

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

**John Kilcullen**

Medieval Christians believed that immediately after death each soul is judged in a “particular” judgment, from which some souls are sent to heaven, others to hell, others to purgatory. They believed that all the souls of holy people who have died, if they have completed any necessary purgation, now enjoy blessedness in heaven. Theologians held that the happiness of heaven consists in, or results from, the “beatific vision”, that is, face-to-face contemplation of God: “We see now through a glass”, i.e. a mirror, “in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known” (1 Cor. 13:12). Christians also believed that at the end of time, on “the Last Day”, also called “Judgment Day”, there will be the Resurrection of the Body, the Second Coming of Christ, and the Last Judgment; that is, souls and bodies will be reunited, and Christ will come again into the world to hold a “General” (as distinct from the particular) Judgment: “And when the Son of man shall come in his majesty ... all nations shall be gathered together before him.... Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand: Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. ...Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. ...And these shall go into everlasting punishment: but the just, into life everlasting.” (Mt. 25:31-5, 41, 46, Douai).

In a number of sermons beginning from the feast of All Saints, 1 November 1331,<sup>2</sup> Pope John XXII challenged one of these beliefs, arguing that the saints will not enjoy face-to-face vision of God until the day of General Judgment.<sup>3</sup> He pointed to Bible texts (such as the passage just quoted from Matthew 25) that seem to say that heaven and hell begin after the Last Judgment; he referred to earlier theologians, notably Bernard of Clairvaux, who seemed to say that the saints would have vision of God only after Judgment Day; he argued that if the saints had the vision of God now, then the General Judgment would be pointless. In scholastic fashion John envisaged a *pars negativa* and a *pars affirmativa*, ranged on opposite sides of the question “Do the holy souls purged

---

1. Volker Leppin, Jan Ballweg, John Scott and George Knysh have contributed information, ideas and criticism to this introduction. 2. See Dykmans, *Sermons*. 3. John’s thesis had been considered and rejected by Thomas Aquinas (whom John had canonized in 1324). For Thomas’s views, see Summa 1-2 q.4 a.5 and 3 q.59 a.5.

of their sins now see the divine essence?” His was the *pars negativa*. The collection of authorities and arguments contained in his second sermon on the subject, preached on 15 December 1331, was progressively enlarged and developed into several works — tracts sent to various people for comment, a *Libellus partis negative* and a work entitled *Queritur utrum anime sanctorum ab omnibus peccatis purgate videant divinam essentiam*.<sup>4</sup>

John’s views provoked much opposition.<sup>5</sup> Twice he offered to revoke his doctrine. In a consistory held between 28 December 1333 and 3 January 1334, he first had his clergy read the arguments for the affirmative position and then argued the negative “with great warmth”; however, he stated, “if its truth were proved more clearly, we would stand just as willingly, and more, in favour of the affirmative conclusion than the negative”. He added a conditional revocation: “It was never my intention to say anything against the faith, and if we have said anything, we revoke the whole from this moment.”<sup>6</sup> He made another similar statement on his deathbed on 3-4 December 1334, affirming belief that the purified souls see the divine essence face-to-face “so far as this is compatible with the status and condition of a separated soul”, revoking anything he might have said contrary to faith and submitting everything he had said to the determination of the Church and of his successors.<sup>7</sup>

All participants in the controversy, including John himself, agreed on two points: that the saints do already enjoy beatitude in heaven, and that after Judgment Day they will enjoy a beatitude that is in some way more perfect.<sup>8</sup> According to John, their beatitude now consists in face-to-face association with Christ in his humanity, but not in face-to-face vision of the divine essence. Opponents of his view drew attention to certain Bible passages that seem to imply that the saints already have face-to-face vision of the divine essence. For instance, Paul wishes to be “dissolved” and to be absent from the body and to walk by sight with the Lord (2 Cor. 5:6-8; Phil. 1:21-3), “the Lord” referring here (they argued) to the divinity; but there would be no point in wishing for

4. See Dykmans, “Fragments”, which includes a reconstruction of the *Libellus partis negative*. 5. See Noël Valois, “Jacques Duèse, pape sous le nom de Jean XXII”, *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, 34 (1914), pp. 391-630, at 551-627; Christian Trottmann, *La vision béatifique* (Rome, 1995), p. 471ff; and Anneliese Maier, *Ausgehendes Mittelalter*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1977), p. 319ff. For a chronology of the controversy see Dykmans, “Fragments”, pp. 165-197. There are references in 2 Dial. to various non-extant tracts or works contributed to the controversy, some by John XXII and others by unknown authors. See below, 2.1 Dial., 3.132, 3.335, 5.27, and 2.2 Dial., [Prologus]. 13, 1.7, 4.12, 9.9, 9.54. 6. This account follows the report quoted in the text below; see chapters 1, 9 and 11. See also NM, pp. 1030-31, and CI, p. 33.19ff. For the official report see CUP, vol. 2, pp. 435-6. 7. See CUP, vol. 2, pp. 440-1. See also NM, p. 1015, and CI, p. 30.6 ff. 8. For Benedict’s account of the range of positions, see Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 466-9.

