

## 40 Cases of Plagiarism

In mid-October 2009 Michael V. Dougherty contacted the Finnish copyright holders of Ilkka Kantola's 1994 book *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* to inform them that he had found extensive *verbatim* plagiarism of Kantola's book in an article by Martin W.F. Stone, published in 2000 in *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales (RTPM)*. Upon learning, at the end of October 2009, of Dougherty's finding, Pernille Harsting discovered that a 1999 article by Martin W.F. Stone, published in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, also contained extensive *verbatim* plagiarism of Kantola's book. Complaints, based on these and further findings by Dougherty, Harsting and Russell L. Friedman, were sent, in the second week of November 2009, by the Finnish copyright holders to the editors of *RTPM*, requesting that the journal retract Martin W.F. Stone's 2000 article, as well as to Martin W.F. Stone's academic work places. In February 2010 an editorial note with the requested retraction was published in *RTPM* 76:2 (2009), v-vi. By that time, Dougherty, Harsting and Friedman had found plagiarism in 40 of Martin W.F. Stone's publications (comprising journal articles, book chapters and encyclopedia entries). Since we firmly believe that plagiarism in scholarship must be disclosed and openly discussed, in this case not least in order to prevent the further dissemination of other researchers' intellectual property under the name of Martin W.F. Stone, we were determined to publish our findings. We are grateful to the editor of the *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale*, Kent Emery, Jr., for supporting the publication of this Dossier; we are gratified that he considers plagiarism, as do we, to be a serious breach of scholarly ethics and a form of conduct that undermines the foundation of all that we endeavor to achieve in the world of learning.

The Dossier below contains 40 entries, documenting the plagiarism found in the 40 publications by Martin W.F. Stone that we have investigated. It is important to emphasize that the list is not exhaustive; it includes only the main plagiarized sources that we have identified and documented as of 24 March 2010. We would be grateful for all supplements to, and corrections of, our documentation.

Each entry includes (1) bibliographical information on the publication by Martin W.F. Stone; (2) bibliographical information on the main source(s) of the plagiarized text found in Martin W.F. Stone's publication; (3) the page numbers on which the plagiarized text is found in Martin W.F. Stone's publication, along with the corresponding page numbers on which the text in question is found in the original source; (4) one or more examples that illustrate the plagiarism. Please note that the bibliographical information in the 40 en-

tries has not been standardized. Instead, we have aimed at making the names of authors and editors as well as the titles of articles, journals and books mirror as precisely as possible the way they are rendered in the original publications, i.e., both Martin W.F. Stone's publications and those he plagiarized. Please also note that the numerous plagiarized footnotes in Martin W.F. Stone's publications are not listed separately but are tacitly included as a part of the plagiarized pages; plagiarism in endnotes in Martin W.F. Stone's publications, on the other hand, is documented in the relevant entries.

In the entries we use the following general abbreviations:

"S 10" means "Stone, p. 10"

"S10" means "Stone, endnote 10"

"X 20 n. 4" means "Source X, note 4 on page 20"

"X 20 & n. 4" means "Source X, page 20 with note 4"

"X 20-21" indicates the plagiarism of an uninterrupted passage found on pages 20-21 in Source X

"S 10 = X 20-21" indicates that text found on page 10 in Martin W.F. Stone's publication is copied from pages 20-21 in Source X.

In *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, "plagiarism" is defined as "the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own."<sup>1</sup> The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (where Martin W.F. Stone was employed until recently) states on its homepage: "K.U.Leuven defines plagiarism as follows: 'Plagiarism is any identical or lightly-altered use of one's own or someone else's work (ideas, texts, structures, images, plans, etc.) without adequate reference to the source.'"<sup>2</sup>

Taking our point of departure in these generally accepted definitions of plagiarism, in our documentation of the 40 plagiarism cases we have only included those occurrences of plagiarism in Martin W.F. Stone's publications that answer to the most obvious and indisputable criterion, namely the unacknowledged copying of someone else's published work and the publishing of it as one's own. More specifically still, by 'unacknowledged copying and publishing' we mean the copying, *verbatim* or in a slightly altered form,<sup>3</sup> of pas-

<sup>1</sup> See J. PERSALL and P. HANKS (eds.), *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, Oxford 1998, 1416b.

