

INTRODUCTION

John Kilcullen

According to the Prologue to 3 *Dialogus*, the first of its planned nine tracts will be concerned with the powers of the pope and clergy. As it stands, it deals only with the powers of the pope: Did Christ make Peter head of the Church? What power did Christ confer on Peter's successors, the popes? The discussion surveys opinions ranging from the claim that Christ has given the pope fullness of power in the sense that he can lawfully do anything not forbidden by morality or divine law (i.e. that he is not bound by human law and custom), to the opinion of Marsilius, who makes the pope subordinate to the authority of the secular ruler. According to Marsilius, Christ did not make Peter head of the Church, Peter never was in Rome, the claim of the Roman bishop to be Peter's successor is false, and there is no sense in which the pope has fullness of power.

Ockham's concern with defining the limits of papal power first emerged in book 7, chapter 67, of the first part of the *Dialogus*. The Master remarks that the question is of great importance "in these days", and says that some think that ambitious clergy have greatly exaggerated the extent of the pope's power, to the detriment of the laity. A number of objections against the claim to fullness of power are reported, namely conflicts with certain traditional views on the extent of Church power – that no one can be ordered to be celibate or to become a monk, that the property even of unbelievers cannot be confiscated by the Church, that there are limitations on any obligation the Church can impose of avoiding excommunicated persons. The discussion is then adjourned to the treatise "On the doctrines of John XXII", which would have formed Part 2 of the *Dialogus*. As has been explained in the introduction to Part 2, the extant Part 2 is not the treatise that Ockham meant to write and it contains nothing on papal power; instead, the question of the extent of papal power is discussed in Book 1 of the first tract of Part 3. By the time he came to write this work, Ockham had treated the matter in a number of other writings and developed a considerable repertory of arguments.¹

Book 1 presents and discusses five views of the power of the pope. The main contrast is between the first three positions, according to which the pope has power (either entirely from Christ or partly from men) to do anything not contrary to morality or revelation, and the fourth (which is the opinion of Marsilius), according to which the pope has no more power than other priests, and no coercive power, unless such power is granted to him by the secular ruler.

1. For a tabular survey, see G. Knysh, *Political Ockhamism* (Winnipeg, 1996), pp. 271-86.

The fifth position (which we can be confident is Ockham's own, since it is found also in his "assertive" works), is that the pope has from Christ great power in spiritual matters, and in temporal matters power to intervene, not regularly, but "on occasion", i.e. when some temporal action is necessary or very useful to the Christian community and no lay person is able or willing to do it; the combination of power in spiritual matters and occasional power in temporals can be called "fullness of power".

Although this power is not the fullest, it is, nevertheless, abundant, singular and very great. . . It is not easy, however, to state, explicitly and in particular, all the cases in which he can do the aforesaid things, or some of them. And perhaps no universal teaching can be given about them by which it may be known with certainty and without error, especially by the simple, when the pope can do such things and when he cannot, and what kind of things he can do in one case and what kind in another (3.1 Dial. 1.16).

Book 2 begins a more detailed discussion of the elements of the fifth opinion. Since Christ is said to have given power to the pope by appointing Peter head of the Church (the pope being Peter's successor), the discussion begins with the question whether Christ did make Peter the head of the Church. But first there is a discussion of the question whether it is beneficial for the Church to have one person as its head. This question occupies the whole of Book 2. An interesting subsidiary question (chapters 20-28) is whether, if Christ did appoint a single head, the Church has power in some situations to change this monarchical constitution to an aristocracy.

