

INTRODUCTION

John Kilcullen

The title of the whole work is *Dialogus*, the title of 1 Dial. is “De hereticis” (p.2).¹ There is no reason to doubt that Ockham is the author; the work is attributed to him by some manuscripts² and by the early editions, and in other works securely attributed to him he mentions that he has been writing a lengthy dialogue.³ Unlike the two tracts of 3 Dial., 1 Dial. is not incomplete; it does not break off in the middle of a topic, no topics have been announced but not dealt with. Since 1 Dial. was written to influence an ongoing controversy, there seems no reason why it would not have been published (i.e. made available to be copied) as soon as it was finished, without waiting for the other Parts of the *Dialogus* to be completed; the different manuscript affinities of the several components (below, p.xvi) suggest that they were put into circulation separately. Ockham could have begun to write 1 Dial. at any time after he left Avignon (May 26th, 1328),⁴ but perhaps it became the main focus of his attention after he completed OND (mid-1332, according to Professor Offler).⁵ The last chapter of OND deals with questions that are pursued in 1 Dial.; sermons that John XXII preached beginning in November 1331⁶ are referred to in various places in the work.⁷ It must have been finished before (or soon after) the death of John XXII in 4 December 1334, since in several places John is referred to as being still

1. We refer to the components of the *Dialogus* as 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial. and 3.2 Dial., meaning respectively Part 1, Part 2, Part 3 Tract 1, and Part 3 Tract 2.

2. **We**: “Incipit primus prologus in primam partem dialogorum a venerabili patre fratre wilhelmo de ocham ordinis minorum professoris sacre pagine editorum”. Incipits of **BaDiEsTo** also name the author, those of **OxAv AnFi** and some others do not. In some there is no incipit. In **WeOxAvToAnFi** and some others the title in the incipit is in the plural, *libri dialogorum*, but in the text of those manuscripts also it is named *Dialogus* (at Prol.2.7, p.2). (The sigla **We**, **Ba**, etc., are explained below, p.321.)

3. Brev. Prol.18 and Prol.23 pp.97, 98; IPP Prol.72, p.282, and 26.31 p.324. Abbreviated names of Ockham’s writings (OND, Brev. etc.) are explained in the publications list below, p.343.

4. L. Baudry, *Guillaume d’Occam. Sa vie, ses oeuvres, ses idées sociales et politiques* (Paris, 1950), p. 114 ff.).

5. On the dates of OND and 1 Dial. see Baudry, *op.cit.*, pp.150-3, 159-63; Jürgen Miethke, *Ockhams Weg zur Sozialphilosophie* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), p.82-5; Offler, OP, vol.1 (edn.2), p.288., and vol.2 p.xvii note 1.

6. M. Dykmans (ed.), *Les sermons de Jean XXII sur la vision béatifique* (Rome: Presses de l’Université Grégorienne, 1973),

7. See 4.11.17-20 (p.152), 5.2.139-41 (p.207), 6.93.9-10, 6.100.484, 7.8.24, 7.67.67. (Such references mean “book.chapter.lines”.)

pope⁸ and his successor is nowhere mentioned. The most likely time of composition is, therefore, 1332-1335.⁹

The *Dialogus* is one of Ockham's "recitative" works, the others being OND and OQ. His "assertive" works include Brev., IPP and EFM.¹⁰ In the recitative works the author does not argue or assert that any doctrine is true but merely recites or reports opinions and arguments that some people assert or might assert.¹¹ It was not considered blameworthy to report heretical or false opinions.¹² Even asserting an opinion actually heretical did not make a person a heretic if he or she was ready to be corrected; hence theologians often made "protestations" stating their willingness to be corrected.¹³ Such safeguards protected not only the author but also copyists, possessors and readers. A recitative work discussing the opinions of some people who asserted, and others who denied, that the current pope was a heretic would have a much better chance of being copied and read than a work that argued directly that the pope was a heretic.

Ockham did believe that the current pope, John XXII, had become a heretic. In 1 Dial. 7.48 the Student asks, "What ought to be done by... learned persons (whether they be masters or students) should the pope become a heretic?" The Master answers: "They must write and compose books, treatises, sermons, and letters, whatever seems expedient,... and publish their works by whatever means are possible to them, concealing or revealing their names as expediency dictates... They have the duty, as far as their talents allow, to effectively condemn the pope's errors and to declare the contrary truth, impressing it on all listeners as much as they can, in public lectures and sermons, in secret conversations also, whenever there might be an opportunity to speak." Like fighters trying "to defeat their enemies directly or by ambushes (*insidias*) and all

8. 1 Dial. Prol. 2.30-31 (p.3) refers to John XXII as pope, 1 Dial. 5.3.259 (p.219) says that John "was or now is a heretic", and 1 Dial.7.10 says that John now sits on the throne of St. Peter.

9. We cannot be certain of the date. References to John as now pope could have been left unchanged even after John's death, perhaps Ockham did not mention Benedict because there was no occasion to do so. See Offler's remarks on the dating of Ockham's works, OP, vol. 1 (edn.2) p.223, and vol.4, pp.89-90.

10. For Ockham's "assertive" treatment of some of the topics of 1 Dial. see CI, and (assuming its authenticity) 2.1 Dial. 11, pp. 51-73. On the difference between "assertive" and "recitative" modes see CI c.2 p.35.8-36.2.

11. On the recitative procedure of the *Dialogus* see 1 Dial. Prol.2.12-14, 27-8, 42-5 and Prol.3.2-4 (p.2ff); 1.3.6-13 (p.10); 5.35.1-9 (p.313); the last speech of 1 Dial.7.73; 3.2 Dial. Prol.46-56, O.P. vol.9, p.5-6; and see next note.

12. Cf. 3.1 Dial. Prol.40ff, OP vol.8 p.116-7.

13. See Brev. Prol.24-35, p.98; IPP Prol.57-70, p.281. In his academic writings Ockham made such protestations: De quant. q.1, OTh vol. 10 p.5-6/36; De corp. Christi cap.1, OTh vol.10 p.90/122, cap.17, OTh vol.10 p.125/156; Expos.Phys. prologus §1, OPh vol. 4, p.3- 4/16.

licit methods they can think of, preachers and doctors or masters must destroy the treachery of a heretic pope directly or by ambushes, publicly as well as secretly, by methods they find convenient.”¹⁴

In the text of *Dialogus* Ockham does not give his own name. Was it originally intended to be anonymous? “In some instances many feel hatred towards the author, and in that situation it is expedient to conceal the author’s name from them”.¹⁵ Ockham did believe that some people hated him,¹⁶ but mostly his works against Pope John and his successors do not seem to have been anonymous. Incipits attribute these works to him, though his name is generally¹⁷ not mentioned in the text even when he writes in the first person.¹⁸ In the *Dialogus* the names of certain persons are reduced to initials, but their identity is not concealed, the key to the initials being given in the Prologue.¹⁹ The Student asks the Master to “hide your own opinion and even your name”, but this may not mean that the author will hide his name — Ockham was not the Master, no real person was the Student, the dialogue is a fiction.

Two manuscripts, however, include a preliminary note (p.1 below) that says that the *Dialogus* was originally meant to be anonymous. In **Fr** the note seems to have been inserted as a late addition (see below, p.xxvii). **Fr** is a late manuscript and it contains other probably inauthentic material, and this note, which is not as well-written as Ockham’s work usually is, could be dismissed as also inauthentic.²⁰ **We**, however, contains it as an integral part of the manuscript, which is early and generally reliable. If the note is authentic then the *Dialogus* was originally intended to be anonymous.

Editing the text

The text of Part 1 of the *Dialogus* exists in 32 manuscripts and three early printed editions. The text of 1 Dial. 1-5 amounts to over 80,000 words. To read

14. Translation G.Knysh, modified. <http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/t1d742.html>

15. *Ibid.*, trans. Knysh.

16. “I do not believe that anyone would adhere to the truth more firmly because of my approval, but I fear that, from the malice of hatred, envy and rancor, many would attack it more sharply and more wickedly by both words and deeds — which I am not ignorant is done in connection with other matters by some, prompted by envy against me”; 3.2 Dial. Prol.

17. With the exception of EFM p.6.3 and IPP Prol.2, p.279.

18. E.g. “doleo enim et gemo”, Brev. Prol.2-3.

19. Prol.2.30-2 (p.3).

20. For these observations see George D. Knysh, *Fragments of Ockham Hermeneutics* (Winnipeg: WCU Council of Learned Societies, 1997), pp. 15-17, 60-1 (written before it was realised that **We** is an early manuscript). Jürgen Miethke accepts the *Prologus primus* as authentic: “Ein neues Selbstzeugnis Ockhams zu seinem *Dialogus*” in Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks (eds.), *From Ockham to Wyclif* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), pp. 19-30, at pp.26, 28.

and transcribe all the witnesses right through would have been a heavy labour not justified by likely improvement in the text. We therefore tried to get a sense of the quality and affinities of the witnesses by making a thorough collation of some sample sections, viz. 1 Dial. 1 (the whole), 1 Dial. 3.1-5, 1 Dial. 4.1-5 and 1 Dial. 7.1-3.²¹ Our colleague, George Knysh, drew our attention to certain passages in 1 Dial. 5 that contain placenames that differ from one set of manuscripts to another; analysis of these passages was consistent with the conclusions drawn from the sample collations.²² On the basis of these studies we chose a selection of witnesses representing various strands of the manuscript tradition to transcribe completely and a sub-set of these to report in the apparatus. For many passages we have read all the witnesses.