early dissolution if there is no sight of the divinity until Judgment Day.<sup>9</sup> In another passage Jesus says to the thief, “This day thou shalt be with me in paradise” (Lk 23:43). According to John’s opponents, the saints already have face-to-face vision of the divine essence, but after Judgment Day their beatitude will become more perfect either “intensively” or “extensively”, i.e. either because the vision will become more perfect or because certain goods (such as the glorification of the resurrected body) will be added to the vision, or for both reasons.<sup>10</sup>

Some participants in the controversy, such as Walter Chatton, John Lutterell and Guiral Ot, tried to develop a position from which the clashing authorities and arguments could be harmonized.<sup>11</sup> Like John, they held that the saints do not yet have immediate vision of God, but like John’s opponents they held that the saints do already have a vision of God: in respect of the first contention, they could be regarded as defenders of John’s position — Chatton certainly presented himself as such — but in respect of the second they modified John’s position significantly. According to Ot, for example, the saints already enjoy a vision of the divine essence, but after Judgment Day that vision will be replaced by a more perfect vision of God, specifically and numerically distinct from the vision they enjoy now. Ot’s position was unanimously rejected by a body of theologians at Vincennes on 19 December 1333.<sup>12</sup>

9. See the extract from Armand de Belvézer in Maier, *op.cit.*, pp. 529-32. Thomas Aquinas had also argued from 2 Cor. 5:6-8: Summa 1-2 q.4 a.5 c. and 3 q.59 a.5 ad 1. 10. According to Thomas Aquinas, “corpore resumpto, beatitudo crescit non intensive, sed extensive”; Summa 1-2 q.4 a.5 ad 5. Bonaventure held that the increase in perfection was in intensity; see Trottmann, p. 420. See also Nicolaus de Lyra, quoted Maier, *op.cit.*, p. 567. Franciscans generally agreed with Bonaventure, and this is the position of the first of our two tracts; see below, 3.233. 11. See A. Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-72, especially pp. 347, 356-8. Chatton distinguishes three specifically different visions of God. The first is the knowledge and faith in this life; the second is that of the saints before Judgment Day, which is a “specular” vision of God (i.e. as in a mirror, through a created intermediary, namely the beatitude of Christ’s soul); the third is the vision the saints have after Judgment, which is *facialis*, i.e. face-to-face; but the second can also be called face-to-face *denominative*. See M. Dykmans, “Les Frères Mineurs d’Avignon au début de 1333 et le sermon de Gautier de Chatton sur la vision béatifique”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 38 (1971), pp. 105-48, especially pp. 137, 143, 145, 147, 148. Lutterell presents a similar theory: vision before Judgment is expressed by the created mind, and therefore represents God inadequately, whereas vision after Judgment is totally effected by God; since the former is the way to the latter, they constitute a single eternal life. See *Iohannis Lutterellis Epistula de Visione Beatifica*, in F. Hoffmann, ed., *Die Schriften des Oxforder Kanzlers Iohannes Lutterell, Erfurter Theologische Studien* 6 (Leipzig 1959), pp. 103-119, especially pp. 105, 110, 112. 12. The meeting was called by the King of France. The theologians were asked two questions: Whether the souls in heaven see the divine essence face-to-face before the resurrection of the body and the General Judgment?, and Is the vision they now have of the divine essence emptied out at the Last Judgment and replaced by another? Unanimously they answered Yes to the first and No to the second. See CUP, vol. 2, pp. 429-432.

John's successor, Benedict XII, rejected John's doctrine and also doctrines like Ot's that denied the numerical identity of the vision before and after Judgment. In the bull *Benedictus Deus* (29 January, 1336), Benedict determined that after Christ's ascension into heaven, holy souls "immediately after their death and purification (in the case of those who need such purification)... *even before they resume their bodies and before the General Judgment*,... see the divine essence with an intuitive vision and indeed face-to-face... the *same* vision... *without any intercision or evacuation*... will be continued until the Last Judgment and from then on sempiternally".<sup>13</sup> It was Benedict's personal opinion that after Judgment day the vision will become more perfect intensively, but *Benedictus Deus* left the question open.<sup>14</sup>