But did Christ in fact establish the Church as a monarchy? At the beginning of Book 3 the discussion is about to come to the question whether Christ appointed Peter head, but the Student decides to reopen a question already discussed in Part 1 of the *Dialogus*, explaining that he wants to discuss it again "because of statements of certain people that we did not have then" (3.1 Dial. 3.1). These people, or rather this person, was Marsilius of Padua, and much of the discussion in Books 3 and 4 is of the opinions of Marsilius. Book 3 discusses the question, Which writings are Christians obliged to believe? Marsilius had argued that Christians are not obliged to believe anything except the Bible (anticipating the Reformers' *sola scriptura*); and, according to Marsilius, it cannot be proved by Scripture that Christ made Peter head of the Church. As the Student remarks,

it seems to me that the common opinion of all christians, especially those obedient to the Roman Church, has been that blessed Peter was established by Christ as head and chief of the Apostles and also of all the faithful. Yet that opinion is attacked these days and there is a very serious deliberate reply to

arguments which seem to be based on divine Scripture. In order, therefore, that I and others should be offered an opportunity of considering more accurately whether our forebears were deceived in this, ... I will set out their replies not in an abbreviated way but fully ... (3.1 Dial. 4.3).

In Books 3 and 4, therefore, Ockham presents Marsilius's opinions on this subject in Marsilius's own words and at length.²

On the question what must be believed, four opinions are discussed. The first is the position of Marsilius, that Christians are obliged only to believe the Bible and any interpretation of the Bible adopted by a general Council. The second is that, in addition to the Bible and the Councils, a Catholic must believe papal decrees, the Canons of the Apostles, and writings of doctors approved by the Church (Augustine, for example). The third is that in addition other doctors (that is, theology teachers) should be believed when they agree with one another. The fourth (which we can be confident is Ockham's own opinion) is more restrictive than the second and third: it is that a Catholic must always believe the Bible, Bible writers and the Apostles, and others sometimes but not always. The explanation of how one might sometimes be obliged to believe authors who are fallible and sometimes err depends on the idea of presumption: one ought to presume that what a generally credible person says on matters of fact within that person's knowledge is true, unless there is some particular reason for doubt. Subsidiary questions discussed in this book include whether Councils are infallible (Marsilius held that they are), and whether there are any passages in the Bible the literal sense of which we may not be able to understand.³

2. A. Van Leeuwen, "L'Église règle de foi chez Ockham", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 11 (1934), pp. 249-88, drew attention to the citations in 3.1 Dial. 3.1 and c. 21 of *Defensor pacis* II.xix; J. G. Sikes, "A possible Marsilian Source in Ockham", *English Historical Review* 51 (1936), pp. 496-504, drew attention to citations in 3.1 Dial. 4.1 of *Defensor pacis* II.xvi.3-10. In all, Ockham in 3.1 Dial. 3.1, 21 and 4.1, 3, 12, 21, quotes *Defensor pacis* II.xvi.2-10, xix.2-7, xxvii.2, and xxviii.5-9. In Books 3 and 4 we have indented the passages quoted from Marsilius, though Ockham does not mention Marsilius by name and (except in a few places) does not indicate that he is quoting anyone. The indentation is not meant to indicate that the quotations are verbatim. Ockham was not altogether consistent in his treatment of these passages. In some places he leaves first person singular pronouns and verbs referring to Marsilius (*mihi, video*), in other places he replaces them with third person plural (thus "... sequens, declino" in Marsilius's text becomes "... sequentes, declinant"). There are also some changes of word order and some minor rewriting. Ockham's text of Marsilius seems close to that of the manuscripts the editors of *Defensor pacis* have called T and H (see Scholz, pp. xxvi-xxxiv). 3. In chapters 14-20 there is a discussion of the proposition that there may be some things in the Bible that at some time cannot be understood at all, or not without some further revelation. Examples considered include passages from Daniel and New Testament passages about the last times (e.g. 2 Thess. 2:7-8). The Master remarks, with some feeling, that those who offer confident interpretations of such passages are rash, even heretics.