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

A: We ((OxA_v) (VfV_c)) Br

B: ToEs (BaDi) Bi

C: Bb (AnFiCe)

D: CaKo (UnVd) (LcNa) LaAxFr

E: PaVgVaPc(PbAr) VbLbSa Ko (PzLmLyGs)

Brackets indicate special closeness. Evidence for our grouping will be presented below (p.xixff). There are also collations and some studies posted on the project website.

The alphabetical order of the group names does not reflect any particular theory of the transmission history but rather our assessment of the quality of their text: the readings of group *A* seem to us more likely than those of group *E* to be what Ockham wrote. However, the grouping is based not on reliability but on the sharing of variants.²³ Individual manuscripts belonging to a generally reliable

²¹ For studies based on these samplings see [MSRIns1d1.html](#), [ms1d3frm.html](#), [w1d4acl.html](#) and [ms1d7frm.html](#). (References without a full URL are to the project website, <https://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogue/>.)

²² Knysh points out that **OxA_vVcVf** use Ancona placenames, **AnFiCe** mention Tours and Nantes, **Vd** mentions Troyes and Reims. The extant manuscripts may have no connection with the places mentioned but perhaps their ancestors did.

²³ Groups are distinguished by variants that are found only in the group that are not likely to have happened by coincidence (e.g. omissions due to homoioteleuton). It has been argued that the “stemmatic” method is question-begging since grouping is based on shared errors. Compare the argument (not his own) reported by D.C. Greetham: “The problem is that this evidence (employed to determine which are ‘good’ manuscripts and which ‘bad’) is then used to disallow readings from the ‘bad’ manuscripts and to welcome those from the ‘good’ in a perfect exemplification of circular reasoning”; David C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York: Garland, 1992),

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

The traditional idea of a stemma cannot easily be applied to this manuscript tradition. There is evidence of “contamination”²⁴ even at the level of the lost group-ancestors of the five families.²⁵ Contamination happened because medieval scholars regarded it as important to correct their text and to check against other witnesses if possible.²⁶ The editorial efforts of medieval scholars resulted sometimes in considerable (at least apparent) improvements.²⁷ They made amendments sometimes by consulting other manuscripts, sometimes by consulting a manuscript of Gratian or Aristotle or some other source quoted, sometimes by conjecture. In some cases the author himself may have amended, or had someone amend, some copy or copies of a work already in circulation.²⁸

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

p.323. This objection is mistaken. Grouping is based on shared variants; deciding which variants are errors comes later.

24. That is, the incorporation into a manuscript of readings taken from some witness other than its exemplar. Medieval scholars who tried to improve their text were doing what a modern editor does, except that they did not say which amendments came from which manuscripts and which were conjectures.

25. Often **AB** agree against **CDE**, but sometimes **ABC** agree against **DE** or **ABD** against **CE**. For examples see [MSRInsId1.html#contam](#).

26. See Mary A. and Richard H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses* (Notre Dame, 1991), p.304-5, 317-8, 428-30.

27. “Among the MSS from which our MSS of the ninth and following centuries are derived, some were perhaps even more corrupt than these are, and our ninth-century MSS are revisions, which have improved on their sources by the comparison of one with another. For, viewed comprehensively, the transmission of MSS has, after all, depended not only on ignorant monkish scribes, who merely multiplied mistakes from generation to generation, but also at certain periods — and the Carolingian revival was one of them — on scholars of considerable learning and ability who were able in great measure to correct the errors of the past. No doubt they have thereby made it impossible for us to arrange the MSS in neat families, but they have preserved many a correct reading and eliminated perhaps the majority of the errors which had come to them”; Maurice Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatises* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), p.130-1. Bévenot’s book is a study of a highly contaminated manuscript tradition.

28. Ockham made various additions to his *Ordinatio*, which the editors have marked by “[§... §]”, e.g. OTh vol.2, p.19.3-20.9/52.

“double” readings,²⁹ where a manuscript has the reading of one tradition together with the reading of another, because a scribe copied both the text of his exemplar and a marginal or interlinear amendment. Amendment may leave no such indication. If a manuscript has been amended from a manuscript of another family, a clean copy made from the amended manuscript might seem to have descended through the family from which the corrections were drawn, perhaps with puzzling minor agreements with another family — the minor variants would be readings the corrector overlooked or did not bother to correct. If the revision was of only part of a manuscript, or if amendments were at first drawn from one manuscript but then later from another (for example, because the manuscript being used as a source of corrections had to be returned to its owner, or because another corrector took over, perhaps some time later, using a different source), a copy of the corrected manuscript might seem to wander from one family to another.³⁰ George Knysh has suggested that the common ancestor of **OxAvVcVf** was a manuscript of the *E* family that had been thoroughly corrected against a manuscript resembling **We**; the evidence for this is that toward the end of Book 7 these manuscripts seem to belong to the *E* family, as if the corrector did not finish the job. If a great deal of contamination had taken place, it might not have been possible to classify the witnesses into families. As it is, however, the family groups listed above are discernible, though some manuscripts (for example, **Fr** and **Ko**) are difficult to classify.

Within the five main families there are also sub-groups of witnesses that seem especially close. Some witnesses are so close that the question arises whether one is a copy of the other. One way to answer this question is to look for omissions they do not share. Omissions they *do* share do not tell us much, since such omissions can easily happen by coincidence (especially when due to homoioteleuton, i.e. when the copyist skips forward to a similar word), but omissions not shared suggests that the manuscript from which the passage is omitted is not the sole exemplar or ancestor of any manuscript in which the passage is found. To justify this inference, the passage must be long enough that a copyist is unlikely to have been able to guess it word for word, it must not be a quotation from a commonly accessible source, and it must be an omission and

29. E.g. 1.3.19 (p.10) “eruditissimi”, 1.8.43 (p.19) “sed”, 1.9.4 (p.19) “universalibus”, 2.4.51 (p.45) “conclusio” and “quam... nituntur” (**D** has both versions), 1.6.17 (p.15) “actionum”, 1.14.50 (p.30) “certius”, 2.13.79 (p.61) “veritates”, 5.3.190 (p.217) “preponendus”, 5.4.75 (p.224) “sufficiunt”, 5.28.8 (p.289) “rationibus”.

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

not an addition (because a copy could contain additional text invented by a copyist or reader). That the passage is an omission and not an addition is more likely if it is found also in other witnesses, especially witnesses of several different families, and if its omission can easily be explained (e.g. as caused by homoioteleuton). The more examples there are of omissions not shared the surer the inference becomes that the one manuscript is not a copy of the other. It seems that our witnesses are not copies of any of the others, except that **Ly** is based on **Pz** (sometimes amended from another source), **Gs** is a copy of **Ly**, and **Lm** is a copy of **Pz**.

One hypothesis to explain the apparent superiority of the **A** and **B** groups over **C**, **D** and **E** is that the former descended from the original through fewer intermediaries, whereas the latter are copies of copies of copies. The later date of a manuscript does not necessarily mean that it is more distant from the original; since manuscripts are durable, a later manuscript may be a copy of an early exemplar. On the other hand, if in some centres the work was in great demand, even an early manuscript might be a copy of a copy of a copy. The early date of **Bb**, **Fi** and **Pa**, which in our opinion are only moderately good representations of the text, suggests that deterioration might happen quickly.

Another hypothesis is that, on the contrary, manuscripts of group **E** represent the earliest version of the text, the one closest to Ockham's original publication, while the **A** and **B** families represent conjectural improvements made by editors working after Ockham's time.

Or, a third hypothesis, the improvements may have been made by Ockham himself when he realised that a faulty text was in circulation, or because he had had afterthoughts. Perhaps the earliest circulated version was prepared by a scribe who made many mistakes later noticed and corrected by the author.

On the first hypothesis, many of the significant differences between the **AB** and **CDE** groups would be explained as omissions in the latter groups due to homoioteleuton.³¹ The second hypothesis would assume "a reviser who took unusual care to see that his additions to the text [of the **AB** groups] ended with the same word or phrase as the passage immediately preceding",³² which would be an odd game. On the third hypothesis — that the **AB** manuscripts include the

31. See Scott, [Omissions-Additions.html](#).

32. *Ibid.*

author's own revisions — the **AB** text would be authentic and would be the author's preferred version.

My suggestion is this. The manuscripts **We** (group **A**) and **Ba** (group **B**) represent Ockham's intended text well though not perfectly. The other members of group **A** (viz. **OxAvVcVf**) may descend from some less accurate copy of a manuscript like **We**, or perhaps from a manuscript belonging to another family that had been corrected against a manuscript like **We**. The older members of group **B**, viz. **To** and **Es**, descend from an ancestor in which the text was very faulty; **Ba** has (in 1 Dial.) an ancestor derived from the faulty group **B** ancestor but well-corrected against a manuscript like **We**. Group **C** manuscripts come from an ancestor that was better than the ancestors of **To** and **Es** but less accurate than manuscripts of the **A** family. Group **C** manuscripts contain many errors found also in groups **D** and **E**, whose ancestors may descend from a manuscript of type **C**. Group **D** manuscripts descend from an **E**-family ancestor partially corrected against some better manuscript(s).³³ For a more detailed discussion of the manuscript families see below (p.xix).

