

## General Introduction and preliminary comment on 1 Dial. 6. 1-15

The 34 manuscripts which contain all or portions of the First Part of Ockham's *Dialogus* may be classified into 5 basic groups or traditions:

A. <b>Bb Fi An</b> Ce Na* Sm	<b>A</b> in the other prefaces
B. <b>We Vc Vf</b> Av <b>Ox</b> Br	<b>E</b> " " "
C. <b>Vg Va</b> Lb Pa Pb Pc Vb Ar* Sa Ko*	<b>B</b> " " "
D. <b>Vd</b> Ca <b>Lc</b> La Un Ax*	<b>C</b> " " "
E. <b>Ba</b> Di To Es Fr* Bz	<b>D</b> " " "

Manuscripts fully collated for our critical Latin text of 1 Dial. 6.1-15 have been highlighted in **green**. The asterisk has been affixed to witnesses evidencing substantial intermixture.

The main reason for assigning a manuscript to a specific group is *the quantitative and/or qualitative preponderance in the ENTIRE manuscript( i.e. in Books 1 through 7) of readings which are peculiar to the group in which it has been included*, notwithstanding the presence of occasional conflation and/or idiosyncracies in a particular witness, or even the preponderance of alternate group readings in some sequences of the total manuscript (a fact indicated by the asterisk). *Each manuscript has its own genetic peculiarities*, which must always be kept in mind in the context of a conveniently simplified ordering system. **Fr**, for instance, borrows heavily from other traditions in many contexts, and simultaneously evidences much creative rewriting. It thus does not belong to *E* in quite the same fashion as **To** or even **Ba**. Likewise, **We** does not belong to *B* in the same manner as **Vc** or **Av** (see further below).

The complex nature of medieval manuscript copying (and the consequent difficulties in tracing definitive and clear-cut affiliations and developing consistent stemmas) is well exemplified by manuscript **Na** (which is primarily group *D* in books 1-5, and group *A* in Books 6-7. It has been asterixed and included in group *A* above because Books 6 and 7 constitute *two-thirds* of the word volume in the *Prima pars*, and Books 1-5 only *one-third*). This witness has been dated by Cenci to the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Independent examination by Prof. Doyle of Durham University (Offler Archives, *Dialogus* folder) has not fully confirmed this assumption, though it seems likely enough. My own analysis indicates that the manuscript's reproduction of the First Part of *Dialogus* relies very strongly on exemplars of groups *A* (the preponderant model), though as just mentioned it also exhibits certain characteristics of *C*

and *E*. The utilization of all these sources does not always seem to have been properly coordinated. Thus in 1 Dial. 1.3, where groups *A* and *C* usually describe the authors of the Canon Law as “viri acutissimi”, and groups *E* and *B* as “viri eruditissimi”, **Na** has “viri eruditissimi acutissimi” (as do **Ca Vd La Lc Fr**). In the same chapter, where group *C* has “indices” and some exemplars of group *E* “determinares”, **Na** has “indices et determinares” (while groups *A* and *B* normally prefer “intimares”). In 1 Dial. 2.21, **Na** has the same major omissions that we find only in some group *C* (**Pa Pz Ly Sa Lb Ko**) and in a few group *D* (**La Lc Vd**) texts. In 1 Dial. 5.34 **Na** includes (as do **Pb La** and **Sa**) an additional appearance of the paragraph-beginning term “**Discipulus**” in the middle of a sentence elsewhere wholly attributed to the Master (whereas **Bb Ca Un Pa Vb Lb Lc** have a superfluous scripting of “**Magister**” in the same place). This particular oddity (its presence in **Bb** suggests but does not prove that it might have been present in the margin of Ockham’s own unedited text) is partially resolved in the text of **We**, and in all manuscripts of group *B* (but not in those of group *E*, except for **Ba** which here borrows from *B*), where the editor of what I now believe (see further below) to have been an *early re-edition* of the *Prima pars Dialogi* provided what he felt was an appropriate equivalent of the “missing” segment implied by the intrusive term. All this points to a very complex process of textual development and copying, and the gaps noticeable here and there in **Na** (e.g. in 1 Dial. 6.1, or in 1 Dial 7.60) possibly indicate an intermittent lack of interest in or capacity for proper editing.