Book 4 at last comes to the question whether Christ did in fact appoint Peter as head of the Church, with authority even over the other Apostles. Marsilius had argued that the various Bible texts usually alleged in favour of Peter's headship do not really prove it. The Master quotes and criticises Marsilius's arguments. He draws on a point made in Book 3, that a generally credible witness ought to be presumed to be telling the truth on a matter of fact within that person's experience. That a certain text has a certain meaning is not a matter of fact but a matter of interpretation, but that a certain person interpreted a certain text with a certain meaning is a matter of fact. The Master brings forward various passages attributed to Anacletus and Clement, who were immediate disciples of the Apostles, to show that the Apostles must have understood Christ's sayings to mean that Peter was head of the Church. Christ would not have left the Apostles in doubt on such an important matter, the Apostles would not have left their disciples in doubt; the Gospel sayings must therefore mean what the Apostle's disciples took them to mean. Building on this, the Master presents another argument: if the whole Church from the time of the Apostles until now has without dissent held a certain doctrine, then that doctrine must be true, by virtue of Christ's promise to be with the Church "all days" (Matthew 28:20); but from the time of the Apostles (as the texts from Anacletus and Clement show) down to Ockham's own time the doctrine of Peter's headship has always been believed by all Christians (even by the Greeks, before they separated); it must therefore be Catholic truth. Unfortunately, the texts from Anacletus and Clement are drawn from the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals.⁴ Of the texts Ockham quotes to prove the antiquity of this belief, the earliest that are authentic are from Cyprian and Eusebius.⁵

As it has come down to us, 3.1 Dial. seems incomplete.⁶ Some of the questions listed for discussion early in the book are never discussed: for example, in Book 1 chapter 1 the Disciple lists questions relating to the pope,

4. Ockham rejected the authenticity of the *Donation of Constantine* (see the last chapter of Brev.), but he did not doubt the authenticity of other material in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals. Marsilius quotes from those decretals sometimes, but sometimes expresses doubt. See C.W. Previt -Orton, "The Authors Cited in the *Defensor pacis*", in *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole* (Oxford, 1927), pp. 405-20, esp. pp. 413-4. (In our notes we signal that a text comes from Pseudo-Isidore — if its historicity is important to the argument — by giving a reference to the edition of Hinschius.) 5. If "all days" is taken to mean "each and every day", then the fact that the evidence is not enough to prove that the headship of Peter was believed throughout the *whole* period is not necessarily fatal to Ockham's argument: on his understanding of Christ's guarantee that error will never prevail, it would be enough to show that Peter's headship was believed in by all Christians during at least some time. See Kilcullen, "Ockham and Infallibility", *Journal of Religious History*, 16 (1991), pp. 387-409. 6. See G. Knysh, *Fragments of Ockham hermeneutics* (Winnipeg, 1997), pp. 121-22.

and then says: “Later I propose to examine some similar [questions] about the power of the clergy”; but as it stands 3.1 Dial. is entirely about the power of the pope. This is not a decisive point: the plan of the book may have changed as it was being written (with the early pages being left unrevised), or perhaps Ockham never intended to treat the powers of the other clergy except incidentally to his discussion of the power of the pope. Stronger evidence of incompleteness is the fact that at the end only the first five of the eleven arguments of Book 4 chapter 1 have been answered and none of the arguments of chapter 2. The first chapter of Book 2 begins a discussion of the first element of the opinion outlined at the end of Book 1; there is no discussion of the other elements, and indeed the discussion of the first is incomplete if Ockham intended to discuss the inference that Christ’s appointment of Peter as head implies that the pope has his authority from Christ. The witnesses Mz and Fr end with the comment “hic deficit aliqualis copia huius partis”.

A translation of 3.1 Dial., with English and Latin in parallel columns, can be found on the project web site. There is also an analysis of the argument, with comments on the aspects in which the discussion seems incomplete. On Ockham’s opinion of what power the pope has and does not have see below, Endnote 1. For a survey of the intellectual relations between Ockham and Marsilius see Endnote 4.

3.1 Dialogus is generally attributed to Ockham. The only shadow of a reason to doubt its authenticity is that it has been transmitted by only three witnesses, the earliest of which (Mz) dates from the late 14th century. These witnesses are also the only source of another work generally attributed to Ockham but perhaps doubtfully,⁷ namely *Compendium errorum*. There are two good reasons for accepting the authenticity of *3.1 Dialogus*. First, there are many witnesses to *3.2 Dialogus* (though none clearly earlier than Mz), and *3.1 Dialogus* and *3.2 Dialogus* are linked together by many apparently appropriate cross-references;⁸ this is strong evidence that they are the work of the same author. Second, in procedure, writing style and doctrine *3.1 Dialogus* is very like *1 Dialogus*, *3.2 Dialogus* and other works securely attributed to Ockham, such as *Octo quaestiones* and *Breviloquium*. The authenticity of *3.1 Dialogus* seems sure.