Combinations of Components

Codices belonging to groups **A** and **C** contain only 1 Dial., but many codices of groups **B**, **D** and **E** include both 1 Dial. and 2 Dial., some include also 3.2 Dial., **Fr**, **Pz** and **Ly** contain also 3.1 Dial.; some codices have other combinations. Let us call the various parts and tractates the "components" of the *Dialogus*. For 1 Dial. there are five families that we have called **A-E**. The witnesses to 2 Dial. fall into two families we may call **A'** and **B'**.³⁴ The witnesses to 3.2 Dial. fall into three families,³⁵ which we may call **P**, **Q** and **R**. For Part 3.1 there are too few witnesses to form families, but there are three versions of the text (found in **Mz**, **Fr** and **PzLy**) that we may call **L**, **M** and **N**.³⁶ Codices containing several components combine these families in various ways. For example, the codices

33. Or perhaps group **E** manuscripts descend from a **D** ancestor that did not (yet) have the amendments noted in Omissions-Additions.html passages 1, 2, 3 and 4.

34. We use prime (') to distinguish the two families in 2 Dial. from the **A** and **B** families in 1 Dial. For an analysis of the families of the 2. Dial. witnesses see Jan Ballweg's analysis, Wit2DialBallwegTr.html, and 2Relationships.html. There is no indication that the two tractates of 2 Dial. ever circulated separately.

35. Scott, w32d1a1.html. According to Scott's analysis, what I here call the **P** family comprises **NaVe**, **Q** comprises **MzPzLy**, **R** the rest. According to our analysis of the end of the *Dialogus*, sigla.html#last, **Ar** and **Vd** belong to **R** but include material from some other tradition; **Di** and **Fr** belong to **R** but have additional material added at the end. Ubl and Heinen (OP vol.9, p. xvi ff.) also distinguish three main families (which they call α , μ and ω) but locate **PzLy** between the first and second families, as being akin to both **Mz** and **Ar**.

36. The manuscripts that contain 3.1 Dial. are (except for **Fr**) members of the **Q** family in 3.2 Dial.1

Ca and **Un** both belong to the **D** family for 1 Dial., but for 2 Dial. **Ca** belongs to the **A'** group and **Un** to the **B'** group; we can represent **Ca** and **Un** respectively as **DA'** and **DB'**. If two codices containing two or more components had been copied from beginning to end from the same exemplar, we would expect them to show the same combination: for example, a **DA'** exemplar would beget **DA'** copies. It is harder to understand how there could be mixed combinations (e.g. one manuscript **DA'**, another **DB'**).

It seems that the various components of the *Dialogus* were first put into circulation separately from one other; this is shown by the fact that their manuscript affiliations are different. No one who had a separate copy of what has come to be 2 Dial. (before someone added it to other parts of the *Dialogus*) would have had any indication in its text that it was part of the *Dialogus*, but the Prologue to 1 Dial. would have alerted a copyist or reader to the likely existence of Parts 2 and 3, and the prologue to either tractate of 3 Dial. would have indicated that it belonged to the third part of the work and that Part 3 included at least one other tractate.³⁷ Thus anyone who had 1 Dial., 3.1 Dial. or 3.2 Dial. would have searched for, or been ready to notice, other components of the work.

Suppose at some time there was a manuscript containing only 1 Dial. in the version of family **D**. Suppose someone using it realised from the Prologue that there might be a Part 2 somewhere, went looking for it, and happened to find a copy of (what he wrongly³⁸ assumed was) Part 2, in the version of family **A'**.³⁹ Suppose another possessor of 1 Dial. in version **D** made a search and found 2 Dial. this time in version **B'**. The outcome would be two combinations, one **DA'**, the other **DB'**. If the possessors of these manuscripts also went looking for Part 3, the outcome might be the combinations **DA'P** and **DB'Q**.

If an additional component found was already part of another codex, the scholar who found it might copy it into his own manuscript in his own hand; or he might arrange for another copyist to add to his codex a copy of the additional

37. Prologue to 1 Dial.: "I want it [this work] to be divided into three tractates, the first of which I want to be called, 'On heretics', the second, 'On the teachings of John XXII', and the third 'On the deeds of those disputing about the orthodox faith'." Prologue to 3.1 Dial.: "Let us therefore turn our attention... to the third part of our dialogue, which from the beginning I have wanted to be entitled, 'Of the deeds of those disputing about the orthodox faith'." Prologue to 3.2 Dial.: "After the tract about the power of the pope and clergy, therefore, let there be added a tract on the rights of the Roman Empire."

38. We suspect that 2 Dial. is not by Ockham; at any rate it was not written to be part of the *Dialogus*. See OP vol. 8, pp.8-13.

39. If 2 Dial. never circulated separately, the searcher would have found 2 Dial. associated with a copy of 1 Dial. and would have added to his own copy of 1 Dial. a copy of 2 Dial. in the version he had just found.

component, which would be in a new hand. If the additional components found were separately existing manuscripts, the components might be bound together into a codex in which there was a change of handwriting (cf. **Pc**, which contains 1 Dial., 3.2 Dial. and 2 Dial., in that order, in different hands).⁴⁰ Some scholars may not have made a search for other components or may not have found all of them. Some codices contain only 1 Dial.; some of these (or their ancestors) may have been made before the other parts were in circulation. Only **Fr**, **Mz**, **Pz** and **Ly** contain 3.1 Dial., many do not contain 3.2 Dial., some contain only 3.2 Dial. Some codices include the *Compendium errorum* (Ce), a more plausible candidate for inclusion as Part 2 than the existing 2 Dial.; for example, **Mz** has the combination **LQCe**. One manuscript and one early printing contain both 2 Dial. and Ce. **Fr** has the combination **DB'CeMR**, **Pz** has in some copies **EA'CeNQ** and in other copies **EA'NQCe**.⁴¹

The hypothesised activities of scholars seeking to complete their copy of the *Dialogus* is of a piece with their attempts to correct their manuscripts, as shown for example in the marginal and interlinear additions to **Es**, **Pa** and **Lb**. It is also of a piece with attempts (e.g. by Simon de Plumetot) to gather together into their libraries, sometimes bound into single codices, several related works (e.g. **Mz**, **Ve**). We can also see such research in attempts to continue the text of 3.2 Dial. beyond the word “antistitem” (e.g. **Es**, **Di**, **Fr**). The attempts of scholars to find more of the *Dialogus* are attested also by copyist’s remark at the end of **Es**, “non reperitur plus parisiis”,⁴² and by d’Ailly’s remark at the end of his *Abbreuiatio*, “Et non plus de hoc notabili opere potui reperire”.⁴³

Another hypothesis has been suggested to account for the way the components are variously combined. Perhaps Ockham issued the whole *Dialogus* (i.e. 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial. and 3.2 Dial.) in several “editions”, of which the later editions are both more accurate and longer — that is, in a later edition Ockham corrected errors in the earliest edition (e.g. by supplying passages that had been left out by accident), and at the same time added material to the end of 3.2 Dial.

40. **Fi** may consist of two originally separate manuscripts, **Pc** of three. **Na**, **Pb** and **Un** may have been manuscripts containing 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. to which an originally separate 3.2 Dial. has been added. See the descriptions of these manuscripts, p.321ff.

41. The codices that combine Part 1 with some other component(s) can be represented as follows: **Ar** EA'R, **Ax** DB', **Ba** BB'R, **Ca** DA'R, **Di** BA'R, **Es** BB'R, **Fi** CB', **Fr** DA'CeMR, **Ko** DA', **La** DB', **Lb** EB', **Lc** DB', **Ly** EA'NR, **Na** DB'P, **Pa** EA', **Pb** EA'R, **Pc** EA'R, **Pz** EA'CeNR, **Sa** EB', **To** BB'R, **Un** DB'R, **Va** EB', **Vb** EB', **Vd** DA'Q. (Ubl and Heinen indicate that **PzLy** draw material from both the **R** and **Mz** traditions).

42. See below, p.326.

43. Ian Murdoch, *Critical Edition of Pierre d'Ailly's Abbreuiatio dyalogi Okan*, thesis Monash University, 1981, p. 127.

Against this hypothesis, it seems unlikely that Ockham would have included 2 Dial. in earlier releases, since in IPP, written not long before end of his life, his references to a projected 2 Dial. imply a work very different from the one we have.⁴⁴ Also, two of the versions of 3.2 Dial. end in mid-sentence;⁴⁵ it seems unlikely that Ockham would have put into circulation a text that broke off in mid-sentence. It seems more likely that a longer text of 3.2 Dial. became shorter by losing pages from the end and that the combination of components came about through the process described above.