**Na** is but one instance of what can be observed in many other manuscripts. **Va** for example (copied in 1437) is a *C* group text with multiple but not comprehensive integrated corrections from a *B* group exemplar of the “Ancona” variety (cf. below). From time to time (for instance in **Pb** and **Lb**) we may even catch various adopted corrections *in statu nascendi* as marginal and interlinear glosses. On the other hand, *E* group manuscripts (the **latest and most idiosyncratic** of the 5 basic groups) sometimes have a significant number of readings in common with the *C* group tradition (as, for instance, in 1 Dial. 6.1-15) or with some late exemplars of the *D* tradition (as in 1 Dial. 6.56). The same kind of relationship may be discerned (though not systematically or universally) between groups *E* and *B*.

The leading exemplar of the *E* tradition (**Ba**, a mid-15<sup>th</sup> century manuscript) shares some very specific readings with **Va** (cf. the apparatus for 1 Dial. 6.1-15 at chs. 1 /thrice/, 5, 14 /four items/), readings which otherwise are only known to exist in the *B* tradition, and which cannot be found in any other exemplars of *C* or *E*. **Ba** in fact copies very systematically and heavily from the *B* tradition throughout the *Prima pars*, whereas **To**, **Es**, and **Di** borrow nothing at all from *B* after Book 5. This demonstrates a fact proved in many other contexts, viz., that important elements of the *B* textual tradition were intermittently available to copyists for *ad hoc* use.

If we focus on the extant manuscripts of the *B* tradition (leaving aside the **Br** fragment which John Scott links to **Vc**) we may recognize three sub-groups: (1) **We** (2) **Av Ox** (3) **Vc Vf**.

**We**, which I and others once believed to be a multiple copy-hands compilation of the later 15<sup>th</sup> century with highly visible and sustained though not quite comprehensive affinities to **Av Ox Vc Vf**, has now been claimed by Leipzig codicologist Matthias Eifler to be *the earliest extant manuscript* of the first part of the **Dialogus**, produced between 1340 and 1345.

Eifler seems clearly wrong here on two counts: (1) A manuscript copied quickly by a team of some 20 scribes, and containing paper watermarked 1351 and 1353 could hardly have been put together between 1340 and 1345. This is elementary logic. (2) **We**, while excellent, contains a multiplicity of passages which cannot have been part of Ockham's original text (this is copiously demonstrated in the apparatus to Books 6 and 7: cf. especially 1 Dial. 7.25). **We** is thus to be understood as an edited early reworking of Ockham's original work. Hence the publication story recounted in the *prologus primus* of **We** pertains in fact to this original text, and not to **We** itself [[This also appears from the close sequential relationship of groups A, C, and D, established long before the availability of group B for purposes of comparative corrections]]. If Eifler's date for **We** were accepted, this would mean that, as plausibly described in this fictitious *prologus primus*, the publication of Ockham's text would have occurred in the early 1330's, shortly after completion of the composition. This is impossible given what we certainly know about the relationship between Ockham and his Franciscan dissident associates at that time. The alleged initial hiding of Ockham's authorship of the first published "*pars*" from **all people with the exception of two** ("*duobus exceptis*") presented in **We**'s spurious first prologue simply does not work in the context of the Munich situation of 1331-1342. The "Central Committee" (so to speak) of the Michaelist dissidents was made up of at least 5 people (Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia of Bergamo, Francesco d'Ascoli, Henry of Thalheim, and of course William himself), none of whom could be (or were) kept "out of the loop" (cf. the interesting indicators in 1 Dial. 6.58, 61), **not to mention their socii**. Prior to 29 November 1342 Ockham was not yet a fully independent scholar, though his autonomy had obviously grown over the years just prior to the death of Michael of Cesena. Not until he became "Keeper of the Seal" and leader of the Cesenist Conventual dissidents could Ockham function in the manner described in **We**'s *prologus primus*.

But if Eifler seems wrong as to the specific date of **We**, he is quite correct as to the general epoch of its emergence should the primary if not conclusive consideration be the dating of the papers used in the codex. The dates Eifler proposes for **We**'s most recent paper watermarks (1351 in gatherings 1 and 2, and 1353 in gathering 5) would thus indicate, in my view, that, on this strict paper date basis, **We** was edited sometime between c.1353 and 1359 (possibly as late as 1362), most probably at Munich, ruled at the time by Lewis (junior) or less probably at Landshut ruled at the time by his younger brother Stephen, when these Wittelsbach sons of the late Emperor Lewis IV were as yet unreconciled with the Avignon papacy (Lewis jr. was absolved of his politico-ecclesiastical "sins" in 1359, as was Ockham (posthumously), Stephen not until 1362), and their surviving Cesenist collaborators were continuing their lonely struggle. No actual complete copies of this re-edited text have survived other than Weimar's Q23.