Of the two tracts edited in this volume, the first, which we have called *De revocatione ficta Joannis 22<sup>i</sup>*, is a critical commentary on John's first revocation, of 3 January 1334, which was also the object of an "appeal" drafted by another member of the dissident Franciscan group in Munich, Bonagratia of Bergamo.<sup>15</sup> This and the second revocation, 3-4 December 1334, are both criticised in Ockham's tract *Contra Iohannem* and also in a tract by an unidentified Franciscan dissident, *Quoniam ut ait Leo papa*.<sup>16</sup> These four works quote reports (*reportaciones*) purportedly made by persons present at the first revocation,<sup>17</sup> and there is also an official transcript which differs somewhat from the report used by the Franciscans.<sup>18</sup> The quotations from the report in *De revocatione ficta* and *Quoniam ut ait Leo papa* include material not found in *Contra Iohannem*, which begins with the passage quoted in chapter 9 of *De revocatione ficta*, and the report in *De revocatione ficta* contains material not found in any of the others, namely the passages quoted in Chapters 2, 3, 4 and the first passage in Chapter 5.<sup>19</sup> Although the introduction to Chapter 2 makes no reference to the *reportaciones* and might be taken as the beginning of a

13. "...mox post mortem suam et purgationem praefatam in illis qui purgatione huiusmodi indigebant, etiam ante resurrectionem suorum corporum et iudicium generale... viderunt, vident et videbunt divinam essentiam visione intuitiva et etiam faciali, nulla mediante creatura in ratione obiecti visi se habente, sed divina essentia immediate se nude clare et aperte eis ostendente... quodque postquam inchoate fuit vel erit talis intuitiva et facialis visio et fructio in eisdem, eadem visio et fructio sine aliqua intercisione seu evacuatione praedictae visionis et fructiois continuata extitit et continuabitur usque ad finale iudicium et extunc usque in sempiternum"; *Codicis iuris canonici orientalis fontes*, Series 3, vol. 8 (Rome, 1958), p. 12. 14. Trottmann, pp. 751-60. 15. Ms Vat. lat. 4009 fols. 164r-168v. 16. This tract is included in NM, pp. 1017-92. 17. Cf. [Prologus].9, 1.12. 18. CUP, pp. 435-6. 19. See on the project website "Reports of the retraction of 3 Jan. 1334", where the comparisons between *De revocatione ficta* and other documents are shown by coloured text.

digression, at other places it is clear that the author attributes these passages to the reporters.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps the author was relying on a fuller version of the *reportaciones*, or perhaps he composed these passages to supply the reasoning alluded to in the words “in the same consistory he... tried to prove” etc.,<sup>21</sup> drawing on other sources of John’s arguments available to the Munich group (such as his sermons, the tracts mentioned in *De revocatione ficta* and the *magnum opus* mentioned in *Compendium errorum*<sup>22</sup>).

Like Ockham’s commentary on *Quia vir reprobis* in the *Opus nonaginta dierum*, *De revocatione ficta* is a critical commentary on a text. At the beginning of each chapter there is a quotation from the *reportaciones*, then there are various points the author makes in reply, and finally there are critical comments on short segments of the passage quoted at the beginning of the chapter (*cum enim primo dicit...* etc., corresponding to the *ad literam* sections in *Opus nonaginta dierum*). To show that John’s doctrine is a heresy is not the main purpose of the work.<sup>23</sup> Its objective is twofold, first to answer certain arguments John gave in support of his doctrine at the consistory of 28 December 1333 to 3 January 1334, and second, and especially, to demonstrate the insufficiency of the revocation John offered at the conclusion of that consistory. According to our author, John’s statement was not really a revocation but at best a protestation, it was untruthful and insincere and not equivalent to the revocation anyone who has pertinaciously asserted a heresy must make before being re-admitted to the Church, and even a proper revocation would not change the fact that John had been a heretic and had therefore ceased to be pope. The same line of argument is also pursued in *Contra Iohannem* and *Quoniam ut ait Leo papa*. John and his supporters might have agreed that John never revoked his doctrine except conditionally but might have argued that all the same he was not a heretic, even though his doctrine was erroneous, because the question had not yet been decided by Church authority.<sup>24</sup> However, it is an important point of the doctrine of heresy and heretics held by the Franciscan dissidents, explained in Chapter 11 of this tract, that a Catholic is bound to believe, explicitly or implicitly, many things that have never been defined explicitly by pope or