Manuscript families

Group A

The members of group *A* contain 1 Dial. only. *Br* contains only the first two books. The *A* group is distinguished from groups *C*, *D* and *E* by many readings that seem likely to be authentic. Many of these are found also in the *B* group, which however have other readings that distinguish them as a separate group (see below, p.xxii). Some *A* group readings are found also in a few members of the *D* and *E* groups (sometimes in the margin or between the lines), namely *Fr*, *Pa*, *Lb* and *Va*; we conjecture that these manuscripts or their ancestors were amended from *A* or *B* group manuscripts.⁴⁶

Matthias Eifler dates *We* to about 1340-45.⁴⁷ This would make it the earliest of the extant *Dialogus* manuscripts, a copy made while Ockham was still alive. *We* is generally close to what we believe is Ockham's intended text. However, it is not infallible. It may have been made in haste; the gatherings are written in different hands, presumably because its exemplar was shared out among many copyists working simultaneously; even if Ockham was himself involved in making the manuscript, he may not have had time to supervise the copying

44. IPP 27.223-4 (p.333), 27.476-7 (p.342), 27.648-9 (p.349).

45. See [sigla.html#last](#).

46. For evidence for these statements see Scott, Omissions-Additions.html.

47. See Matthias Eifler, *Katalog der lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek*, <http://bilder.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/hs/projekt-Weimar-pdfs/Q-23.pdf>. Knysh does not accept this dating, Preliminary%20comment1%20%283%29.pdf

closely or proofread it carefully. We follow **We** other things being equal; often, but not always, we follow **We** even against all or most other manuscripts.⁴⁸

The **OxAvVcVf** sub-group all contain an alphabetical *tabula* or index not found in other witnesses.⁴⁹ **OxAvVcVf** (but not **We**) often withhold titles of respect from John XXII.⁵⁰ **Ox** existed in 1444, **Av** seems to date from the first half of the 15th century.⁵¹ Textually and in presentation **Ox** and **Av** are close.⁵² **Ox** has a brief summary at the top of each chapter,⁵³ **Av** has the same summaries in 1 Dial. 1-3 inclusive and from then onwards leaves space for a summary; these chapter summaries are not found in any other manuscript.

Vf and **Vc** are also very close to one another textually and in presentation.⁵⁴ **Vc** has impressive artwork at the beginning of each Book, but the corresponding folios of **Vf** were long ago removed; presumably they were taken because they also showed impressive artwork. Various features suggest that the both

48. Places where we do not follow **We** include: Prol.2.27 (p.3) “etiam”, 1.2.72 (p.9) “prophetia scripture”, 1.3.28 (p.11) “ad... accedas”, 1.3.42 (p.11) “principaliter”, 1.9.22 (p.20) “respectu”, 1.9.82 (p.22) “theologie”, 1.12.26 (p.26) “aut... respondentis”, 1.15.19 (p.31) “consideratione”, 2.2.14 (p.37) “revelatione”, 2.4.107 (p.47) “omnem... approbare”, 2.13.16 (p.58) “sententia”, 2.17.20 (p.68) “eorum”, 2.28.104 (p.90) “unde”, 3.4.8 (p.113) “illi... iudicandi”, 4.2.2 (p.138) “difficultate”, 4.2.15 (p.139) “tripliciter”, 4.17.14 (p.164) “eis patenter”, 4.25.6 (p.179) “artare”, 5.2.164 (p.208) “occurrit”, 5.3.271 (p.220) “Quorundam exigit”, 5.4.28-9 (p.221) “non... sunt”, 5.4.39 (p.222) “firmitatis fidei”, 5.8.39 (p.239) “est subiectus”, 5.9.4 (p.241) “inductas”, 5.31.33 (p.303) “maior”, 5.31.61 (p.304) “ita esse”, 5.35.34 (p.314) “speciali Iudeorum”, 5.36.54 (p.319) “quam... fideles”.

49. A transcript of the *Tabula alphabetica* will be found on the project website at VcTabula.pdf.

50. See 2.12.36 (p.56) “sanctissimi” (where **OxAv** have “iniquissimi”), 2.12.38 (p.56) “sanctissimi patris”, 3.11.72 (p.135) “sanctissimi patris domini”, 4.9.2 (p.148) “sanctissimo patri”, 4.11.16 (p.152) “sanctissimum patrem”, 4.11.23 (p.152) “nostri summi pontificis”, 5.3.2 (p.209) “sanctissimum patrem”, 5.4.2 (p.220) “sanctissimum patrem nostrum dominum papam”, 5.28.3 (p.289) “nostri pape” and “domini nostri pape”.

51. For the dates of manuscripts see p.321ff.

52. Variants distinctive of **OxAv** include those found at: 1.2.58 (p.8) “cedit”, 2.12.36 (p.56) “sanctissimi”, 2.13.82 (p.61) “pertinere”, 2.24.40 (p.82) “interdixit”, 2.33.13 (p.104) “nescimus”, 4.3.33 (p.142) “scienter”, 4.23.14 (p.174) “repugnare”, 4.23.50 (p.175) “timeat”, 4.32.26 (p.195) “imminentium”, 5.18.23 (p.261) “Alexandrie”, 5.31.6 (p.302) “ecclesia... potest”, 5.31.15 (p.302) “monstraverit”. A mistake at 3.6.123 (p.122) “falsam” may reflect the state of their common ancestor.

53. A transcription of the chapter summaries of **Ox** will be found at OxCapitula.html

54. Variants distinctive of **VfVc** include those found at: 2.4.4 (p.43) “consequenter”, 2.23.20 (p.80) “quod”, 2.27.10 (p.86) “placitum”, 3.8.14 (p.125) “quamdiu”, 3.10.3 (p.129) “adduxi”, 3.11.47 (p.134) “solī”, 4.13.9 (p.156) “docuerat”, 4.25.17 (p.179) “alius”, 4.28.5 (p.184) “enim”, 4.30.51 (p.192) “sapientibus”, 4.32.26 (p.195) “presule”, 5.3.17 (p.210) “pueri”, 5.3.68 (p.212) “dominus”, 5.8.14 (p.238) “collegio”, 5.8.31 (p.239) “alias”, 5.15.142 (p.256) “tradiderit”, 5.17.23 (p.261) “Alexandrie”, 5.19.22 (p.263) “fuerint”, 5.21.24 (p.265) “habuit”, 5.26.58 (p.286) “mendicantium”, 5.31.30 (p.303) “tota tali”. In one passage **Vc** agrees with **We** against the other members of group *A*: 5.24.159 (p.278) “Pisana”.

manuscripts were made by the same copyist, or at least in the same scriptorium, at about the same time (see below, p.340). **Vf** and **Vc** seem to date from the 1470s, which makes them about contemporary with **Fr** and the first printed edition. Although **Vf** and **Vc** are close textually they do sometimes differ. **Vc** often goes with one or all of **CDE**.⁵⁵

Omissions not shared show that no member of group **A** is a copy of any of the others.⁵⁶ There must have been an ancestor no longer extant for the whole group, another for the **OxA_vVcVf** sub-group and another for each of the pairs **OxA_v** and **VfVc**.

We report all variants of **We** (except for a few that are trivial or clearly wrong). We use the group siglum **A** in reporting variants found in at least three of **WeOxA_vVcVf**. We report **Br** only occasionally.

Group B

To dates from the late 14th century, **Es** from the 14th or 15th, **Ba** and **Di** from the 15th. They all contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. **Bi** is a fragment containing only a few chapters (from 1 Dial. 2.4.119 to 2.7.13).⁵⁷

In 1 Dial. 1-5 the members of this group are close textually to the manuscripts of group **A**.⁵⁸ Perhaps the **B** ancestor was a somewhat inaccurate copy of an **A** manuscript, or perhaps it descended from a manuscript of another family that

55. E.g. Prol.1.1.6 (p.1) “nescio”, “componam”, 2.1.39 (p.34) “scriptorium”, 2.1.46 (p.34) “abhorreant”, 2.3.65 (p.41) “episcopi”, 2.13.77 (p.61) “assertionem”, 2.16.25 (p.67) “obviant”, 2.17.18 (p.68) “istam secundam”, 2.18.23 (p.70) “expositam”, 2.19.26 (p.71) “propria”, 2.29.79 (p.95) “unitate minori”, 3.3.18 (p.113) “qui”, 4.28.68 (p.186) “missionem”, 5.15.183 (p.258) “hoc”.

56. Of group **A**, **We** alone omits 3.4.8-10 (p.113) “illi... iudicandi”, 5.4.28 (p.221) “non... sunt” and 5.36.54 (p.319) “quam... fideles”; **Ox** alone omits 1.11.25-7 (p.25) “ab... hereticus”, 2.19.31-2 (p.72) “est... invisibilium”; **Av** alone omits 2.2.23-4 (p.38) “ad... apostolis”, 2.4.103-6 (p.47) “que... omnia”, 3.6.124-6 (p.122) “ex... falsam”, 4.13.90-2 (p.159) “ergo... corrigi”; **Vf** alone omits 3.9.69-71 (p.129) “absque... pravitate”, 4.9.11-12 (p.149) “reputandus... hereticus”; **Vc** alone omits 4.24.11-12 (p.177) “sed... orthodoxe”. For more examples see SignifOmissions.html#gpa.

57. Since the text is short, we cannot be sure of its affinities. That **Bi** belongs to group **B** is suggested by variants found at 2.4.122 (p.48) “videar”, 2.5.8 (p.48) “argumento”, 2.5.11 (p.49) “argumento”, 2.5.18 (p.49) “intenderim”, 2.5.18 (p.49) “istis”, 2.5.18 (p.49) “amplius”, 2.5.22 (p.49) “illis veritatibus”, 2.5.28 (p.49) “comprehendi”, 2.5.32 (p.49) “aliorum”, 2.5.32 (p.49) “que”.

