

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/105667>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2020-10-30 and may be subject to change.

## Thomas Aquinas's Second Parisian Regency. A Neglected Biographical Detail\*

In the 1280s the Franciscan theologian John Pecham wrote several letters which were provoked by the debate at the University of Oxford over the unicity of substantial form.<sup>1</sup> Three of these letters relate an incident involving Thomas Aquinas. In these letters, Pecham declares that Thomas submitted some of his views to the judgment of his fellow masters at the faculty of theology in Paris. This incident must have occurred sometime between 1270-1272, during Thomas's so-called second Parisian regency.

Although Pecham's correspondence is well known, the significance of the passages relating this incident has not been duly recognized.<sup>2</sup> Insofar as the passages have been noticed at all, they have been considered Pecham's biased version of events more accurately described in the Naples inquiry leading to Aquinas's canonization and in William of Tocco's biography of Thomas Aquinas. I think, however, that the incident reported by John Pecham is not identical with the events described by Bartholomew of Capua and William of Tocco. This mistaken identification has prevented historians from studying Pecham's testimony on its own merits and has led them to ignore a small but not unimportant detail in Thomas's academic career.

*John Peckham*

The topic of the three letters in which Pecham relates the incident that occurred during Thomas's second regency is the unicity of substantial form. The doctrinal details need not detain us here. Among other things, Pecham defends himself in these letters against the charge that his opposition to the theory of the unicity of substantial form was caused by a hostile attitude towards the Dominicans in general and Thomas Aquinas in particular. Pecham dismisses the Dominican charges as a malicious libel and reports the incident almost in passing.

The first letter in which Pecham mentions that Thomas submitted his views to the faculty of theology was written on December 7, 1284, and was addressed to the chan-

---

\* I wish to thank J. F. Wippel and L.-J. Bataillon for their comments on this article and the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research for making my research possible.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. D. A. Callus, *The Condemnation of St Thomas at Oxford* (London 2<sup>nd</sup> 1955), p. 17-33.

<sup>2</sup> D. L. Douie, *Archbishop Pecham* (Oxford 1952), p. 16, 288, 290, 292 and 295, discusses the letters, but she seems to believe that Thomas Aquinas recanted his views. The best discussion of the letters is in: D. A. Callus, «The Problem of the Unity of Form and Richard Knapwell, O. P.», in: *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson* (Toronto – Paris 1959), p. 151-154. But he too only observes that «there does not seem to be any difficulty in admitting Pecham's statement, that Thomas submitted his teaching on the Unity of Form to the judgment of his colleagues, in the sense that he made some polite concessions to the susceptibilities of the theologians of the old school. It is likely that this happened some time between Advent 1269 and Lent 1270, when Aquinas had to face a general attack» (p. 154). Below I shall propose a different scenario and a different dating of the incident reported by Pecham.

cellor and masters of the University of Oxford. The letter has acquired fame in the scholarly literature because it contains a section which has been interpreted as proof that Bishop Tempier intended to start an inquiry in Paris against Thomas, which, on the instructions of some cardinals, was transferred to the papal court, where it was left pending.<sup>3</sup> Recently, John Wippel and I have re-examined the tenability of this interpretation.<sup>4</sup> The question whether or not there was an inquiry pending against Thomas Aquinas, however, is not at issue here. Rather, I wish to draw attention to another element in the same section of Pecham's letter. There, Pecham claims that the interrupted evaluation of Thomas's views in 1277 concerned the very same theses (*ad discussionem ipsorum articulorum*) that Thomas Aquinas had submitted to the judgment (*arbitrium*) of the theologians at a meeting in Paris.<sup>5</sup> This meeting must have taken place a few years earlier, since Pecham indicates that he was present. More specifically, the meeting must have taken place during Thomas's and Pecham's regency in Paris. Thomas's second Parisian regency lasted from 1268/69 to 1272.<sup>6</sup> Pecham incepted at the University of Paris during the Spring of 1270, where he took the place of Eustachius of Arras on the Franciscan chair of theology. His regency is generally supposed to have lasted until 1272.<sup>7</sup> In sum, then, the meeting reported by Pecham must have taken place sometime during the years 1270-1272:

«Causam vero opinionum bonae memoriae fratris Thomae de Aquino, quas fratres ipsi opinionibus sui ordinis esse dicunt, quas tamen in nostra praesentia subiecit idem reverendus pater theologorum arbitrio Parisiensium magistrorum, pendere diximus in Romana curia indecisam, pro eo quod, cum vacante sede apostolica per mortem sanctae memoriae domini Johannis, Dei gratia tunc temporis Romani pontificis, episcopus Pa-

---

<sup>3</sup> R. Wielockx, «Autour du procès de Thomas d'Aquin», in: A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Thomas von Aquin. Werk und Wirkung im Licht neuerer Forschungen* (Cologne 1989), p. 414.