20. See the introductory words to Chapters 3, 4 and 5. 21. See 1.8. 22. For the tracts see below 3.335 and 5.27, and for the *magnum opus* see CE 6.13, p. 57, parallel with 2.2 Dial. 1.7 below. For possible identifications of these tracts see Dykmans, “Fragments”, pp. 232-6. Offler sees reasons to doubt the authenticity of CE but decides in its favour; OP, vol. 4, pp. 3-6. Knysh criticizes this decision; see his *Ockham Perspectives* (Winnipeg, 1994), pp. 46-51. 23. Cf. 5.71–73. 24. “[S]es adversaires n’auraient pas eu le droit de le faire condamner comme hérétique, le point en litige n’ayant pas encore été formellement défini par l’Église”; Valois, *op. cit.*, p. 626. Ockham would have agreed that the pope’s adversaries could not condemn him *judicially* for a doctrine the Church had not explicitly condemned as heretical, but extra-judicially they could.

councils, including, notably, any doctrine held as Catholic by all Catholics.<sup>25</sup> According to these Franciscans, before John began to preach on the subject every Catholic held that the purified souls of those who have died in the state of grace already see God face-to-face, even before Judgment Day: if this is so, then, since John has contradicted a doctrine universally held as Catholic, he can be judged without further examination to be pertinacious and a heretic. John claims that he put forward his own view only *recitative* (and some of the things he said do fit this description), but some of his words show that he put it forward *assertive* and pertinaciously, and his actions show the same thing. In the view of the dissident Franciscans, John taught a heresy (one not yet explicitly condemned), held it pertinaciously, and never revoked it.

The second tract, which we have called *Responsiones ad quasdam rationes sophisticas adductas ad muniendum errorem Iohannis 22<sup>i</sup> de visione animarum sanctarum in celo* (*Responsiones* for short), is an answer to supporters of John's position. We cannot identify these supporters or their writings. Like the first tract, the second assumes, without trying to prove, that the alleged heresy is a heresy; its objective is to answer certain arguments given in its support. These include arguments from texts of scripture that seem to imply that the souls' reward will follow Judgment Day and passages from the writings of St Bernard; there is not much overlap with the arguments discussed in the first tract. In the last chapter the author argues that simple lay people do not have to wait to be told what to believe by the pope and cardinals but are bound to believe what they find when they read the Bible themselves — or, by implication, what they find when they read the relevant Bible passages under the guidance of John's critics. In both tracts distinctions among the levels of beatitude are important to the argument.<sup>26</sup> Some Bible passages promise beatitude before Judgment Day; other passages that promise *complete* beatitude after Judgment Day do not imply that the former passages cannot be taken to promise some lower degree of beatitude before that day. There is an English translation and an analysis of the argument of both tracts on the project web site.

The two tracts have come down to us in the early printed editions and in many manuscripts as the second part of Ockham's *Dialogus*, with the title *De dogmatibus Iohannis 22<sup>i</sup>*. We know from Ockham's prologue to Part 1 that the *Dialogus* was intended to include a Part 2 discussing the erroneous teachings of Pope John XXII, but it seems certain that the extant Part 2 is not the one Ock-

25. See 11.260–269. 26. See, for example, 2.1 Dial. 3 and 5, and 2.2. Dial. 4 and 6.

ham intended to write. According to cross-references contained in other Parts of the *Dialogus* and in other works,<sup>27</sup> Part 2 would have dealt with many teachings that the dissidents regarded as heretical, and presumably it would have been in dialogue form. The Part 2 that has come down to us is not in dialogue form and deals with only one topic, John's views on the beatific vision.<sup>28</sup> Some of the topics forecast in Part 1 for Part 2 are discussed in the first two "preambulary" tracts of Part 3 (the only extant tracts of Part 3), which were not included in the original plan for Part 3 sketched out in the Prologue to Part 1. It seems that some time before beginning to write Part 3, perhaps when John died, Ockham decided to postpone writing Part 2 but deal with some of its more urgent topics at the beginning of Part 3. However, references in *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate*, which may have been his last work, suggest that Ockham never gave up his intention to write a comprehensive Part 2 on all the errors of John XXII — an intention apparently never carried out, since no text in dialogue form has been found that fits this description.<sup>29</sup>

We do not know how these two tracts came to be incorporated into the *Dialogus*. Since references to Part 2 in Ockham's latest works do not fit the extant Part 2, it seems that for as long as he continued to write Ockham did not regard these tracts as part of the *Dialogus*. Perhaps they were inserted into the *Dialogus* at the end of his life by Ockham himself or by someone acting on his instructions, but in view of the unsuitability of such a substitution this seems unlikely. Perhaps they were inserted after his death, though not at his instruction, by someone who knew he had written them. Perhaps they were inserted by someone who did not know but guessed, perhaps wrongly, that Ockham had written them. We have no way of deciding between these possibilities. It has been suggested that a copyist may have mistaken this work for the missing Part 2, misled by its title "De dogmatibus papae Iohannis XXII", which was

