the apparatus thus: “Sarracenorum] Knysh: paganorum Ly, christianorum W”. Thus the name of the editor making the conjecture is given before a colon. If some other text of Ockham’s supports the conjecture, a reference to it is given before the colon, thus: “et universis] Kilcullen (cf. Brev. 2.5.2-3): universis et W”. A conjectural addition is marked in the text by square brackets: “... sacri videntur asserere [minorem]”. A conjectural deletion is marked by angle brackets: “pro cursu temporalium rerum <legibus imperatorum et regum> utuntur”. Conjectural additions and omissions are reported in the apparatus as substitutions; we do not use “added” or “omitted”, since we do not want to seem to give our conjectures the same status as the archetype. In the apparatus conjectural additions are indicated thus: “asserere minorem] Kilcullen: asserere W”, meaning that “minorem” has been added by conjecture. For conjectural omissions, the lemma is the word preceding the rejected words and the variant consists of that word followed by the rejected words. Thus “rerum] Scott: rerum legibus et imperatorum et regum W” means that by an editor’s conjecture the

words “*legibus imperatorum et regum*” have been rejected. We believe that some additions or omissions found only in Ly are conjectures and we mark them in the text with brackets. Other variants in Ly and in the margins or texts of some witnesses may also be conjectures, but we record them as ordinary variants. If the positive apparatus mentions Ly only, the reading we have adopted is probably a conjecture by the editor of Ly. If the positive apparatus mentions only Esm, Esb or Ess, the reading may have come from some manuscript not now extant, or it may be a conjecture by one of the correctors of Es; and similarly for other manuscripts.

Where Ockham quotes from some other source (for example, Gratian, or Marsilius), the text as found in our witnesses sometimes differs from the text as found in modern editions of the source. Sometimes the difference seems due to deliberate editing on Ockham’s part (for example, compression, transition, correction of grammar), and sometimes the wording as found in the witnesses is essential to the argument. In all such cases we follow our witnesses against the modern edition of the quoted text, but we record the reading of the modern edition in our apparatus. Sometimes the difference seems accidental; in those cases also we follow the witnesses against the modern edition, if the witnesses are unanimous and their text makes reasonable sense; however, if the difference seems accidental and the text of the witnesses cannot be understood without forcing grammar or sense, we follow the modern edition, reporting the text of the witnesses in our apparatus. In every case both the reading of the witnesses and the reading of the modern edition will be clear from the apparatus; if the apparatus does not mention the source, it can be inferred that it agrees with our text.

We use “S” (for “Source”) as the siglum for the modern edition, which is identified in a nearby note on the quoted passage (or in the list of references, p. xv below).¹⁴ Thus “conatur] Es Pz S: cognatur Ly, conor W” means that Es, Pz and the modern edition of the source read “conatur”, that Ly reads “cognatur”, and that the remaining witnesses read “conor”. In some cases the source quotes another source (for example, Marsilius quotes Augustine), and then we sometimes record the reading of a modern edition of the remote source (identified in a nearby note). Thus “aberret] S: haberent Mz, habuerunt Fr, abhorrent Ed, abhorreat Augustine” records that we have followed the modern edition of Marsilius, while various other readings are found in our witnesses and

¹⁴ We have consulted two modern editions of the Vulgate (see Vulg Ma and Vulg St in “References” below). Our manuscripts are generally close to Vulg Ma.

in the modern edition of the Augustine text quoted by Marilius. In one case, where otherwise the text would not make reasonable sense, we have followed a modern edition of the original text against our witnesses and against the intermediate source. Thus “avarus cum sciencia] Augustine: avarum consciencia Ed Lb Es S; avarorum consciencia Az” means that we have followed the modern edition of Augustine rather than our witnesses or the source our author quotes (Gratian).

There are some errors in the references as found in the witnesses. Sometimes the error is minor, a wrong number or a variation in the wording of an incipit (e.g. a reference to “*Qui filii sunt legitimi*” instead of “*Qui filii sint legitimi*”); we correct such errors in the text and do not report them in apparatus or notes. Similarly we silently correct errors or omissions in references included in passages Ockham quotes (e.g. from the gloss). More serious errors apparently due to a mistake or fault of memory on Ockham’s part (e.g. a reference to *Sane* when the text quoted is found in *Solite*) we correct in the text and report in the apparatus. We do this also with apparently erroneous references to other sections of the *Dialogus* (e.g. “supra, prima parte istius dialogi, libro 5^o, 18^o c.”, when the material referred to is found in c. 17); these may be relics of some earlier state of the *Dialogus*.