7. See G. Knysh, *Ockham Perspectives* (Winnipeg, 1994), pp. 46-51. 8. References in Part 3.1 to Part 3.2: Prologus, 1.8, 1.9, 1.15, 2.2, 2.8. References in Part 3.2 to Part 3.1: Prologus, 1.3, 1.13, 1.20, 1.23 (three references), 2.10, 2.14, 2.15. See Baudry, pp. 212-214, and “Ockham’s References to the Dialogue or its Parts” on the project web site.

When was it written?⁹ Ockham did not date his works and did not deliberately indicate the order in which they were written. A work may be datable if it refers to an event or period (e.g. the reign of a pope), if it includes a cross-reference to some datable other work (by Ockham or by some other author), if another author refers to, or shows acquaintance with, Ockham's work, or if a work does not refer to some event it might be expected to have referred to if the event had already occurred. Order of composition may be inferred from comparisons of different degrees of maturity or elaborateness of treatment or apparent verbal dependency; the absolute date of composition of a work may be inferred from the order of composition together with the dates of other works in the series established by some other method.

The prologue to *3.1 Dialogus* (3.1 Dial. Prol.18-19, 22) indicates that the reigning pope is Benedict XII; there is no mention anywhere in the work of Benedict's successor, Clement VI, and no other references to datable events have been noticed. Benedict XII was pope between 20 December 1334 and 25 April 1342. In *3.2 Dialogus* and in *Breviloquium*, but not in *3.1 Dialogus*, there are references to Benedict XII's constitution *Redemptor noster*, issued 28 November 1336; we might infer that *3.1 Dialogus* was written before that constitution was issued, but there are other indications that *3.1 Dialogus* was being written later than 1336 (see below). The quotations in *3.1 Dialogus* from Marsilius's *Defensor pacis*, implying a date after 1324,¹⁰ do not help, since we already know that *3.1 Dialogus* was being written while Benedict was pope. It has been suggested that Marsilius wrote at least the first twelve chapters of *Defensor minor* in answer to *3.1 Dialogus* and that those chapters must be dated before 1341,¹¹ which would imply that *3.1 Dialogus* was written before 1341; but the allusions to Ockham in *Defensor minor* are not sufficiently detailed and accurate to prove that Marsilius must have seen a completed copy of *3.1 Dialogus*.¹²

9. See Baudry, pp. 209-218; Miethke, *Ockhams Weg*, pp. 123-125; Offler, OP, vol. 4, p. 87. Miethke concludes that 3 Dial. was begun after AP, that 3.1 Dial. was completed before 1342, and 3.2 Dial. may have been in progress until the end of Ockham's life. He reports and criticizes the opinions of Riezler (that 3 Dial. was written before 1343) and Knotte, followed by Scholz (that 3 Dial. was written in 1338, on the basis of 3.1 Prol. and an apparent reference in 3.2 Dial. 2.8 to *Redemptor noster*). Baudry's conclusion (p. 215) is that 3 Dial. was composed during the years 1339-1341 and that both tracts were in circulation by the beginning of 1342. 10. *Defensor pacis* was completed 24 June 1324. See Miethke, *De potestate papae*, p. 210, n. 634. 11. Offler, OP, vol. 4, p. 87; cf. Baudry, p. 217 n. 6. 12. See "Marsilius's response to Ockham" in Endnote 4, p. 372 below; as with Lupold von Bebenberg's knowledge of OQ (see below), Marsilius's information may have been by word-of-mouth. It has been suggested that a reference in the chronicle of Johannes von Viktring might help date the *Dialogus*, but see Baudry, p. 211, n. 2, and Miethke, *Ockhams Weg*, pp. 121-2.