27. See "Ockham's References to the Dialogue or its Parts" on the project web site. 28. The copyist of the Cologne manuscript gives similar reasons for thinking that the extant Part 2 does not belong to the *Dialogus*: "Sequitur tractatus secundus principaliter, qui est de dogmatibus Iohannis pape 22. Puto tamen quod tractatus ille qui sequitur non sit ille qui est secunda pars principalis huius operis, tum quia non procedit dialogando, tum quia non tractat de erroribus bullatis contentis in quattuor constitutionibus Iohannis 22 sed tantum de erroribus per eum predicatis, quos tamen se tractaturum in hac secunda parte in precedenti tractatu plures repromittit." (fol. 275r) (Presumably "quos" refers to "erroribus bullatis".) 29. From the references in IPP 27.223-4 (p. 333), 27.531 [rather, 27.476 (p. 342)] and 27.648-9 (p. 349), Offler infers (OP, vol. 4, pp. 274-5) that the organization of Part 2 as Ockham planned it toward the end of his life would have been: tract 1 on the heresies of John's constitution *Ad conditorem*, tract 2 on those of *Cum inter*, tract 3 on those of *Quia quorundam*, and tract 4 on those of *Quia vir*. (Cf. Baudry, p. 175.) This plan corresponds with the organization of several other attacks by Ockham on John XXII, including EFM, CE and IPP cap. 27. References in 3 Dial. are consistent with this plan; see 3.1 Dial 1.9 and 3.2 Dial 1.24.

foreshadowed as the title for Part 2 in several places in Part 1; however, there is no evidence that the existing Part 2 ever circulated as a separate work<sup>30</sup> and no information about its original title, if it had one. In a fairly detailed table of contents of the *Dialogus* included in a manuscript made some time after 1356<sup>31</sup> the entry for Part 2 reads, “Secunda pars eiusdem” without further detail, which may suggest that the table maker did not have access to a copy of 2 Dial., which in turn may suggest that the existing Part 2 was inserted into the *Dialogus* after 1356; but other hypotheses are possible — perhaps the maker of the table happened not to have a complete copy of the *Dialogus* (none of the extant manuscripts except Fr contains all parts and tracts), or perhaps he did not find for 2 Dial. as convenient a summary as was offered by the prologues to the other two parts. At all events, from the last quarter of the fourteenth century there is evidence that the existing Part 2 had somehow become part of the manuscript tradition of the *Dialogus*. Pierre D’Ailly’s *Sentences* commentary and *Abbreviatio Dyalogi Okan*, which date from before 1378, show that D’Ailly was acquainted with the existing Part 2 and regarded it as part of the *Dialogus*.<sup>32</sup> The existing Part 2 is also included in a manuscript completed in 1389.<sup>33</sup> On balance we have decided not to exclude the existing Part 2 from the *Dialogus* and we will continue to refer to its two tracts as “2.1 Dial.” and “2.2 Dial.”

It is not certain that the two tracts were intended to form a single work. Each has its own objective, as explained above. The objectives overlap somewhat, since the first tract is concerned not only with the adequacy of the supposed retraction but also with the pope’s arguments in favour of his position, while the second is also concerned with arguments (a different set of arguments). The two objectives could have been pursued in two parts of a work planned as a unit, or they could have been pursued in two works written separately, perhaps even by different authors, and put together later as being relevant to the same general topic. In the incunabula editions they are presented as Tract 1 and Tract 2 of Part 2. In most manuscripts, however, Part 2 does not contain two distinct Tracts: with a few exceptions, the manuscripts present what the incunabula call

---

<sup>30</sup> The two tracts are contained in Ha and Kg without any other part of the *Dialogus*, but in these manuscripts also they are designated as Part 2 of the *Dialogus*. <sup>31</sup> Bremen 35, fol. 176r. George Knysh drew attention to this manuscript and suggested that it shows that the existing Part 2 was then not part of the *Dialogus*. <sup>32</sup> See Ian Murdoch, *Critical Edition of Pierre D’Ailly’s Abbreviatio Dyalogi Okan* (Monash University thesis, 1981), pp. xvii-xix, xxi, xxiii. <sup>33</sup> Pa, which, according to the scribe’s note on fol. 171v, was finished on 11 May, 1389. Its incipit for Part 2, fol. 156rb, reads: “Incipit 2<sup>us</sup> tractatus de dogmatibus Iohannis 22<sup>us</sup>”. (Some manuscripts refer to the parts of the *Dialogus* as *tractatus*.) The table of contents, written in the same hand, refers to “secunda pars dyalogi eiusdem, scilicet de dogmatibus pape Iohannis 22<sup>us</sup>”. See Baudry, pp. 174-5.