<sup>4</sup> J. M. M. H. Thijssen, «1277 Revisited: A New Interpretation of the Doctrinal Investigations of Thomas Aquinas and Giles of Rome», in: *Vivarium* 35 (1997), p. 82-83, argues that the 1277 investigation of Thomistic views is a reference to the inquiry against Giles of Rome. Some of the theses that were culled from Giles of Rome's commentary on the *Sentences* and censured were also upheld by Thomas Aquinas. See further J. F. Wippel, «Bishop Stephen Tempier and Thomas Aquinas: A Separate Process Against Aquinas», in: *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 44 (1997), p. 117-136, who also argues that the introduction of a separate inquiry against Thomas Aquinas in 1277 is unnecessary for understanding the textual evidence.

<sup>5</sup> See also Thijssen, «1277 Revisited», p. 83-85, for a brief discussion of Pecham's testimony.

<sup>6</sup> See J.-P. Torrell, *Initiation à Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Sa personne et son œuvre* (Fribourg 1993), p. 265.

<sup>7</sup> Thereafter, he became master of theology at the Franciscan Friary in Oxford, until 1275, when he was made Provincial of the Franciscans in England. See Ioannes Pecham, *Quodlibeta quattuor* (ed. G. J. Etzkorn et F. Delorme, Grottaferrata 1989), p. 21\*.

risiensis Stephanus bonae memoriae ad discussionem ipsorum articulorum de consilio magistrorum procedere cogitaret, mandatum fuisse dicitur eidem episcopo, per quosdam Romanae curiae dominos reverendos, ut de facto illarum opinionum superederet penitus, donec aliud reciperet in mandatis.»<sup>8</sup>

Note that Pecham attributes different weight to the several elements in his account. He indicates that he acquired his knowledge of the events of 1277 described in his 1284 letter from hearsay, whereas his knowledge of the 1270-1272 meeting is based on personal recollection. The connection between both events and the reason why they are mentioned in the 1284 letter is the thesis of the unicity of substantial form.

The incident that occurred during Thomas's second regency is mentioned and elaborated upon in two other letters by John Pecham. In the second letter, dated January 1, 1285, and addressed to several cardinals at the Roman Curia, Pecham repeats his eyewitness account of the meeting of the theologians in Paris at which Thomas submitted his theory of the unity of form along with some other theses:

«Alia autem inconvenientia sequuntur innumera ex hoc ipso [i. e., from the view that only one substantial form exists in man]. Fuit revera illa opinio fratris Thomae sanctae memoriae de Aquino, sed ipse in his et in aliis huiusmodi dictis suis suam innocentiam Parisius in collegio magistrorum theologiae humiliter declaravit, subiiciens omnes suas huiusmodi sententias libramini et limae Parisiensium magistrorum; cuius nos per auditus proprii certitudinem testes sumus.»<sup>9</sup>

Again, in a third letter addressed to the Bishop of Lincoln, dated June 1, 1285, Pecham claims that he came to Thomas's assistance until the latter submitted his views. Pecham declares that not only the masters of theology, but also the Bishop of Paris (Stephen Tempier) and Thomas's own brethren argued against the unicity of substantial form:

«Dicit nos opiniones de unitate formae rationibus et sanctorum testimoniis persequentes in mortuum impingere, quod est falsum. Quin potius ei, de quo loquitur, cum pro hac opinione ab episcopo Parisiensi et magistris theologiae et a fratribus propriis argueretur argute, nos soli eidem astitimus, ipsum prout salva veritate potuimus defendendo, donec ipse omnes positiones suas, quibus possit imminere correctio, sicut doctor humilis subiecit moderamini Parisiensium magistrorum.»<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (ed. H. Denifle et A. Chatelain, vol. 1-4, Paris 1889-1891), vol. 1, n. 517, p. 625. Pecham's letters have also been edited in F. Ehrle, *John Pecham über den Kampf des Augustinismus und Aristotelismus in der zweiten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, reprinted in: F. Pelster (ed.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Englischen Scholastik* (Rome 1970), p. 67-68.