58. See for example Omissions-Additions.html passages 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. See also 2.23.15 (p.80) “Catholicam”, 3.5.18 (p.115) “papa”. **B** are sometimes close to **We** but not to other **A** manuscripts, viz. passage 24, 26, 39. See also 4.25.4 (p.179) “octavo”.

had been corrected from a manuscript of the *A* group. But in some places the *B* manuscripts have their own distinctive text.⁵⁹

To is a very faulty manuscript; *Es* in its original state was also faulty but was then thoroughly amended and in its corrected state is close to *Ba*; *Di* seems close to *Ba*. One might think that *Es* was copied from *To*⁶⁰ and then corrected from a better manuscript, that *Ba* was either that better manuscript or a fair copy made from *Es* after correction, and that *Di* was a copy of *Ba* or vice versa. However, these hypotheses are all ruled out by omission in each manuscript of passages found in some or all of the others. *Es* before correction contains passages not found in *To*,⁶¹ and *To* contains passages not found in *Es*,⁶² so one cannot be a copy of the other. Likewise *Ba* has passages not found (or found only incompletely or in a disordered state) in *Es*,⁶³ so *Ba* is not a copy made from *Es* before or after correction; at least one passage added by correction in *Es* is not found in *Ba*,⁶⁴ so *Es* was probably not corrected from *Ba* (at least, not from *Ba* alone). *Di* and *Ba* each omits passages found in the other,⁶⁵ so neither is a copy of the other.

In short, in 1 Dial. no member of the *B* family is a copy of any of the others.⁶⁶ They independently represent an ancestor no longer extant. As the fragment *Bi*

59. Variants characteristic of group *B* are found at Prol.2.31 (p.3) “generalem”, Prol.2.32 (p.3) “Othonis”, 1.11.26 (p.25) “igitur”, 1.13.21 (p.28) “dicat”, 1.15.2 (p.31) “istos assertores”, 2.1.103 (p.37) “fides”, 2.1.106 (p.37) “et manifesta”, 2.2.19 (p.38) “humani generis”, 5.2.67 (p.204) “manifeste”, 5.26.58 (p.286) “mendicantium”. All manuscripts of group *B*, and no others, refer to Gerard Odonis as “now” general of the Franciscan order. This may suggest that their ancestor already existed before 1342 (when Gerard ceased to be Minister General) and that whoever introduced this remark did not share the dissident Franciscans’ view that Gerard was never legitimately head of the Order. More likely, as George Knysh has suggested, whoever inserted this remark intended to suggest that the Student is a supporter of John XXII (cf. Prol.2.39, p.3) and nothing can be inferred about its date.

60. *Es* and *To* agree in a strange error at 3.4.19 (p.114) “acceperunt”.

61. See 1.5.7-12 (p.14) “symbolum... ideo”, 3.9.25-7 (p.127) “non... hoc”, 5.5.78-80 (p.228) “precepit... iactari”.

62. See Prol.2.48-50 (p.3) “heretice... censende”, 4.25.76 (p.181) “ipsum... cogit”, 5.13.31-2 (p.247) “ius... ecclesie”, 5.6.53-4 (p.231) “Sed hereticaretur”, 5.15.110 (p.255) “et... persone”.

63. See Comments.html on 1.12.12 (p.26) “Ad... spectat”, 4.9.51-3 (p.150) “veritatem... credere”, 5.9.17-8 (p.242) “non... errare”.

64. See 5.26.28-9 (p.285) “quod concilium generale non potest” (omitted BaEs, added Esm)

65. *Ba* omits, *Di* has: 2.4.47-49 (p.45) “absque... veritatem”, 3.6.114-6 (p.122) “ex... heresim”, 5.15.62-64 (p.253) “nec... alios”, 5.6.53-4 (p.231) “Sed hereticaretur”. *Di* omits, *Ba* has: 4.1.26-7 (p.138) “accipitur... pertinax”, 4.2.25-7 (p.139) “adhesisset... exitisset”, 4.30.40-42 (p.192) “numeratur... dampnabiliter”, 5.3.141-2 (p.215) “depositione... postea”. *ToDi* agree in repeating 4.11.64-8 at 4.11.88 (p.155) “reputandus”. *Es* repeats the passage and deletes it, *Ba* does not repeat it. This suggests that *Di* is not a copy of *Ba*.

66. For more evidence see SignifOmissions.html#gpb.

illustrates, there may have been other manuscripts of this family that have not survived; indeed relationships among the survivors imply that several others did exist (the source of the corrections to **Es**, the intermediaries that explain similarities and differences between **Ba** and **Di**, **Es** and **To**).

Ba sometimes agrees with the **A** group against other members of its own group,⁶⁷ and it shares with **We** some significant variants not found in other members of the **A** and **B** families.⁶⁸ These facts suggest that an ancestor of **Ba** may have been corrected (or corrected additionally) from a manuscript similar to **We**. In one place a reading found only in **Ba** may be the authentic text.⁶⁹

Whereas the **A** and **C** families contain only 1 Dial., manuscripts of the **B** family also contain 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. Textually the manuscripts of this group are akin in all three components. Each of the two earliest members of this family, **To** and **Es**, neither of which is a copy of the other, is written in one hand throughout, which suggests that the three components had been combined in some early member of this family before any of its extant examples was made.

In 2 Dial. (though not, as we have argued above, in 1 Dial.) **Ba** may have been copied from **Es** after **Es** had been corrected against some no-longer-extant manuscript.⁷⁰ Or perhaps **Ba** is a copy of the manuscript against which **Es** was corrected, the copying being more accurate in 1 Dial. than in 2 Dial. (**Ba** was made by several copyists.)

Es has throughout many marginalia, including content summaries.⁷¹ The same summaries are found in **Ba** in 2 Dial. only, and not in **To** and **Di**. In 1 Dial. **Es** and **To** have in the text two passages that originated presumably as summaries and one passage that seems to have copied a reader's marginal comment.⁷² Perhaps an ancestor of the **B** group had summaries and comments that were

67. See Omissions-Additions.html passages 7, 21, 41, 42.

68. For example: 1.6.22 (p.16) "si", 1.9.72 (p.22) "obiecta", 1.10.29 (p.23) "sanctiones", 1.12.9 (p.25) "Reputandus", 2.1.78 (p.36) "invenerimus", 2.3.56 (p.41) "credendas", 2.13.52 (p.60) "debet esse", 5.3.94 (p.213) "theologice", 5.8.76 (p.240) "exponerent", 5.32.61 (p.308) "vocabulum". They both have two passages not found in any other witness: 2.13.73 (p.61) "vel... simul", 4.30.33-4 (p.191) "ergo... censendus". In several places they share an error not found in any other witness: 1.10.29 (p.23) "sanctiones", 4.11.4 (p.152) "Quartus", 5.29.87 (p.295) "plateis". In several places **Ba** has both the reading of **We** and the reading of other members of the **B** group: 1.8.43 (p.19) "sed", 5.5.53 (p.227) "predecessorum", 5.15.38 (p.253) "sic".

69. See 5.30.11 (p.297) "clericorum".

70. See "Witnesses to Part 2 of the Dialogus: Ba and Es", second paragraph, 2dmsr.html#Ba.

71. For example, in the margin beside 1.2.78 (p.9) there is: "Nota quod divine scripture nichil est addendum seu auferendum" (fol.2b).

72. See 4.24.3 (p.177) "obtinere", 4.26.13 (p.182) "hereticalis", 2.25.8 (p.83) "predicit". **Ba** and **Di** do not have these variants.

copied by **Es** and in 2 Dial. by **Ba**, with a few intrusions into the text of **Es** and **To**, but were otherwise not reproduced.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Ba** and **Es**. The group siglum **B** refers to **Ba** and **Es** in agreement.

Group C

Bb, **An**, **Fi** and **Ce** contain Part 1 of the *Dialogus* only (except that **Fi** also contains 2 Dial. written in a different hand — the codex seems to consist of two manuscripts originally separate).⁷³ According to notes written into the manuscripts, the part of **Fi** that contains 1 Dial. existed in 1372 and **Bb** existed in 1375. These are among the earliest witnesses. **An** existed in 1409, but it is possible that **An** was made before 1372, since **Fi** may have been copied from it (see below). **Ce** was copied later, between 1452 and 1465, so it cannot be the source of any of the others (and in any case it omits many passages they have).⁷⁴

Manuscripts of the **C** family are distinguished from the **A** and **B** families by a number of characteristic variants.⁷⁵ They have many shared omissions, found also in families **D** and **E**⁷⁶ (which are distinguished by further omissions and other variants).⁷⁷ It may be that **C** group manuscripts were ancestors of groups **D** and **E**.

Textually **Bb** stands somewhat apart from the other members of the group.⁷⁸ It is not a copy of any of them⁷⁹ and none of them is a copy of it.⁸⁰ **Fi** and **An** are

73. See below, p.327.

74. E.g. 1.1.31 (p.6) “Tertia censa”, 4.9.16 (p.149) “absque... credere”, 4.12.19 (p.155) “tamen... crucifixum”, 4.17.18 (p.164) “erronea... tanquam”, 4.26.4 (p.182) “aut... abiurare”.

75. Variants characteristic of the **C** group are found at: Prol.1.8 (p.1) “fuerim”, 4.29.11 (p.188) “refugit”, 5.2.56 (p.204) “sepulture”, 5.3.54 (p.211) “intra”, 5.3.159 (p.215) “in quo”, 5.4.47 (p.222) “generis”, 5.15.181 (p.258) “apostoli”, 5.22.47 (p.267) “concludunt”.