the second tract as a continuation of the first, without any break or heading,<sup>34</sup> and in some manuscripts the chapters of the second are numbered continuously with those of the first.<sup>35</sup> The filiation of the manuscripts, though different from that for other parts of the *Dialogus*, seems to be the same for both tracts, which implies that all the extant manuscripts descend from an archetype in which the two tracts were contained together (though this does not prove that they were written to go together). On the other hand, each tract has its own prologue<sup>36</sup> and each ends with its own “protestation”; neither makes any reference to the other, even when dealing with similar material; and in explaining its objective, the prologue of the second refers to itself as “this present work”. On balance it seems more likely they were written as two separate works, and we have decided to present them as such, each with a title drawn from its own description of what it is about.

*De revocatione ficta* cannot have been written before its author had the report of John’s statement of 3 January 1334. It is unlikely to have been written after John’s death on 3 December 1334, since it makes no reference to his deathbed statement and in several places implies that John is still alive.<sup>37</sup> *Responsiones* also supposes that John is still alive,<sup>38</sup> and since the controversy over the beatific vision began from John’s sermon of 1 November 1331, the tract cannot have been written before then. It must have been written after the controversy had made some progress, since it refers to various other controversial works; but those works have not been identified or dated. Neither tract refers to the views of Chatton, Lutterell or Ot, which we might suppose would have interested Ockham and his colleagues. However, even if their interventions had already taken place the Munich dissidents might not have heard of them, and their positions differed from John’s and therefore might not have seemed relevant to criticism of him; absence of any reference therefore does not help to date these tracts. The most we can say, then, is that the first tract seems to have been written during 1334 and the second sometime through

---

34. A few do mark a break. Ko ends the first tract with an explicit, followed by an incipit for the second. Pam has “secundus tractatus”, Vbm has “forte tractatus 3<sup>us</sup>”, Frm has “pars secundus”. Lb has extra space, Sa has a large heading, Va has a small extra space. 35. Numbering is continuous in Ba, Di, Es, Fr, Vd. (In Vd the chapter numbers are not by the scribe.) In Lb the chapter numbers of Tract 2 begin again at 1. In most manuscripts the chapters are not numbered. 36. The manuscripts do not label these as prologues, but the style is strongly reminiscent of the prologues of other works of the time. 37. For example, *De Revocatione ficta* acknowledges that John may believe that his statement exonerates him (9.14–15), it envisages the possibility that John may be converted (11.8), it states what sort of revocation he should make (11.372), it warns against trusting his claim that he is willing to consider criticism (12.6). See Baudry, pp. 173–4. 38. The “Prologue” to *Responsiones* refers to John as ruler in Avignon ([Prologus].9).

the period between 1 November 1331 and 3 December 1334. Either tract or both may have been finished or revised after John's death, but there is no evidence that that actually happened.

Are these tracts authentic works of Ockham? If a copyist or editor was mistaken about their belonging to the *Dialogus*, he may well have been mistaken about their authorship. The question cannot be given a definite answer. It seems clear that the works ascribed to various members of the dissident Franciscan group were to some extent joint productions and that the degree of collaboration varied from one work to another.<sup>39</sup> Some works are clearly by Ockham as principal or sole writer. The *Letter to the Friars Minor* is explicitly personal, and it mentions (though not by name), as distinct from works of other members of the group, works that Ockham has written himself or is writing.<sup>40</sup> The *Work of Ninety Days*, which Ockham, writing personally in the Epilogue,<sup>41</sup> refers to as his own, reports the views of "the attackers", i.e. the views of the dissident Franciscans, "who, though they agree in the main assertions against the attacked, do, however, think in opposed ways in some incidental matters"; at some points in this work Ockham seems to be writing almost from dictation,<sup>42</sup> but in other places he indicates that his position may not be identical with that of other members of the group.<sup>43</sup> The *Dialogus* was clearly Ockham's own project (though it may originally have been intended to be anonymous), which he advertises in other surely authentic works.<sup>44</sup> Much of its content is the common property of the group, but again there are indications in some places that he is presenting a personal opinion — for example, when in the *Dialogus* the Student expresses surprise or disbelief and asks for a thorough explanation.<sup>45</sup> There are other works in the writing of which Ockham had some part but not as principal writer. The *Allegationes de potestate imperiali* exists in two versions, one of which (according to Offler) is a collaboratively produced document that was then rewritten (possibly not by Ockham himself) so as to reflect Ockham's own