The remaining witnesses of the extant tradition B were produced considerably later. Both the **AvOx** and the **VcVf** groups go back to the same original through at least one intermediary, and common place names in **Av Ox Vc Vf** (cf. 1 Dial. 5.22-24) associate this original with the **March of Ancona** (which, of course, suggests but does not necessarily imply that this is

where it (the original) was composed). Each “Ancona” sub-group has been edited further, and the immediate ancestor of sub-group 2 (**Av Ox**) has provided chapter headings analogous to those of **Ly. Vc** and **Vf** are products of the 1470’s (**Vc** was the copy of Pope Sixtus IV), while **Av** and **Ox** are slightly earlier (**Ox** already existed in 1444). The common source of sub-groups 2 and 3, with its Table of Contents and Admonition to the Reader (both Table and Admonition were authored by one or more extremely competent though unfortunately anonymous editor or editors), would thus appear to be at least contemporary to the early Council of Basel if not slightly earlier. There is no proof (as yet) to indicate the survival of a comprehensive *B* text of the **Av Ox Vc Vf** variety independent of Table or Admonition. Nor does any of the “Ancona” texts reproduce the spurious prologue alluded to above, which is found only in **We** and **Fr**, though it is arguable that the Admonition just possibly uses language indicating some knowledge of this prologue.

It would thus seem on current evidence that tradition *B* was not much copied or referenced after ca. 1353/62, and that prior to “Ancona” it was only briefly and selectively consulted ca. 1390 or thereabouts by a *D* tradition editor, and again ca. 1420 or thereabouts by the initial editor(s) of tradition *E*, as demonstrated by the comparatively poor quality of the latter’s early manuscripts (**Es To**) beyond the first third of *Pars prima*. By ca. 1430 we get the original of “Ancona” (but again with comprehensive omissions after 1 Dial. 7.43, and without the spurious *prologus primus*). **Ba** with its very comprehensive borrowings through the end of Book 7 appears a little later. Around 1460 we have the selective Frankfurt compilation, which has the extra prologue, but does not consider it a part of the **Dialogus** proper. **We** itself, whose exact whereabouts in the period ca.1360-ca. 1475 remains obscure resurfaces as a gift to the University of Erfurt. Finally we have some very late *C* texts who simply copy from the *D* tradition mentioned above.

The textual archaeology of the Ancona subgroup of tradition *B* in 1 Dial. 6.1-15 intimates at first glance that its source either relied on an exemplar which had very little in common with tradition *C*, or else that, **in this segment**, the “Ancona” editor(s) of *B* (unlike tradition *E* in the same passages) deliberately chose not to draw on tradition *C* for assistance. Analysis of further segments where “Ancona” (whose contacts with *E* have been well-documented by John [Scott](#)) obviously and repeatedly borrows from *C* (cf. below at 1 Dial. 7.42-73) indicates the greater plausibility of the latter hypothesis, particularly since it seems increasingly possible that “Ancona *B*” actually originated as a deteriorated *C* group manuscript which was then massively corrected by reference to *B* up to 1 Dial. 7.43. The clearcut and abundant evidence that both *E* and Ancona *B* do rely on tradition *C* as convenience dictates, becomes a powerful argument in support of the view suggested earlier that *E* and Ancona *B* are in many respects **derivative and conflated texts** rather than “pure” representatives of a neglected and subsequently rediscovered Ockham original. Certainly, neither *E* nor Ancona *B* as we have them can be anterior to *C*, even if we were to postulate that *C* was only sporadically available to the editors of *E* and Ancona *B*. There is also growing evidence that tradition *E* is closely linked to some manuscripts of tradition *D*, and may well have been a continuation and “correction” thereof (cf. [Introduction](#) to 1 Dial. 6.51-67).