76. See Omissions-Additions.html (except not shared by **D** in passages 1-4).

77. See below, notes 83 and 97. The **C** manuscripts in some places agree with **AB** against **DE**: 2.19.32 (p.72) “credo... invisibilium”, 2.27.73 (p.89) “et... credendum”.

78. **C(-Bb)**: 1.2.3 (p.6) “authentic”, 1.2.44 (p.8) “assertiones”, 1.3.54 (p.11) “catholicas”, 2.1.48 (p.34) “adhibere”, 2.3.27 (p.40) “sanctionibus”, 2.3.40 (p.41) “adhibere”, 2.3.86 (p.42) “Petri”, 2.33.21 (p.105) “periculum”, 3.5.22 (p.115) “manifestum”, 3.6.108 (p.122) “errantes”, 3.11.40 (p.134) “Magister”, 4.15.14 (p.160) “Quantum”, 4.23.47 (p.175) “De facto”, 4.25.21 (p.179) “non”, 5.3.38 (p.210) “stante”, 5.3.152 (p.215) “illegitime”, 5.3.157 (p.215) “perfectis”, 5.24.150 (p.277) “infidelium”, 5.25.147 (p.283) “Lucensis”, 5.25.155 (p.284) “Pisana”, 5.25.162 (p.284) “Eugubii”, 5.29.99 (p.296) “tali”, 5.32.19 (p.306) “Archippus”.

79. **Bb** has some passages the others omit: 2.12.18-20 (p.55) “condempnate... pontificem”, 4.11.69-72 (p.154) “tenetur... credere”.

80. **Bb** omits passages the others have: 1.8.9 (p.17) “propter... licet”, 1.12.31 (p.27) “alicuius... spectat”, 1.15.4 (p.31) “solum... canonica”, 2.1.14 (p.33) “veritates... sunt”, 2.12.30 (p.56) “esse...”.

very close and **Ce** resembles them. Neither **An** nor **Ce** can be a copy of **Fi**.⁸¹ In 1 Dial. 1-5 we have found nothing to rule out the possibility that **Fi** and **Ce** may be copies of **An**, but George Knysh informs us that in 1 Dial. 6 and 7 there are passages omitted from **An** that are found in **Fi**⁸² and suggests that **An** and **Fi** may be independent copies of a lost ancestor.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Bb**, **Fi** and **An**. We use the group siglum **C** in reporting variants found in at least two of these three.

Group D

La, **Lc**, **Ko** and **Ax** contain 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. only; **Ca**, **Vd**, **Un**, and **Na** contain 1 Dial, 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial. Each component of **Na** was written by a different copyist; in **Un** 3.2 Dial. was written in a new hand. **Ca**, **Na** and **Ax** were made in the late 14th century and the others in the 15th century.

Manuscripts of group **D** agree on a number of variants not found in other groups.⁸³ There are four significant variants in which they agree with groups **A** and **B**,⁸⁴ which suggests that their ancestor had been partly amended against an **A** or **B** manuscript. (These amendments are in book 1 and chapter 4 of book 2: perhaps the corrector got some distance and lost access to the better text or gave up.) Manuscripts of group **D** often agree with manuscripts of group **E**;⁸⁵ perhaps **D** and **E** had a common ancestor, or perhaps the **D** ancestor had an **E** ancestor, or vice versa, or perhaps there was extensive contamination.

Christum", 4.24.38 (p.178) "explicite... dampnatas", 4.25.51 (p.180) "ut... alium", 5.5.76 (p.227) "qui... precepit", 5.15.180 (p.257) "a... potestatem", 5.26.38 (p.286) "quia... convenirent".

81. **Fi** omits, **An** and **Ce** do not omit: 5.29.54-6 (p.294) "est... scissa", 5.32.105-6 (p.310) "Magister... ordinabit".

82. E.g. in 1 Dial. 6.67 lines 39-41, 57-9, 62-4. According to Knysh **An** is the work of six copyists, the third taking over at 1 Dial. 6.67, and the last three are less accurate than the first.

83. For variants characteristic of **D** see 1.3.49 (p.11) "licet... quedam", 1.9.20 (p.20) "contra... reprobati", 1.11.9 (p.24) "Quamobrem", 1.14.50 (p.30) "certius", 1.15.22 (p.31) "eosdem", 5.1.49 (p.200) "specialiter", 5.1.48 (p.200) "quia etsi", 5.2.22 (p.202) "allegationi", 5.16.4 (p.258) "alias... diligenter". **Ly** occasionally goes with **D**, we think because it includes variants taken from a **D** manuscript.

84. See Omissions-Additions.html, passages 1-4.

85. E.g. 1.2.26 (p.6) "Augustino", 1.4.8 (p.12) "intellectum", 2.15.3 (p.64) "interrogationem habeo", 2.17.37 (p.69) "negari", 2.20.41 (p.75) "vitandos", 2.26.23 (p.85) "Anglicis".

The members of group **D** often disagree with one another. **LcNa** are close,⁸⁶ **CaLa** sometimes agree against the others,⁸⁷ otherwise there do not seem to be any sub-groups.

None of these manuscripts is a copy of any of the others.⁸⁸ Some manuscripts of this group contain material not found in others of the group, suggesting borrowing from other families.⁸⁹ We regard **Ca** and **Vd** as reasonably good witnesses to the text. **Un** has lost folios from the beginning and from the end; textually it seems close to **Vd**. **La** and **Lc** have many omissions; we regard **Lc** as a poor witness. **Na** is damaged and in places illegible. **Ax** has many omissions and implausible readings. **Ax** and **Ko** seem to belong mainly to group **D**, but they have readings drawn from other traditions.⁹⁰

86. Neither is a copy of the other. **Na** is not a copy of **Lc**: 2.3.79 (p.42) “tanquam... docuerunt”, 2.13.65 (p.60) “sed diffinit”, 2.22.22 (p.79) “tertia... ligat”, 2.27.49 (p.88) “ad... approbanda”, 2.32.36 (p.99) “licet... ecclesie”, 2.33.5 (p.104) “differentia... fidem”, 5.12.17 (p.246) “potest... fidelium”, 5.30.98 (p.300) “succenseam... verecundia”, 5.32.41 (p.307) “Apostolica... §”, 5.36.36 (p.318) “tertia... errare”. **Lc** is not a copy of **Na**: 3.2.10 (p.111) “excommunicatus... notat”. Except for this omission **Lc** might be a copy of **Na**, as is suggested by the following puzzling feature. At 3.1.48 (p.110) “Christi” **Lc** adds in the text “magister istius nominis hereticus plures”, words found in the margin of **Na** at 3.2.6 (p.111) “Magister... plures”. Thus a correction in **Na** has been misplaced in **Lc**. If **Lc** is not a copy of **Na**, we must suppose a lost manuscript containing that marginal correction, which **Na** has reproduced also as a marginal correction. Another disagreement between **Lc** and **Na** at 5.1.49 (p.200) “quia etsi” suggests that they had different exemplars.

87. See 2.24.19 (p.81) “asserens”, 2.27.45 (p.88) “sibimet”, 2.32.114 (p.102) “responsio”, 2.34.31 (p.107) “revocata”, 3.6.51 (p.120) “hereticorum”, 4.1.9 (p.137) “ille... tenax”, 4.30.53 (p.192) “obscurus”, 5.24.116 (p.276) “in trieribus”.

88. Of the members of this group, **Ca** omits, others do not: 4.9.64 (p.151) “fidem... explicite”, 4.28.33 (p.185) “qui... iniquitati”. **La** omits, others do not: 2.1.103 (p.37) “ergo... veteri”, 2.25.8 (p.83) “et... continet”, 5.30.51 (p.298) “clericorum... multitudo”, 5.32.18 (p.306) “in... erat”, 5.32.74 (p.308) “et... laicorum”. **Vd** omits, others do not: 1.3.18 (p.10) “intellectum... canonum”, 2.12.69 (p.57) “sua... diffinitio”, 2.13.94 (p.61) “ita... illo”, 2.27.95 (p.90) “Magister... miracula”. **Lc** omits, others do not: 2.3.79 (p.42) “tanquam... docuerunt”, 2.22.22 (p.79) “tertia... ligat”, 2.27.49 (p.88) “ad... approbanda”, 2.33.5 (p.104) “differentia... fidem”, 5.12.17 (p.246) “potest... fidelium”. **Fr** omits, others do not: 3.6.111 (p.122) “a... perversam”. **Na** omits, others do not: 3.2.10 (p.111) “excommunicatus... notat”. **Un** omits, others do not: 4.19.27 (p.166) “suam... statim”, 5.3.213 (p.218) “vobiscum... solum”. **Ax** substitutes something unique: 2.26.26 (p.85) “discipulus... quod”.

89. **Ca** has, others omit: 1.10.16 (p.23) “quam... subalterne”. **CaFr** have, others omit: 2.20.45 (p.75) “infra... fideliter”, 2.24.7 (p.80) “dampnatio... quidam”. **Vd** has, others omit: 2.4.15 (p.44) “de... sancta”. **Fr** has, others omit: 4.1.34 (p.138) “appropriatur... Magister”, 4.2.48 (p.140) “si... contradictionem”, 5.31.57 (p.304) “sed... solvendi”.