39. As Offler remarks, "The polemic of Michael's followers against John XXII was a collective effort, in which the participants freely shared their ideas and their materials. Consequently there is a family resemblance in their works... The similarities [between CI and *Quoniam ut ait Leo papa*] are no more than might be expected in two works, written at almost the same time, for the same purpose, from the same materials, by two men living in the close personal and intellectual contacts of the Minorite circle at Munich"; Introduction to CI, pp. 26-7. See similar remarks in OP, vol. 4, p. x. 40. Est enim mihi per viros litteraturae egregiae evidenter ostensum... ad quae probanda plura volumina sunt edita; et ego... tenuitate ingenii mei scripsi manu mea quinquaginta sexernos... et adhuc habeo scribere quadraginta et amplius; EFM, p. 15.8-16. 41. OND 124.459ff. 42. OND 105.19-21. 43. Cf. OND 94.327-332, 103.85-98, 106.66-114, 124.44, 124.96. 44. E.g. Brev., pr.18-21, pp. 97-8; IPP, pr.72, p. 282. 45. "Because I have not elsewhere heard that distinction of natural law, I wish to make objections against it...", 3.2 Dial. 3.6; "I have not heard or read that opinion anywhere else", 3.1 Dial. 3.4.

distinctive view.<sup>46</sup> With respect to works attributed to certain members of the group, scholars have suggested that some passages may have been contributed by other members of the group.<sup>47</sup> There are writings produced by members of the group of which the authorship is unknown or doubtful, for example the two “Ottoboni” tracts and the Freiburg *quaestio* discussed by Annaliese Maier,<sup>48</sup> which might have been written by Ockham but could have been written by some other member(s) of the group. The noteworthy tract *Quoniam ut ait Leo papa*, contained in the *Chronicle of Nicolaus the Minorite*, has not been attributed to any known author, and indeed Nicolaus is not otherwise known. Although, as we noted above, in the writings for which he was principally responsible, Ockham was careful not to ascribe his own distinctive opinions to the other members of the group, it seems that he and they were not much interested in being known as writers or as holders of distinctive opinions.

Against attributing our tracts to Ockham is their general quality: in some places the argument is weak, confused or lacking in force,<sup>49</sup> and there is nothing that seems original. *De revocatione ficta*, especially Chapter 11, and the last chapter of *Responsiones*, are reminiscent of writings securely attributed to Ockham, and perhaps they were written by him. But the ideas expressed in both tracts were common to the dissident group and the whole of each treatise might well have been written by some other member of the group. How much other members of the group may have had to do with these tracts is a question we must leave to those better acquainted with the works of the other dissident Franciscans.

The present edition is based on the work of Volker Leppin and Jan Ballweg, whose edition is to appear in *Im Streit um die Schau Gottes. Ockhams ‘De*

46. See OP, vol. 4, pp. 360-1, 363. 47. Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 408-9, points to features of the Trier draft appeal, ascribed to Bonagratia, that suggest that Bonagratia drew on work of his theologian colleagues: “Das Manuscript der Appellation ist im juristischen Teil offensichtlich ein erster Entwurf, der voll ist von Streichungen, Verbesserungen, Ergänzungen usw., während der theologische Teil den Charakter einer nur hier und da korrigierten Reinschrift hat”. 48. Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 373-414, 505-42. Maier suggests (pp. 523-7) that the Freiburg *quaestio* may have been written by Ockham. Offler does not accept the suggestion, OP, vol. 4, p. xi. 49. For example, compare *De revocatione ficta* 3.131–153 with the similar argument as put by Armand de Belvézer and its parallels in the Ottoboni tract, the Freiburg *quaestio* and the Trier draft appeal, Maier, *op. cit.*, p. 529-42. It is hard to believe that anyone familiar with any of these works would have been content to write the version in *De revocatione ficta*. If, as Maier suggests, Armand de Belvézer’s treatise, or, as Offler surmises, the Freiburg tract, was the *opus sollemne* that the author of CE copied in his own hand (CE, note to 6.14, p. 57), then he is not likely to have been the author of *De revocatione ficta*, unless the treatise was written before that copying was done.

*dogmatibus Papae Johannis' im Spannungsfeld von Frömmigkeit, Theologie und Politik*, by Volker Leppin, Jan Ballweg, Claudia Heidemann and Annette Weissenrieder. Their edition will form Chapter 5, and a discussion of the witnesses to the text will be Chapter 4. An edition of 2 *Dialogus* by Leppin and Ballweg has long been planned as part of this British Academy edition of the *Dialogus*. Kilcullen and Scott have revised the edition of Leppin and Ballweg to bring it into conformity with the editorial conventions of the British Academy edition. We have re-read many of the witnesses, we have revised the division into chapters and the paragraphing and revised the text in other ways, and we have numbered the lines by chapter rather than by paragraph. The notes in the present edition are based mostly on the research of Volker Leppin, Jan Ballweg and Annette Weissenrieder.