In any event, none of these groups is able on its own to provide an exclusive basis for reconstructing the text whence stem all of our extant witnesses. Furthermore, the fact that **we do not possess a single manuscript of the *Dialogus* which may securely be dated to the author's lifetime** [our oldest are **Bb**, a mid-14<sup>th</sup> century group *A* exemplar which belonged to the Basel Dominicans and **We** /group *B*/] raises special issues of authenticity. There is no need to doubt that the reproduced texts remain substantially faithful to Ockham's unpublished autograph, but the presence therein of occasional uncorrected errors (cf. for instance our [Introduction](#) to 1 Dial. 7.65-73), as well as of additions, adjustments, or improvements some of which go back to the very beginning of the **Dialogus'** textual history should perhaps make us more vigilant as to yet further "improvements" demonstrably or potentially attributable in the various groups to a number of post-Ockham editors. The most curious of these improvements are doubtless the mentioned "*prologus primus*" (in **We**) and its homologue in **Fr**, which I earlier discovered in 1975. The [text](#) of this spurious if interesting and historically useful prologue (an integral part of **We**, and therefore also composed in the putative 1353-1362 time frame) has been edited by my Australian colleagues. It is interesting BTW that the very specific references to 1 Dial. 5 found in 3 Dial.1 (whose existence, or at least the existence of some portions of it, is attested c. 1360 in the Bremen ms.) are all to the **We** chapter numeration (**except one**, which follows the numeration of other traditions). Perhaps a clue to the state of Ockham's lost autographs, perhaps not. It is difficult to say since all extant independent mss. of 3 Dial.1 are from approximately the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century with no prior utilization recorded. The spurious prologue certainly knew (and echoed) the prologue to 3 Dial. 1 [Prologue of 3.1: "Salomonis utcumque sequendo vestigia". Spurious prologue of **We**: "Venerandorum virorum vestigia non relinquitur"].

Group *A* contains some of the oldest manuscripts (**Bb** may well be **the** oldest of all extant *Dialogus* manuscripts, but this has yet to be verified by watermark analysis). These, however, have a few defective peculiarities and significant verbal omissions.

Group *C* represents the 14<sup>th</sup> century tradition which evolved into the printed editions (Paris 1476 and Lyons 1494 [the latter reprinted by Melchior Goldast in 1614]) and is therefore *the one most familiar to historical practitioners of the Dialogus*. It is the group to which belonged the lost manuscript by reference to which Pierre d'Ailly composed his abbreviation of the *Dialogus*. This group's text also has many defects. Originally, it was a slightly deteriorated version of group *A* which, as time went on, acquired more and more distinct characteristics.

Group *D* (discovered through a collation process by Scott and Kilcullen) is clearly posterior in origin to group *C*, whose readings "contaminate" its text significantly, and, as mentioned earlier in connection with **Na**, has a number of readings in common with *E* (some *D* manuscripts more than others), including four notable variants (also shared with *B*) which John [Scott](#) has studied separately in his important article. One can be more specific here, since *D* and *E* represent the evolution of the **Dialogus** text at a time when there was a great deal of interplay between various traditions. *D* began as a form of *A* which had acquired even more idiosyncracies than *C*, and was subsequently "corrected" by reference to *B* at least through the first portion of the *Pars prima* (*D* does not have the signature expression "*scilicet infra c. 68*" which distinguishes *C* at 1 Dial. 6.1). In the latter portions of the *Prima*, *D* initiated a switch within 1 Dial. 6.56 between the positions of Master and Disciple, attributing to the former what traditions *A*, *B*, and *C* attributed to the latter and vice versa. Some further deterioration in *D* (**Ax**) then added additional words within these switches, and all of this was

eventually borrowed by the class *E* manuscripts (along with the signature expression of *C* mentioned above). Neither *A* nor *C* (except for very late 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. exemplars of *C* like **Ko** and **Ar**) borrowed anything from *B*, but *D* and *E* did, the former only through 1 Dial. 2.4, the latter (with the exception of the late **Ba**) through Book 5, as was stated above.

Groups *E* and Ancona *B* thus have some reasonably good late exemplars, but their tradition, as we have said, cannot be traced back much further in time than the 1420's. The frequent excellence of the text provided by Ancona *B* needs to be balanced by concerns for authenticity which cannot in all instances be positively resolved. We can demonstrate that Simon de Plumetot corrected his group *C* **Dialogus** exemplar (**Pa**, originally copied in 1389) by reference to a group *E* text sometime in the third or fourth decade of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. We know that Henry of Zoemeren's *Epithoma Dialogi* (c.1460) was also based on a group *E* text. But, as mentioned, we lack any convincing evidence for the early existence of this tradition. There is (to repeat) even less evidence for the systematic continuity of the *B* tradition in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, indeed, well into the 15<sup>th</sup>, prior to the composition of the "Ancona" original ca. 1430. For these and other reasons mentioned above we cannot always fully identify the "good" readings shared by *E* and *B* (even those of **We**) with Ockham's authentic words. Strict analysis indicates that only **four** of the "significant" *E+B* variants reviewed by John [Scott](#) in his most useful study [these four variants are not the same as the four variants mentioned a few lines above] represent readings absolutely required for maintaining the integrity of Ockham's text (viz. variants 3, 19, 20, and 32). **Most if not all of the remaining variants could easily have been the work of learned editors, beginning with those who worked on the earliest tradition of the text published by Ockham himself in 1343** [[we can deduce the date of this initial publication from the implications of the *prologus primus* of **We**, from our knowledge of the circumstances of Ockham's career in the years 1332-1342—after his completion of the extant *Pars prima* in the late spring of 1332—from the silence about the **Dialogus** in all extant Ockhamist tracts of those years, and from an analysis of the famous "Ockham excursus" in Johann Viktring's **Liber Certarum Historiarum** at VI.12]] **which was the ultimate source of the type A manuscripts: Bb/An/Fi etc.** A subsequent "corrected" version of Ockham's original text was the source of **We** (*B*) as copied ca. 1353/62. The fact that **We** was prepared quite hurriedly, and had little immediate echo, would suggest a date closer to its terminus ante quem. The text it copied (the actual prime version of **We**) would have been prepared very shortly before the copy was made.