By comparison of the “maturity” and other characteristics of several works Offler concludes that Ockham wrote *An Princeps* before *3.1 Dialogus* and *Breviloquium* after it, that *Octo Quaestiones* and *Breviloquium* were “nearly, if not quite, contemporaneous”, and that he wrote *Breviloquium* before he had progressed far with *3.2 Dialogus*.¹³ Arguing from indications of absolute date, he suggests that “within the extreme limits October 1337—early 1340 the months between August 1338 and the end of 1339 seem the most likely” for the writing of *An princeps*,¹⁴ which would suggest that *3.1 Dialogus* became the focus of Ockham’s attention at the end of 1339 or early 1340. “The extreme limits of date for the composition of *Breviloquium* are the spring of 1337 and the early summer of 1342”,¹⁵ which would suggest that Ockham transferred his attention from *3.1 Dialogus* to *Breviloquium* in 1337; but this is too early, being inconsistent with the inference from the likely date range of *An princeps*. Offler’s narrow range for *Breviloquium* is “the twelve months following the middle of 1340”,¹⁶ and for *Octo quaestiones* “the twelve or fifteen months after mid-summer 1340”.¹⁷ If we accept these conclusions, it seems that Ockham was working on *3.1 Dialogus* from 1339 or 1340.

The inclusion in *3.1 Dialogus* of cross-references to *3.2 Dialogus* has prompted the suggestion that *3.2 Dialogus* was written before *3.1 Dialogus*.¹⁸ However, *3.2 Dialogus* also contains cross-references to *3.1 Dialogus*; further, it cannot be assumed that a work Ockham refers to must already exist, since cross-references may be based on a detailed plan of a work not yet written (as seems

13. Offler, OP, vol. 4, pp. 87-89. Apart from some observations on p. 88, Offler does not set out the comparisons, but his familiarity with Ockham’s works gives his opinion authority. 14. OP, vol. 1 (2nd edn.), p. 223. 15. OP, vol. 4, p. 86. 16. *Ibid.*, p. 90. According to Baudry (p. 218), *Brev.* was written during 1341. 17. *Ibid.*, p. 88. OQ includes quotations from Lupold von Bebenberg’s *Tractatus de iuribus regni et imperii Romani*, completed in 1339 or 1340, with supplements, written perhaps in 1341, that reflect knowledge, apparently from word of mouth, of Ockham’s criticisms; see *Politischen Schriften des Lupold von Bebenburg*, ed. Jürgen Miethke and Christoph Flüeler (Hanover, 2004), p. 199-203. This helps determine the likely completion date of OQ to the end of 1341 (*ibid.*, p. 202). 18. “In Cap. 2 des 2. Buchs des 1. Tractats (p. 790 [Goldast edn.]) wird schon der Inhalt des 1. Buchs des 2. Tractats dieses Theiles citirt; die einzelnen Theile des Werkes sind also nicht in der Ordnung entstanden, die ihnen nach der Vollendung des Ganzen wurde. Der erste Theil des Dialogs ist jedoch vor dem dritten entstanden; denn in dem letzteren (p. 843) wird das 7. Buch des ersteren citirt”; S. Riezler, *Die Literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Baiers* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 265 n. 2. Similarly Georges de Lagarde, *La Naissance de l’esprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge* (Paris, 1958-63), vol. 4, p. 33, n. 65, suggests that since *3.2 Dial.* refers to *3.1 Dial.* in the future tense, and since [which is not true] *3.1 Dial.* does not refer to *3.2 Dial.*, therefore *3.2 Dial.* is likely to have been written first. The assumption is that a writing Ockham refers to must already exist. Though he rejects the thesis that *3.2 Dial.* predates *3.1 Dial.*, Baudry in other places makes the same assumption: “La première partie existait certainement quand fut rédigée la troisième, puisque celle-ci y fait maintes fois allusion”; Baudry, p. 159.

true of references in *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate* to 2 *Dialogus*). There has been some discussion of the tense of these cross-references and of certain other verbal details (e.g. the use by Discipulus of “conicio”).¹⁹ But a reference in the future tense may be to something already written (“If you search the Bible, you will find...”). Further, the dialogue framework of *Dialogus* is a fiction, so the Student may “conjecture” what the author knows, and it is to be expected that references to what has been or will be discussed (“erit sermo”, “tractabimus”) will be in the tense appropriate to the plan of the final work, whatever the order in which its parts were written. Nothing can be inferred, therefore, from these cross-references about the relative order of the two tracts of 3 *Dialogus*.