90. **Ko** and **Ax** have almost all the readings characteristic of family **D** listed above, note 83. See also the passages studied in Omissions-Additions.html. However, sometimes **Ko** or **Ax** agree with other families against **D**: 1.2.25 (p.2) “rectioribus” (**Ko** with **E**), 1.3.19 (p.10) “eruditissimi” (**Ko** and **Ax** with **CE**), 1.3.49 (p.11) “licet... quedam” (neither with **D**), 1.4.65 (p.14) “multitudo” (**KoAx** with **E**), 2.12.64 (p.57) “patet... computantur” (**Ax** not with **D**), 2.18.15 (p.70) “excommunicata... est” (**Ko** not with **D**), 5.2.101 (p.206) “monstrandum” (**Ko** with **E**), 5.3.70 (p.212) “ordinum” (**Ko** with **Ar**),

The Frankfurt manuscript

Fr is not a typical member of any of the families, but it seems closest to group **D**. Perhaps it descends from a group **D** manuscript that was corrected from a manuscript of group **A** or **B**.⁹¹ It contains 1 Dial., 2 Dial., *Compendium errorum*, 3.1 Dial., 3.2 Dial. and *Octo questiones*. **Fr** was made in the late 15th century, at about the time of the first printed edition.

Fr contains a prologue otherwise found only in **We**. In **Fr** this prologue occupies the second column of the reverse of a folio (12v) the first column of which is blank. The previous seven pages are blank. It is at the very end of the first gathering. This gathering, which contains a detailed table of contents (which includes the other prologue but not this one), was probably made after the main text, since otherwise there would have been no reason why it should contain blank pages — the text would have continued at the end of the table of contents. The extra prologue seems, then, to have been added after the main text had been copied.

Fr contains material not found not found in other witnesses: extra questions and arguments, different arguments or a different way of putting the argument, explanatory comments or words to fill out the logic.⁹² In our opinion these variants are not authentic, since they are not found in other manuscripts most of which pre-date **Fr**; perhaps they were composed by an owner of some ancestor of **Fr**. The text also includes material that may have originated as marginal comment.⁹³ **Fr** often quotes more of the canon law text⁹⁴ (sometimes thereby obscuring the point), and sometimes gives more authorities,⁹⁵ as if some scribe

5.3.73-5 (p.212) “sed... augeatur” (**Ko** with **Ar**), 5.16.4 (p.258) “alias... diligenter” (**Ko** not with **D**), 5.30.110 (p.301) “non... errante” (**Ko** with **E**).

91. See Omissions-Additions.html passages 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 33, 39. In passage 39 **We** is the only **A** group manuscript with the same reading, which is also in the **B** group.

92. See 2.27.63-5 (p.89) “nullo... ostendere”, 4.28.83 (p.187) “iudicandi”, 4.28.96 (p.188) “esset... computandus”, 4.30.18-20 (p.191) “videtur... veritatem”, 4.30.21 (p.191) “Ad... quia”, 4.30.59-65 (p.193) “Qui... censendus”, 5.24.13-18 (p.272) “post... alia”, 5.36.68 (p.320) “errabit”. Some of these passages show a special interest in technicalities of logic, which in the *Dialogus* Ockham usually avoids; see below, 1.10.30-5 (p.23).

93. E.g. 4.28.52 (p.186) “censendi”, 4.29.47 (p.189) “tenetur”, 4.29.48 (p.190) “Et... iudicandus”, 5.3.189 (p.217) “veraci”, 5.24.113 (p.276) “subiecta”.

94. See 4.25.17 (p.179) “consentit”, 4.28.69 (p.186) “verba”, 4.30.55 (p.192) “recurrent”, 4.34.13 (p.198) “emendare”, 5.3.59 (p.211) “ait... dist.”, 5.4.91 (p.224) “precepta”, 5.13.75 (p.249) “obedientia... pastores”, 5.21.29 (p.265) “institutis”, 5.22.22 (p.266) “ditioni”, 5.30.55 (p.299) “Et infra”, 5.30.98 (p.300) “conticescam”, 5.31.19 (p.302) “et cetera”, 5.31.62 (p.304) “Et parum post”.

95. See extra authorities at 5.5.120 (p.229) “casu” and “homine”, 5.20.11 (p.264) “potestatem”, 5.32.42 (p.307) “Antiquos”. Quotation from the canon at 5.29.51-2 (p.294) “illis temporibus” and “unum”.

or editor wished to exercise expertise in canon law. On the other hand, its Bible references often have the wrong numbers. The text is in many ways idiosyncratic. There are changes of word order, substitutions of synonyms (e.g. “vero” for “autem”), simplification of formulae for introducing references (“ut habetur” or “ait enim” and the like often omitted or replaced by “dicit sic”).

We do not regard **Fr** as a reliable witness to the text, but it seems worth reporting since it may preserve readings coming from earlier and more reliable witnesses. It is in any case an interesting manuscript because of the additions and modifications to Ockham’s text made by unknown medieval users.

In our apparatus we regularly report **Ca**, **Vd**, **La**, **Lc** and **Fr**. We use the group siglum **D** in reporting a variant found in at least three of these five.

Group E

Vg contains 1 Dial. only; **Pa**, **Lb**, **Va**, **Vb** and **Sa** contain 1 Dial. and 2 Dial. only; **Ar**, **Pb** and **Pc**⁹⁶ contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial. and 3.2 Dial.; **Pz**, **Ly** and **Gs** contain 1 Dial., 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial. and 3.2 Dial.; **Pz** also contains *Compendium errorum*; **Lm** contains 2 Dial., 3.1 Dial., 3.2 Dial. and *Compendium errorum*. **Pz** was printed in 1476 and **Ly** in 1495. According to notes found in the manuscripts, **Pa** was completed on 11 May 1389 (which makes it one of the earliest of the *Dialogus* manuscripts), **Vb** already existed in 1413, **Va** in 1437 and **Lb** in 1444. **Pb**, **Pc** and **Vg** have been dated by experts to the 14th century, **Ar** and **Sa** to the 15th.

There are many variants found in all or most members of group **E** and not generally in other witnesses.⁹⁷ Omissions not shared show that many of the members of this group cannot be the sole source of any of the others.⁹⁸

96. **Pc** could have been three separate manuscripts originally. See below, p.334.

97. Variants characteristic of group **E** will be found at: 1.4.65 (p.14) “multitudo”, 1.14.20 (p.29) “officii”, 1.14.50 (p.30) “certius”, 2.1.111 (p.37) “veritas”, 2.9.34 (p.53) “actus”, 2.13.79 (p.61) “veritates”, 2.22.21 (p.79) “consequens”, 2.32.124 (p.102) “qua ostenditur talem”, 2.33.157 (p.103) “generalī”, 3.2.18 (p.111) “iudeus”, 3.9.37 (p.127) “adhesionē”, 4.4.23 (p.143) “Manichei”, 4.13.59 (p.158) “non... credendum”, 5.2.101 (p.206) “monstrandum”, 5.6.84 (p.233) “et... potest”. At 5.3.55 (p.211) “sibi” repetition is found in many **E** group manuscripts viz. **PaVgVaPcPbVbSa**, but not in **ArLbKoPzLy** — perhaps because some scholars recognised the error and eliminated it. **VgPzLy** share a repetition at 4.3.5 (p.141) “pertinax... et”. **PaArPb** add a passage not found in other manuscripts at 2.13.126 (p.63) “sententiam... qui”.

98. Other **E** manuscripts have, but: **Ar** omits 4.2.56-65 (p.140) “quemadmodum... Christiane” (to the end of chapter 2: see Comments.html); **Lb** omits 1.8.18-20 (p.18) “et... pontificum”, 5.32.47 (p.307) “sed... errare” ; **Pa** omits 3.6.121-2 (p.122) “suam... errantes”; **Pb** omits 1.6.25 (p.16) “secundum...pertinere”; **Pc** omits 3.5.24-5 (p.116) “aliquis... cito”; **Va** omits 4.19.47-8 (p.167) “et nullo... censendus”, 4.7.26 (p.148) “sicut... desperandum”; **Vg** omits 2.8.9-11 (p.51) “debent... orthodoxe”.

The leading members of this group are, in our opinion, **PaVgVaPz. PcPbAr** are fairly close to the leading members, **VbLbSa** less so.

Va and **Vg** seem close to one another.⁹⁹ Both include readings from *C* or *D* manuscripts.¹⁰⁰ **Va** (or an ancestor) was corrected against an *A* or *B* manuscript.¹⁰¹ **Vg** has many marginal corrections, which could well come from an *E* source.¹⁰² Both **Pa** and **Lb** have many interlinear and marginal corrections from some *A* or *B* source.¹⁰³

PbAr seem to form a sub-group in 1 Dial.; they show no special closeness in Parts 2 and 3.2.¹⁰⁴ **Ar** was made perhaps a century after **Pb**.¹⁰⁵ Neither is a copy of the other, as various omissions, additions and confusions show.¹⁰⁶

VbLbSa also seem to form a sub-group.¹⁰⁷ Neither **Lb** nor **Sa** can be a source of the other or of **Vb**,¹⁰⁸ but **Vb** may be a source of the others (probably not the

99. E.g. 2.17.8 (p.68) “fidelium”, 2.19.31 (p.72) “invisibilium”, 5.3.133 (p.214) “acquiritur”.

100. E.g. 4.17.38 (p.165) “universalis”: **Vg** with *CD* reads “talīs”, **Va** reads “talīs universalis”, suggesting that **Vg** and **Va** borrowed from *CD*.