<sup>9</sup> *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 1, n. 518, p. 626-627, and Ehrle, *John Pecham*, p. 70.

<sup>10</sup> *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 1, n. 523, p. 634, and Ehrle, *John Pecham*, p. 74.

What conclusions can be drawn from Pecham's testimony? It appears that as early as 1270-1272, Thomas's views on the unicity of substantial form, and a few other unspecified theses as well, were considered controversial. Consequently, Thomas was invited to explain his views in a forum of his fellow masters of theology at the University of Paris. We may safely assume that the masters who between 1270-1272 weighed Thomas's statements on their balance (*libramen*) and subjected them to their file (*lima*) saw no reason to pursue the matter any further. During his lifetime, no disciplinary proceedings were ever started against Thomas Aquinas, nor were his views officially censured.

It is important to note that John Pecham does not state that Thomas recanted his views or that he made any concessions.<sup>11</sup> Pecham would certainly have mentioned in his correspondence a prohibition or a condemnation of Thomas's theory of the unicity of form. Instead, however, Pecham, in the same letter of January 1, 1285, urges Pope Honorius IV to make a doctrinal decision in the controversy about the unicity of form. Pecham claims that there never had been any authoritative decision on this matter, and for this reason he tries to win papal support for his own stance in this debate.<sup>12</sup>

Traditionally, Pecham's account has been considered his personal version of events that were also described in the testimony that Bartholomew of Capua gave at the Naples inquiry and in a section of William of Tocco's biography of Thomas.<sup>13</sup> Quo-

---

<sup>11</sup> This is not to say that Thomas Aquinas did not make any concessions. As John Wip-pel suggested to me, Thomas Aquinas's rewording of his stance with respect to the numerical identity of Christ in his *Quodlibet* may have resulted from the episode described by Pecham.

<sup>12</sup> *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 1, n. 518, p. 627, and Ehrle, *John Pecham*, p. 70-71. As far as we know, Pecham never received a reply, and in 1286 he condemned Richard Knapwell for his adherence to the thesis of the unicity of form. See Callus, *The Condemnation*, p. 33.

<sup>13</sup> In general, historians have expressed a negative judgment on Pecham's character – partly based on hostile contemporary sources – and on the veracity of his letters. An exception is the study by A. Callebaut, «Jean Pecham O. F. M. et l'augustinisme. Aperçus historiques (1263-1285)», in: *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 18 (1925), p. 443-451, which argues that Pecham's letters might be more accurate than Bartholomew of Capua's testimony. Callebaut was attacked by P. Mandonnet in a review that appeared in *Bulletin Thomiste* 3 (1926), p. 104-107. Other studies which link one or more of Pecham's letters to Bartholomew of Capua's account are P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIIIe siècle* (2 vols., Louvain 1908-1911), vol. 1, p. 99-100; A. Walz, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, adaption française par P. Novarina (Louvain 1962), p. 156; Douie, *Archbishop Pecham*, p. 15-16; Callus, «The Problem», p. 154; M.-D. Chenu, *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*, transl. with authorized corrections and bibliographical additions by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes (Chicago 1964), p. 89-90; J. A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino. His Life, Thought, and Works. With Corrigenda and Addenda* (Washington, D. C. 1983), p. 255-256. I. Brady, «John Pecham and the Background of Aquinas's *De aeternitate mundi*», in: A. A. Maurer (ed.), *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274-1974. Commemorative Studies* (Toronto 1974), p. 152-153, associates Pecham's ac-

tation of the relevant sections shows, however, that it is very unlikely that these three sources concern the same events.<sup>14</sup>

*Bartholomew of Capua*

At the canonization inquest in Naples in 1319, Bartholomew of Capua reported the following story which he had heard from several Dominicans of Thomas Aquinas's humility and patience towards an aggravating opponent:

«Item dixit dictus testis [i. e., Bartholomeus de Capua] se audivisse a pluribus fratribus Predicatoribus, fide dignis, quod quando idem frater Thomas, una vice, disputabat Parisiis ubi erat frater Joannes de Pizano ordinis fratrum Minorum, qui fuit postea archiepiscopus Cantuariensis, quantumcumque dictus frater Joannes exasperaret eundem fratrem Thomam verbis ampullosis et tumidis, nunquam tamen ipse frater Thomas restrinxit verbum humilitatis set semper cum dulcedine et humanitate respondit. Et idem faciebat dictus frater Thomas in omni disputatione, quantumcumque acuta et solerti.»<sup>15</sup>

The opponent who had addressed Thomas Aquinas «in pompous and inflated terms» was John Pecham, and the context was an academic disputation. It must have taken place during Thomas's second regency. The exact occasion of the exchange – a *Quodlibet*, a graduation ceremony, a classroom disputation – remains unknown, as does the topic of the disputation. The claim of some historians that Capua's account concerns

count with both the testimonies of Bartholomew of Capua and William of Tocco, thereby implying that Capua's and Tocco's accounts concern the same events. This identification is also made in Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas*, p. 256 and 287-288, and in Torrell, *Initiation*, p. 268, n. 20 and 21. In addition, Brady's thesis is followed in the new edition of William of Tocco's biography. See *Ystoria sancti Thome de Aquino de Guillaume de Tocco (1323)* (ed. C. le Brun-Gouanvic, Toronto 1996), p. 149, n. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Perhaps superfluously, it should be noted that the events discussed in this note are distinct from yet another event involving Thomas Aquinas and John Pecham which is reported by Roger Marston in one of his *Questiones disputatae*. See Roger Marston, *Quodlibeta quatuor* (ed. G. F. Etzkorn et I. C. Brady, Quaracchi 1968), p. 10\*: «Ego [scil. Rogerus Marston] tamen praesens fuit Parisius et corporeis auribus audivi, quando incepit Cantor de Perona, assistente Magistro Girardo de Abbatisvilla, praesentibus fratre Thoma de Aquino et fratre Ioanne de Pecham et aliis Doctoribus sacrae theologiae usque ad viginti quatuor vel circiter, ubi haec opinio [scil. quod Verbum in divinis accipitur notionaliter et essentialiter] fuit excommunicata solemniter tanquam contraria Sanctorum assertionibus.» It is clear that Marston is referring to the inception of a new master at which Thomas Aquinas and John Pecham, as well as the other masters of theology, were present. Already Callus, «The Problem», p. 152, has pointed out that this passage does not state that Thomas Aquinas's views had been condemned, as some historians appear to believe.

<sup>15</sup> *Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis notis historicis et criticis illustrati* (6 vols., ed. D. Prümmer et M.-H. Laurent, Toulouse s. a.), vol. 4, p. 374.

Thomas's stance with respect to the unicity of substantial form and, more specifically, refers to his *Quodlibet* III held at Easter 1270 – or any of the other *Quodlibeta* held during Aquinas's second regency and discussing this doctrine – is unfounded.<sup>16</sup> It appears more likely that the episode narrated by Bartholomew of Capua is not identical with the incident about which Peckham speaks in his letters, since the latter was not a disputation, but rather a convocation of the theologians in Paris. It is extremely unlikely that Peckham would have conflated the two types of academic gatherings.

*William of Tocco*

The same observations would appear to be true for the testimony of William of Tocco. In his biography composed in 1328, William of Tocco gives many examples of the meekness and humility of Thomas Aquinas. One of the stories is set in Paris and involves a «certain religious» who contradicted Thomas's views during his *vesperies*, that is the ceremony marking the inception of this unnamed religious as a full-fledged master. After a protest by his students, who were indignant about the new master's doctrinal position, Thomas refuted him in a respectful way «on the next day», probably at the ceremony that is called the *resumptio*:

«Quod cum quidam religiosus Parisius deberet per cancellarium examinari ad magisterium in uesperis, sicut est moris, licentiandus de obiectis questionibus opinionem contrariam tenuit ueritati quam in suis scolis determinauerat frater Thomas. Cui cum uir ille patientissimus non reputans sibi preiudicatum, in quo ei fuerat a magistro adhuc nouitio contradictum, quasi uere humilis, qui sui contemptum ut magnanimus contempnebat, quietus mente et uerbo tranquillus, cum suis fratribus sociis rediit ad conuentum. Studentes uero et predictus socius eius sui magistri non ferentes iniuriam dixerunt: «Magister, nos grauiter in uestra persona sumus offensi, quia ille magister contra uestram opinionem non debuit dicere, et uos non debuistis hanc ueritatis iniuriam coram omnibus magistris Parisiensibus sustinere.» Quibus quietus magister plus in animo quam in uerbo respondit: «Fili, uisum fuit michi nouo magistro in suo principio esse parcendum, ne confunderetur in conspectu omnium magistrorum. De mea uero doctrina non dubito de cuiuscumque contradictione doctoris, quam Deo operante firmaui sanctorum auctoritatibus te rationibus ueritatis. Si tamen fratribus uidetur aliud, die crastina supplere potero quod obmisi.» In crastinum autem cum ad idem in aula dompni episcopi coram eisdem frater Thomas cum studentibus conuenisset et eedem questiones et determinationes fuissent per licentiandum sine correctione aliqua repetite, frater Thomas cum omni moderamini dixit: «Magister, ista uestra opinio, salua ueritate, teneri non potest, quia est contra tale concilium. Unde oportet uos aliter dicere, si non uultis a concilio discordare.» Tunc aliter dicere cepit, sed opinionem in sententia non mutauit. Contra quem iterum arguens et concilium contra ipsum addu-

---

<sup>16</sup> The following historians have connected Capua's account to Aquinas's *Quodlibeta*. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant*, vol. 1, p. 99; Callus, «The Problem», p. 154; Chenu, *Towards Understanding*, p. 286-287, and also p. 89.

cens, compulit ipsum suum confiteri errorem et petere humiliter a predicto doctore scire plenius veritatem.»<sup>17</sup>

Even though William of Tocco seems to have many details of a *vesperies*-ceremony wrong, as several commentators have observed, it is obvious that the incident took place during an academic disputation, not at the type of plenary faculty meeting apparently referred to by John Pecham.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, it is not clear at all that the «*quidam religiosus*» involved in the episode was a Franciscan, let alone John Pecham. The passage from Tocco does not provide any clues as to the dating of the episode. It could well have taken place during Thomas's first Parisian regency of 1256-1259.

These details in Tocco's testimony make it, in addition, extremely unlikely that it concerns the same episode which Bartholomew of Capua reported. According to the latter's testimony, it was Thomas Aquinas himself who presided over the disputation (*frater Thomas, una vice, disputabat Parisiis*). The disputation at the *vesperies*, however, which William of Tocco is relating was conducted by the *quidam religiosus*, the candidate who was incepting. Thomas was merely one of the masters attending the ceremony. Note, furthermore, that neither Bartholomew of Capua nor William of Tocco mention the topic of the disputation.

Nevertheless, some historians have woven Capua's and Tocco's accounts into a single consistent story. Ignatius Brady, for example, put forward the thesis that the episode related by William of Tocco concerned John Pecham's inception as a master of theology and that the questions at issues during his *vesperies* concerned the world's eternity. In Brady's view, Pecham's two Questions on the world's eternity that have been preserved represent the *resumptio* of his *vesperies*.<sup>19</sup> A few years later, these Questions were targeted in Thomas Aquinas's *De aeternitate mundi*. This is not the place to resolve the date and context of Thomas's treatise on the world's eternity. Let me just observe that Brady's thesis has been severely criticized by James Weisheipl, who, partly building on a study by John Wippel, believed that the *De aeternitate mundi* was not aimed against a specific scholar.<sup>20</sup> Interestingly, Weisheipl did not question

<sup>17</sup> Guillelmus, *Ystoria sancti Thome*, p. 149-150.

<sup>18</sup> Brady, «John Pecham», p. 154

<sup>19</sup> Brady, «John Pecham», p. 152-154. Brady's thesis is followed in Torrell, *Initiation*, p. 270, and in John Pecham, *Questions Concerning the Eternity of the World*, transl. by V. C. Potter (New York 1993), p. xvi-xvii. The latter wrongly attributes the thesis to James Weisheipl, who in the first edition (1974) of his *Friar Thomas*, p. 286-288, followed Brady's thesis, although he later rejected it. Potter does not seem to be familiar with Weisheipl's revised interpretation. See the following note.