In two other works Ockham refers to the *Dialogus*. In *Breviloquium* he writes: “Qui illa, quae hic dimissa comparere desiderabit [et] discussa videre, dialogum quendam prolixissimum in plura volumina distinctum... inspiciat, si ipsum habere voluerit”.²⁰ This suggests that several volumes of the *Dialogus* were already available when he was writing *Breviloquium*. If we assume that a “volume” would not contain any component smaller than one tract, and that 2 *Dialogus* was not available,²¹ then we could infer that 1 *Dialogus*, 3.1 *Dialogus* and 3.2 *Dialogus* were already in circulation when *Breviloquium* was written. This inference would be uncertain, however, since Ockham may have been referring to a publication planned but not yet completed. In *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate* Ockham writes: “quae in hoc compendio perstringuntur, in aliis operibus, praesertim in quodam dialogo, quem dudum incepi, qui habuerit, discussa inveniet exquisite”.²² Again, this may suggest that some of the *Dialogus* was available, but again the inference is uncertain. The words indicate that the *Dialogus* had been begun long ago and suggest that it had not yet been completed, but they neither exclude nor imply the abandonment of the project and imply nothing about the completion or circulation of any of its parts. Since Ockham wrote the parts and tracts of the *Dialogus* in an attempt to influence an ongoing controversy, it seems likely he would have put each of them into circulation immediately it was finished. The filiations among the manuscripts for 1 *Dialogus*, 3.1 *Dialogus* and 3.2 *Dialogus* are different, suggesting that they were launched at different times under different circumstances. Matthias Eiffler’s dating of one of the manuscripts of 1 *Dialogus* suggests that that part of

19. Baudry, pp. 212-4. 20. Pr.18-23 (p. 98). 21. See the introduction to 2 Dial., above, p. 9. 22. Pr.72 (p. 282).

the work was in circulation in the early 1340s,²³ when it seems likely Ockham was working on *3.1 Dialogus*. But for the two tracts of *3 Dialogus* we have no evidence of when they were put into circulation.

A large work such as *3.1 Dialogus* might well have been written over some years, some of it long before datable events it mentions, some of it long afterwards. A reference to a person (e.g. a pope) as living might survive even though the work was not finished until after that person's death, or the author might insert some topical reference just before circulating a work substantially finished some time earlier. Ockham may have had several works in progress at the same time, or he may have switched his attention from one to another and back again over an extended period.²⁴ As they have come down to us, *3.1 Dialogus*, *Breviloquium* and *3.2 Dialogus* are incomplete.²⁵ Any of them may have been completed but the end lost, or the project may have been abandoned, or the work may have been neither completed nor abandoned, and in that case the writing could well have continued, off and on, until the end of Ockham's life. This last possibility is not ruled out by the absence of references to any datable event after the reign of Benedict XII; there may simply not have been occasion to mention such an event. It seems that the best we can say is that Ockham was working on both tracts of *3 Dialogus* from the early 1340s, perhaps using materials he had written earlier, but, if these works were never finished, as seems likely, he may have continued to work on them during the pontificate of Clement VI, perhaps even to the end of his life in 1347 or 1348.