Apart from reference errors there may be other errors for which the author himself, and not some copyist, is responsible. It is difficult to recognise such errors — difficult to recognise that they are errors, difficult to recognise that they are the author’s. We assume that our author mostly wrote good sense and that he was a clear-headed logician. Generally, if we see some way of correcting faulty sense or logic without leaving the extant witnesses too far behind, we make the correction in the text, marking it as conjectural and recording the readings of the witnesses in the apparatus. Other errors that may be Ockham’s, if we guess that he has said what he meant to say (e.g. where he puts “*policernia*” for “*politeuma*”), we do not correct in the text but correct in the notes.

On the web site there is a full collation of all the witnesses we have read, but in this printed edition we do not report insignificant variants. Variants we regard as insignificant are between: *igitur/ergo/ita*; *vel/seu/sive/aut*; *et/atque/ac*; *nec/neque*; *autem/vero*; *is/illem/iste/ipse*; *namque/nam/quia/quod*; *huius/huiusmodi*; *sciendum/notandum*; *quando/quandoque/quandocumque*; *rursum/rursus*; *scilicet/id est*; *super/supra*; *adhuc/ad huc*; *predicta/prescripta*; *dicit/dixit* in introducing a quotation; proper name/pronoun; *quidem/quidam* (between which some scribes do not differentiate); presence or absence of prefixes when there is no

effect on meaning (e.g. *purgata/expurgata*) and other substitutions of synonyms (e.g. *subditi/subiecti*, *absque/sine*, *defendere/defensare*); presence or absence of “*et*” or “*vel*” in lists; presence or absence of “*autem*”; presence or absence of “*quod*” after “*dicit*”, “*dixit*” (etc.); “*beatus*” before a saint’s name; presence or absence of “*est*” after “*dicendum*”; transpositions that do not affect meaning; repetition or non-repetition of elements readily understood, e.g. of a preposition after a conjunction (“*in hoc opere quid de domino summo pontifice ac de doctrina eius...*”); presence or absence of “*et cetera*” at the end of a quotation, and the omission of more or fewer words before “*et cetera*”; dittography; presence or absence of “*c.*” (in canon law and bible references); “*y* and/or *x*” for “*x*” where *x* and *y* are near synonyms and “*y* and/or *x*” seems to be the scribe’s way of correcting a miscopying (see <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/MSRlns1d1.html#vel>); *eisdem/eadem causa et questione*; differences of spelling and spelling mistakes (or non-words); variations in proper names; variation between arabic and roman numerals; deletions and marginal and interlinear changes apparently made by the original scribe; presence or absence of “*Magister*” or “*Discipulus*” at the beginning of a chapter; variations in chapter division and chapter numbering. Variants not excluded by these rules may not be reported if they seem meaningless or ungrammatical and untranslatable. Variants of a kind generally excluded may be reported if they seem interesting in the particular case.

Besides filtering out insignificant variants, we do not report the less significant witnesses. Which witnesses are the most significant varies from one part of the work to another. In the introduction to each part we will explain which witnesses we will report regularly and which only occasionally. If the apparatus does not mention a certain witness, it cannot be inferred that the witness agrees with the editors’ text.

The purpose of the apparatus in the printed volume is not to make it possible for readers to infer the state of every witness, or to provide evidence on the relationships among the witnesses (this is to be found on the web site, in discussions of relationships hyperlinked to full collations). Its purpose is to enable readers to reconsider the text, by recording well-attested and significant variants found in good witnesses but rejected by the editors. How this idea applies depends on the quality of the text tradition. Since the text tradition of 3.1 *Dialogus* is weak, and the text tradition of 2 *Dialogus* does not include any witness (or small group of witnesses) clearly superior to the rest, there are for the texts edited in this volume rather few variants that are really well-attested and significant and found in good witnesses, and we have therefore erred on the

side of inclusion: many of the variants reported are “significant” only to a minor degree.