<sup>20</sup> See J. F. Wippel, «Did Thomas Aquinas Defend the Possibility of an Eternally Created World? (The *De aeternitate mundi* Revisited)», in: *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19 (1981), p. 21-37. In the first edition of his *Friar Thomas* (1974), Weisheipl still followed Brady's thesis. In J. A. Weisheipl «The Date and Context of Thomas's *De aeternitate mundi*», in: L. Gerson (ed.), *Graceful Reason. Essays Presented to Joseph Owens* (Toronto 1983), p. 287-288, Weisheipl attempts to refute Brady's thesis. Weisheipl also includes his new insights in the second edition of *Friar Thomas* (1983), p. 475.



## Anmerkung

Brady's interpretation of Capua's and Tocco's testimony nor their identification with the passages in Pecham's letters.<sup>21</sup>

### *Conclusion*

This note should have made clear that John Pecham's report in the three letters quoted above should be studied on its own merits. Placing it within the context of Bartholomew of Capua's testimony along with that of William of Tocco's biography may gravely distort its meaning. If one takes Pecham's account seriously, it appears that some time between 1270 and 1272 Thomas Aquinas willingly submitted some of his doctrines to peer review. The historical circumstances under which Thomas made this move are unclear. Was he put under pressure? Was it a strategical move to silence the opposition? The outcome seems clear enough, however. Since there are no documents indicating that Thomas's views were censured during his lifetime, it is safe to conclude that they were not censured. The incident left no traces, except in the memories of those figures involved. Almost fifteen years later, one of them, John Pecham, rather incidentally saw reason to refer to the events of 1270-1272.

In addition, the re-examination of Capua's and Tocco's texts has demonstrated that they need not refer to the same episode. Moreover, it is not as evident as has been generally assumed that their testimonies are related to the debate over the world's eternity or the unicity of substantial form.

*J. M. M. H. Thijssen (Nijmegen)*

---

<sup>21</sup> Weisheipl, «The Date», p. 249.

## Notiz

In dem von Theo Kobusch und mir herausgegebenen Sammelband *Platon. Seine Dialoge in der Sicht neuer Forschungen* (Darmstadt 1996) findet sich ein Beitrag von Thomas Alexander Szlezák mit dem Titel «Mündliche Dialektik und schriftliches «Spiel»: *Phaidros*». Bei der Drucklegung dieses Beitrags ist dem Satzbetrieb ein Fehler unterlaufen – für den ich als einer der Herausgeber des Sammelbandes die volle Verantwortung übernehme –: Auf S. 116 (Zeile 2) ist nach «διαλεκτικῆ» der Begriff «τέχνη» versehentlich nicht abgedruckt worden – bedauerlich, aber ein Faktum. Im glücklicherweise noch vorhandenen Manuskript des Szlezák-Beitrags ist der Platon-Text jedenfalls korrekt zitiert; auch ist auf S. 116 (Zeile 5) von der «Kunst der Dialektik» die Rede, dies also in Entsprechung zum Manuskript-Text.

In einer Rezension des Platon-Bandes von Ernst Heitsch (vgl. *Gnomon* 71 [1999], S. 291-296, bes. S. 296) erfährt der Szlezák-Beitrag massive Kritik, besonders deshalb, weil sich Szlezák einen Platon-Text schaffe, den Platon so nicht geschrieben habe.

Dazu nur dies: Heitschs Invektiven gegenüber Szlezák sind nachweislich nicht nur ungerechtfertigt, sondern darüber hinaus zumindest auch unfein, da ein von Szlezák nicht zu verantwortender Druckfehler verwandt wird, um dessen Interpretation *in toto* zu desavouieren. Mit solchen Invektiven, durch die sich der Rezensent unbeabsichtigt selbst diskreditiert, ist der Sache der Platonischen Philosophie jedenfalls kein Dienst erwiesen: Platon präferierte den *sine ira et studio* Argumente austauschenden Dialog, der nie verstummen sollte – so Platon im auch von Heitsch geschätzten *Phaidon*. Zu diesem Dialog sollten die Kontrahenten zurückfinden.

Burkhard Mojsisch (Bochum)