23. See <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/projekt-Weimar-pdfs/Q-23.pdf>. Scholars had suggested that 3.2 Dial., 3.16, implies that 1 Dial. was put into circulation before 3.2 Dial. was written: "Quamvis in prima parte nostri Dialogi li. 6 tractaverimus. . . hic tamen de hac materia conferamus ut excitemus alios tractatum hunc visuros qui primam partem forsitan huius operis non habebunt". See Baudry, p. 159. However, this passage would not strictly prove that 1 Dial. was already in circulation, only that Ockham foresaw that 1 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. might not circulate together. 24. "We are not entitled to assume that he never had more than one piece of work in progress at any particular time"; Offler, OP, vol. 1, 2nd edn., p. 223. "We cannot safely suppose that his method was to undertake and finish off in turn a number of discrete items which can now be arranged in a neat chronological sequence... Quite as likely is that Ockham during these years [while he was writing 3 Dial., Brev. and other works] was drawing from a stock of memoranda, arguments and authorities which he had accumulated as relevant to his current preoccupations and which he had already to some extent worked up into literary form. To that stock he may have resorted in the course of his various polemical enterprises as the needs of any particular treatise seemed to demand, indulging in a greater or less degree of rewriting as the spirit moved him. If that is so, even the very extensive passages of verbal identity or similarity to be found in his various works at this period do not provide an entirely reliable guide to dating them"; OP, vol. 4, pp. 89-90. 25. Baudry is mistaken when he says, "Le premier traité nous est parvenu en entier", p. 210. See above, pp. 108-9.

3.1 Dialogus has been transmitted in three manuscripts (Mz Fr Lm) and in three early editions (Pz Ly Gs).²⁶ On the project web site there is an analysis of the relationships between the witnesses to 3.1 Dial., with links to places in the text that illustrate the relationships. Gs derives from Ly. Ly derives from Pz, differing from it (in 3.1 Dial.) mostly by intelligent conjecture, not because the editor(s) of Ly had access to any other witness. There is nothing to suggest that Pz derives from any other extant witness. Pz is thus the only one of the early printed editions that can count as an independent witness. The Lambeth manuscript, Lm, is simply a copy of Pz.²⁷ The independent witnesses therefore come down to three, Mz, Fr and Pz.²⁸

None of the extant witnesses is uniquely the basis of our text. In general Mz seems best, but we have often followed one or both of the other witnesses against Mz or made emendations by conjecture. Sometimes we have adopted readings from Ly, though we believe that they are conjectures made by the editor(s) of Ly. Mz and Fr often agree against Pz, and when they do they often seem to have the more plausible text. When Fr stands against Mz and Pz it usually seems plainly wrong, but occasionally its text seems best.²⁹ Correctors (including perhaps the original scribe) have amended Fr in many places, and we have sometimes adopted these corrections in preference to the readings of other witnesses, though in some cases they may have been conjectural. The text tradition is rather weak: there are many places where some conjecture must be made, if not by an editor then by the reader. There is a discussion of problems with the text of *3.1 Dialogus* on the web site.

In our apparatus we regularly report Mz and Pz, but not Fr (or its marginal or interlinear corrections) except when it agrees with one of the other witnesses or we adopt its reading. We also regularly report Ly. Although it is not an independent witness, Ly (or Gs, derived from it) is the text on which scholars have until now relied, and it has therefore seemed useful to record its readings when we have rejected them.

²⁶ For explanation of these sigla, see “Sigla”, above, p. xix. ²⁷ That Lm was a copy of Pz was suggested by Ian Murdoch, *Critical edition of Pierre d’Ailly’s “Abbreviatio dialogi okan”* (Melbourne, Monash University thesis, 1981). Collation has confirmed this suggestion; see <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/31d1msr.html#PzLyLm>. ²⁸ *Compendium errorum* and 3.1 Dial. have the same set of witnesses. See Offler’s introduction to CE in OP IV, p. 3ff. For critical discussion of Offler’s views on the relationship between the witnesses see Kilcullen, “The text tradition of the *Compendium errorum*”, at <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/msrce.html>. Offler remarked: “the weakness of CE’s textual tradition is not auspicious for the future editor of *Ius IIIae Dial.*”, Offler, OP, vol. 4, p. 11. ²⁹ For example, see 3.1 Dial. 1.4.115, 2.23.18-9, 3.15.7-9.