There is little difficulty in discerning the artificiality of **We**'s "*prologus primus*". It not only conflicts with Ockham's stated attitude towards his **Dialogus** in all of the genuine prologues by substituting an authoritative "clue" theory to Ockham's open-minded "dialectical discussion towards truth" (a substitution which is not supported in the personal works referencing the **Dialogus**), but also contradicts Ockham's words as to the Disciple's role and reactions both in the original **Dialogus**' prologue, and in subsequent passages [one of many examples: the Disciple certainly "dares" to openly take the side of the Cesenists against John XXII and Gerald Odo in 1 Dial. 6.1 re 1 Dial. 5.4, hardly in line with the *prologus primus*' statement that the Disciple "de parte esset omnino michi contraria mecumque communionem habere penitus non auderet"]. It is nevertheless a skillful pastiche of Ockham's own words taken from various authentic works, and does provide useful information because of its closeness to the original document it corrects and occasionally clarifies.

It should also be pointed out that the textual adequacy of group *B* (especially “Ancona”) is not uniform or consistent, as the apparatus of 1 Dial. 6 (and that of 1 Dial. 7) clearly reveals. In many cases the “common text” of *B* has not been adopted in the preliminary version of our critical edition, either because it is obviously defective, or because it is superfluous (sometimes awkwardly so, as in 1 Dial. 6.14). Group *B* is particularly strong (though not infallible) in the recording of Biblical, Canon Law, and Patristic citations, and is frequently our best general witness, yet it needs to be supplemented and corrected by the other groups if the intended text of Ockham’s **Dialogus** is to be adequately or nearly adequately approached. While the notion that tradition *E* and *all* of *B* may in fact have been as close in time to Ockham’s original as *A* and *C*, and that their 14<sup>th</sup> c. intermediary texts have been “lost”, is not entirely impossible (what is?), this seems a rather improbable *ad hoc* solution to the vexed problem of textual continuities, and the challenge of demonstrating the antiquity of the glaring systematic defects of most *E* manuscripts in two-thirds (!) of the *Pars prima* is abysmally daunting to say the least. In the current state of the evidence, and in the absence of clear indications to the contrary, it is much safer and much more probable to accept that a given tradition begins with the direct and demonstrable sources of its earliest extant exemplars.

Whether or not to adopt subsequent editorial improvements into our final critical text is, of course, a distinct issue. Some of the late creative idiosyncracies of the textual tradition have merit which possibly transcends their inauthenticity. One good example would be the description of the respective statuses of Michael of Cesena and Gerald Odo in the prologue. Ockham’s original text certainly referred to Michael as being “General” of the Franciscans. By late 1331 if not earlier, this identification would have seemed questionable to most and perhaps inappropriately uttered by the Disciple. The “objective” solution was universally adopted (by the “Master” one should add) in the prologue to 1 Dial. 3 [= ‘some say Michael, others Odo’]. **We** “corrected” the 1 Dialogus prologue’s original by simply eliminating the title attributed to Cesena. But the late text of *E* would perhaps have been most logical as uttered by a Disciple who was a fervent supporter of John XXII [=Michael was the “quondam” and Odo the “nunc” General. And the “Bavarum” epithet concerning Lewis was also maintained by the Disciple]. It is conceivable that Ockham might not have been averse to the inclusion of similar “improvements” into his partially unpolished text. The author of **We** certainly thought so in many contexts! And there is, after all, the evidence of the famous chapter 51 of Part I of the *Summa Totius Logice* as an indicator of Ockham’s attitude towards such matters, as well as the concluding sentences of 1 Dial. 7.73. He may even have left small specific indicators as to this wish scattered in his autograph. Unfortunately we shall probably never know. A good starting point for further reconstructive work would be to base our critical text on the convergence of *A* and *B* readings. I shall attempt this task in the forthcoming “intermediate” presentation of the text.