101. See Omissions-Additions.html passages 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42; in the other passages **Va** agrees with other members of group *E*. In passages 41 and 42 only the *A* manuscripts and **Ba** of the *B* group has the same reading. **Va** has the same two lines of material both before and after passage 19 (see 4.25.58-9, p.181), suggesting that in an ancestor this passage was omitted and then inserted in the wrong place. For other places where **Va** agrees with *AB* witnesses see 2.13.65 (p.60) “esse... veritatem” (**Pc** also agrees), 5.14.16 (p.251) “sex”, 5.36.51 (p.319) “quod... secundo”, 5.18.49 (p.262) “regere”, 5.20.9 (p.264) “potestatem”, 5.22.22 (p.266) “ditioni”. The *A* manuscript to which **Va** seems closest is **Vc**: Prol.1.6 (p.1) “nescio”, 5.15.194 (p.258) “ergo... petro”.

102. See for example: 5.3.127-8 (p.214) “Si... depositionem”, 5.8.65-6 (p.240) “tamen... fidem”, 5.24.55-6 (p.274) “Aut... ecclesiam”, 5.26.36-7 (p.286) “convenerint... locum”, 5.35.63-4 (p.315) “tempore... infidelium”.

103. See for example Omissions-Additions.html passages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

104. In **Ar** there is a change of writer part-way through 1 Dial.5 (below, p.312), and apparently also a change of exemplar. This may explain why **Ar** ceases to be close to **Pb**.

105. See Ballweg, Wit2DialBallwegTr.html#Ar.

106. **Pb** has, **Ar** omits: 1.7.7 (p.17) “de... illorum”, 1.9.15 (p.19) “theologic... subordinata”, 2.32.83 (p.101) “sed... humane”. **Ar** has, **Pb** omits: 1.2.20 (p.7) “secunda... censenda” (**Pb** adds in the wrong place), 1.2.44 (p.3) “quia... tacere”, 1.2.67 (p.9) “sed... ingenio”, 5.2.61 (p.204) “magister... mente”. At 5.3.70 (p.212) and the paragraph following, most of which **Pb** omits, **Ar** and **Ko** include probably conjectural material (see Comments.html). At 1.6.15 (p.15) “Discipulus... putanda” **Ar** has authentic text omitted by **VbLbSa** while **Pb** has something probably conjectural. At 5.7.55-8 (p.235) **Ar** and **Pb** both omit a passage which **Ar** adds a few lines down in the wrong place: “in... errare”, “mores”. Both **Ar** and **Pb** borrow some material from a *D* group manuscript; see Comments.html on 1.2.20.

107. See Comments.html on: 1.2.20, 1.3.60, 2.19.30. Also 2.31.40 (p.98) “Discipulus... quod”.

108. **Sa** omits and **LbVb** do not: 1.10.14 (p.23) “inferiores... scientie”, 1.12.31 (p.27) “punitio... criminis”. **Lb** omits and **SaVb** do not: 1.8.18-20 (p.18) “et... pontificum”, 5.32.47 (p.307) “sed... errare”.

direct source of **Lb**¹⁰⁹), or the three may have a common ancestor. **Lb** includes some material that appears in **Vb** in the margin.¹¹⁰ Some marginal additions in **Lb** may supply material (from the source of its corrections, a manuscript like group **B**) that may already have been omitted from the **VbLbSa** exemplar (or from earlier ancestors),¹¹¹ others supply material that may have been present in its exemplar (since it is present in **VbSa**) but was omitted when **Lb** was copied.¹¹² **Sa** has omissions that correspond to omissions in **Vb**;¹¹³ it does not seem to have been corrected against any other manuscript.¹¹⁴ Although **Vb** seems to have been the ancestor of a number of manuscripts of 2 Dial.,¹¹⁵ **Lb** and **Sa** seem to be its only possible descendants in 1 Dial.; this is consistent with the suggestion made above (p.xvii) that in some codices the two parts may be copies of different exemplars.

PzLmLyGs form another sub-group. It is almost certain that **Lm** is a copy of **Pz**.¹¹⁶ **Ly** seems to be mainly a copy of **Pz**, but its publisher claims to have had the text revised by scholars¹¹⁷ and they seem to have borrowed from some manuscript of group **D**, one like **Fr**;¹¹⁸ we have not noticed any such borrowings after 1 Dial. 3.4. **Pz** (or an ancestor) seems to have taken some variants from a manuscript akin to **PbAr**.¹¹⁹

In our apparatus we regularly report **Pa**, **Vg**, **Va**, **Pz** and **Ly**. We use the group siglum **E** in reporting a variant found in at least three of these five.

109. At 5.3.55 (p.211) “sibi” there is a passage repeated in **Vb** but not in **Lb**: if the writer of **Lb** had copied from **Vb** directly but recognised and omitted the repetition, he would probably have marked it for deletion in **Vb**.

110. At 1.2.20 (p.7) “secunda... censenda” **Lb** seems to include corrections from **Vbm** along with corrections drawn from another source.

111. See 1.2.67 (p.9) “sed... ingenio”, 1.3.60 (p.12) “canonistarum ... a”, 1.6.12 (p.15) “oportet... canonistas”, 1.6.15 (p.15) “Discipulus... putanda”, 1.9.48 (p.21) “postponitur... iuri”.

112. See 1.5.7 (p.14) “recte... distinguendo”, 1.15.12 (p.31) “quomodo... tractatus”, 2.2.57 (p.39) “quas veritates”, 2.4.68 (p.46) “inter... christi”, 5.2.140 (p.207) “docet... constet”.

113. See above, note 111. In those places **Sa** makes the same omissions as **Vb**.

114. At 3.2.6 (p.111) “magister... plures” the reading in **Sa** may be a conjecture to supply an omission from **Vb**. (The relevant page is missing from **Lb**.)

115. See OP vol.8, p.14.

116. See 31d1msr.html#PzLyLm

117. See OP vol.8, p.x.

118. MSRIms1d1.html#LyFr. Cf. 1.8.41 (p.19) “dispensationem”, 1.8.43 (p.19) “alios”, 1.9.20 (p.20) “contra... reprobati”, 1.9.23 (p.20) “noscitur... moralis”, 1.9.26 (p.20) “maioris”, 1.9.32 (p.20) “probata... dampnanda”, 1.9.37 (p.20) “veritate”, 1.9.42 (p.21) “postponenda”, 1.9.60 (p.21) “reprobanda”.

119. E.g. 1.2.25 (p.2) “rectioribus”, 2.19.32 (p.72) “credo... invisibilium”, 5.3.70 (p.212) “ordinum”.

Analysis of the relationships among the witnesses shows that from the time when Ockham put 1 Dial. into circulation until the end of the 15th century many scholars devoted much effort to copying and amending the text. It seems that many more copies were made than have survived, including the ancestors of the groups and sub-groups and the various intermediaries we need to postulate to explain the resemblances between similar manuscripts that were not copied from one another. Some amendments seem to be conjectural, but many may have been made by consulting other manuscripts. Emendation was not merely sporadic; some manuscripts were thoroughly re-worked from beginning to end (cf. **Es**, **Pa**, **Lb**), and some lost ancestors may also have been thoroughly revised. Some codices also contain tables of contents, summaries, chapter headings and marginal comments, which show how closely the *Dialogus* was studied. It seems clear that the work was highly valued by many scholars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Reporting of variants

There are about 30 witnesses showing a very large number of variants. Most of these variants are “noise”, but others represent text traditions going back to Ockham’s original or to sources close to it, such as the ancestors of the five manuscript families.

To reduce the noise we generally report only significant variants (for an illustrative list of insignificant variants see OP vol.8 p.xviii), and only those that represent one or more of the five manuscript families, i.e. only variants found in all or most of the regularly-reported members of a family. We do, however, report variants referred to in the Introduction, and also variants found in **Ly** or **We**, which are witnesses of special interest.

All variants, even trivial variants found only in a single witness, are reported in collations and witness files posted on the website.

Sigla used in the apparatus

For sigla for individual witnesses, see “Manuscripts and early editions”, p.321.

S: The edition of a quoted text referred to in the note on the passage.

Tx: The text in the upper part of the page.

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

Group sigla:

A: We, Ox, Av, Vc and Vf.

B: Ba and Es.

C: Bb, Fi and An.

D: Ca, Vd, La, Lc.

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

Ed: Pz and Ly.

When we report a witness not normally reported, its individual siglum is added to the siglum of its group. Thus “**BDi**” would mean “Ba and Es, and also Di”.

When a witness differs from others covered by the same group siglum, this is indicated by adding in parentheses its individual siglum preceded by a minus sign. Thus “A(-Vc)” means “A except for Vc”.

Emendations in the manuscripts

“m” added to the individual siglum indicates something written in the margin; e.g. “Esm” refers to something written in the margin of the manuscript **Es**.

“b” added to the individual siglum indicates something written between the lines, e.g. “Esb”.

“s” added to the individual siglum indicates something inserted into the line of text, e.g. over an erasure, e.g. “Ess”.

Also, deletions and marginal or interlinear additions may be indicated respectively by “[d]... [/d]”, “[m]... [/m]” and “[b]... [/b]”

Note: The conventions explained in OP vol.8 p.xvff are followed also in this volume.

Footnotes

Besides the apparatus, there are at the foot of the page —

references to sources explicitly mentioned in the text, and

numbered footnotes containing references and other information supplied by the editors.