Ballweg found that the witnesses to the text fall into two main groups with various sub-groups. The division into Group A and Group B arises mainly from the fact that in witnesses of Group B part of the text has been misplaced, due perhaps to a binding error,<sup>50</sup> but the groups are also distinguished by other differences; in general, the witnesses in which the text is in the right order also seem generally to have the better (or more plausible) text. Ballweg's analysis and our observations suggest the following grouping:

Group A: (**Ca** Pc) (**Pa** Vd) **Pb** (Di **Fr** Kg<sup>51</sup>) (Ha Ko) Ar (**Pz** Lm) (**Ly** Gs)

Group B: (**Vb** Na Va) **Lb** ((**Es** **Ba** To) (**La** Lc Un) **Ax**) **Fi** Sa

Bold sigla indicate the witnesses we have re-read and collated, which include representatives of each of the sub-groups (except Ha and Ko, which contain a somewhat re-written version of the work). In formulating the consensus of the groups and sub-groups we often discount Ca, Fr, Lb, Ba, Ax and Fi: Ca because in part it is illegible, due to damage; Fr, Ax and Fi because of their many errors, i.e. omissions or variants that are implausible and not found in other witnesses;

<sup>50</sup> In Vb the misplacement divides the word "in/tellexerunt", so it must have happened after the text was written. Anne Kilcullen has suggested the following explanation. The phrase "eadem facilitate dicetur", missing from its proper place at the top of what is now fol. 175r (which should have been 176r) was written as a correction into the bottom margin of the page that now appears as fol. 176v (which should have been 175v). As it happens, the same phrase begins fol. 177r. Someone gathering the pages for binding later mistook the correction in the margin of 175r for a catchphrase and flipped the sheet. Since such an accident is not likely to have happened twice, Vb may be the ancestor of all witnesses of Group B, but, if so, some members of group B had intermediate ancestors, since sub-groups can be distinguished, notably the one to which Es belongs. <sup>51</sup> Ballweg observes that Di Fr and Kg are generally closer in their readings to witnesses of group B, and indeed Kg has the misplacement of text characteristic of the members of the B group. Perhaps Di Fr Kg descend from a group B ancestor but an intermediate ancestor of Di and Fr recognised and corrected the text misplacement. The readings of Fr are often close to those of group A.

Ba because (in this Part of *Dialogus*) it seems to be a copy of Es; Lb because it seems dependent on two other extant witnesses (or on lost witnesses close to them), in that its original text often agrees with Vb and its corrections often bring it close to Es. Lb and Es have many corrections, but generally they merely bring the text into line with that of other members of Group B, though in some cases the reading of Es seems more convincing than other variants. Fi is full of errors, but often it shows a good reading not found in most witnesses. Even generally poor manuscripts may provide authentic readings, because of the efforts medieval academics made to improve their manuscript by comparing them with others. We have therefore thought it worthwhile to collate some witnesses that are generally inferior.<sup>52</sup>

Assuming that users of our edition will not want to be shown a multitude of unpromising variants, we have adopted a number of “filtering” rules. We do not report variants that are insignificant (as defined in the introduction to this volume, p. xii), and we report regularly only some of the witnesses to the text. We report the consensus of each the two main groups A and B, the consensus of two sub-groups, Az and Bz, and the consensus of the early printed editions, Ed. We often report the variants of three “lead” witnesses, namely Pa (which we regard as a good representative of group A), Vb (a member of group B, perhaps the ancestor of that group) and Es (a member of a sub-group of group B); but generally we report their variants only when the same reading is found also in at least one other member of their group or sub-group. Ly derives from Pz, and for 2 Dial. its differences from its source seem due to intelligent conjecture, rather than access to any other witness. All the same, we report significant variants unique to Ly because Ly (or its derivative, Gs) is the text most scholars have been accustomed to use, and also because the editor (or editors) of Ly took great care to produce an intelligible text. In positive apparatus entries we sometimes report witnesses not regularly reported. Otherwise we do not report variants of individual witnesses unless they seem interesting or unless support for the reading we have adopted is weak. A complete collation of all the witnesses we have read, a study of the relationships among the witnesses and a discussion of problem passages in the text will be found on the project web site. Anyone who wants a fuller apparatus should consult the edition of Leppin and Ballweg.

---

52. For discussion of the relations among these witnesses, with links to the places in the collation that illustrate relationships, see “Witnesses to Part 2 of the *Dialogus*” on the web site.