Chapters 1 through 15 of 1 Dial. 6 have been reconstructed here on the foundation of a full collation of the 11 “best” and most reliable exemplars of our 5 manuscript groups, with occasional references to other witnesses. The two printed editions of the 15<sup>th</sup> century have also been carefully examined, though only that of Lyons (Trechsel) has been fully reported.

The preliminary “reliability” pattern which emerges in this first published segment of book 6

is quite interesting, but cannot at this stage be fully conclusive for the entire book, and even less for the entire treatise. The manuscript which is closest to our critical text in these opening chapters is **We** (with an 87% rate of variants convergence), closely followed by **An** (86%), **Fi**, **Vc**, **Vf**, **Bb** (all at 85%), more distantly by **Ox** (83%, not counting a large textual omission at 1 Dial. 6.15), with **Va**, **Vd**, **Vg** and **Ba** trailing somewhat (all between 74% and 78%), and the historic Trechsel Lyons printed edition bringing up the rear at 72%. We should note however that many defective variants are unique to each discrete witness, whose value in confirming or denying most standardized readings is not drastically impaired by such erroneous choices. Nor should we forget that, on balance, variant units and/or clusters only affect some 15% of the total text. A “reliability” rate differential of merely 13-15% between “best” and “worst” within that narrow 15% is hence contextually minimal.

My colleagues John Kilcullen and John Scott kindly reviewed the first pre-posted version of 1 Dial. 6. 1-10 a long time ago, as well as the first posted versions of 1 Dial. 6. 1-50 and of 1 Dial. 7.42-51, for which I remain most grateful. I also thank them for verifying in a number of manuscripts (which were then unavailable to me) the contexts of 1 Dial. 1.3 and 1 Dial. 5.34 mentioned earlier.

The anonymous 14<sup>th</sup> century scribe who copied our witness **Vg** recorded book 6 of the First Part as the “*secunda pars*” of this treatise (cf. fol. 126 vb). This is a useful perspective. [[It is also a surviving indicator of the text’s publication in three sequential instalments in four manuscripts of the *C* tradition: **Vb**, **Va**, **Lb**, and **Vg**. Cf. e.g.ms. **Vg** at fol. 126vb “*incipit tercia pars*”, and at fol. 127ra “*postilla oquam*”: substituting for the usual “*liber septimus*”]] For it is here, in this massive sixth book, that Ockham’s conflict with Pope John XXII begins to spill over into issues of immediate practical relevance to the dissident Franciscans of Munich. Is the Pope above the law? If not, how should one proceed to verify whether he is a criminal? How should one punish him if it turns out that he is? The very title of book 6 is pregnant with political passion. The tensions and not always restrained fury of this historic confrontation still reverberate through these pages, and Ockham’s powerful dialectic continues to fascinate and to inspire nearly seven centuries after the events to which it was applied.

The material presented by Ockham in this first segment of 1 *Dialogus* 6 had been utilized for doctrinal reconstructions in A.S. McGrade’s *The Political Thought of William of Ockham*, at p. 19 n.38, p. 88 n.23, p. 94 n.38, and p. 107 n. 78. It had been utilized for the same purpose in my *Political Ockhamism*, at p. 28 n.21, p. 35 n.34, p. 50 n.128, p. 96 n. 229, p. 98 n. 233, p. 158 n.249, p. 238 n.7, p. 261 n. 98, p. 263, p. 268, and pp. 290-292. A new perspective may be added to these earlier analyses. It is now arguable that Ockham knew the theories of Jean Quidort (“Johannes Parisiensis”, “John of Paris”), and may sometimes have quoted him *verbatim* in the *Dialogus*. The French Dominican thus plausibly joins Marsilius of Padua as a source of the radical anti-papal doctrines discussed in 1 Dial. 6.6-9.

For the general context and meaning of 1 Dial. 6.1-15, see my *Fragments of Ockham Hermeneutics*, pp. 92-99. For my views on the progressive composition of the *Prima pars*, cf. the as yet unrevised **Introductions** to the various posted segments (esp. 1 Dial. 7.65-73, 11- 23, 24-34).

**George Knysh**



**Revised January 2014**