<sup>2</sup> See <<http://www.kuleuven.be/plagiarism/definition.html>>, "Most recent update: 30-07-2008"; visited on 23 March 2010.

<sup>3</sup> In this specific context, "slightly altered form" refers, e.g., to Martin W.F. Stone's writing "is" instead of "was"; occasionally using synonyms such as "cognisance" instead of "knowledge", and "Thomas" instead of "Aquinas", as well as a Greek or Latin word instead of its English equivalent; and occasionally making minor changes to the order of words or sentences.

sages of text written and published by others, and publishing this copied text under one's own name, without indication of the dependence on the source.<sup>4</sup> Following this criterion, in our documentation we have not included the examples in Martin W.F. Stone's publications of unacknowledged paraphrasing of others' published work. Furthermore, we have not registered the examples of unacknowledged use of standard translations, but only noted some of the places where Martin W.F. Stone claims authorship of standard translations and translations published in earlier works by other scholars.

In several cases Martin W.F. Stone leaves out any mention of the specific work(s) from which he plagiarizes. Generally, however, and as exemplified in entries 11, 15 and 26 below, in his footnotes Martin W.F. Stone mentions many of the works by other scholars that served as sources for his unacknowledged copying. However, in none of the instances listed in the 40 entries below does he indicate his debt to these sources, and, in particular, he never informs the reader that he is copying *verbatim* or nearly *verbatim* from them. Instead, he usually refers to the work in question at a different place, or for a different issue.

A particularly illuminating example of this practice of mentioning without acknowledging the source that he is copying from, is offered in Martin W.F. Stone's article, "*Initium omnis peccati est superbia*", from 2005 (see entry 24 below). After having copied, mostly *verbatim*, pages 126-131 of D. Catherine BROWN, *Pastor and laity in the theology of Jean Gerson*, on pages 314-321 of his article, Martin W.F. Stone writes, on p. 321 (immediately after the last sentence copied *verbatim* from Brown's book): "In an otherwise exemplary study, D. Catherine Brown asserts that....<sup>116</sup> It is to be hoped that the argument of this paper casts doubt on this conclusion." As it turns out, footnote 116, printed at the bottom of p. 321 in Martin W.F. Stone's article, refers to the pages in Brown's book that come immediately before and immediately after the pages copied *verbatim* by Martin W.F. Stone: "Brown, *Pastor and Laity*, 131. See also 118-23."

As mentioned above, as a consequence of our discovery of this plagiarism, one article by Martin W.F. Stone (listed in entry 4 below) has already been retracted. Two further retractions will soon appear (of the articles listed in entries 3 and 29). In addition to the published retractions, the editors and publishers of these three articles have agreed that the articles will no longer be made available in a commercial electronic version, and that labels, stating the facts about the article's retraction on account of plagiarism, will be sent to all

---

<sup>4</sup> That is, without quotation marks and an unambiguous reference to the original source, or without in some other way making clear to the reader the nature of the copying.

subscribers (with the request that they be placed on the first and the last page of the articles in question) and added to all hitherto unsold copies of the publications. We believe that these steps are indispensable in order to prevent this plagiarized material from being cited in the future. We therefore urge authors, editors and publishers—all those whose intellectual property rights and legal copyright have been infringed by this plagiarism—to request the retraction of the articles, book chapters and encyclopedia entries in which their work has been plagiarized.

## Dossier of 40 Cases

### Case 1 (1998)<sup>5</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, “The Philosophy of Religion”, in *Philosophy 2: Further Through the Subject*, ed. A.C. GRAYLING (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 269-350 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Mark D. JORDAN, “Religion, history of the philosophy of”, in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted HONDERICH (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 759a-763a (= J)

S 269 = J 759b; S 270 = J 759b; S 271 = J 759b; S 272 = J 760a; S 273 = J 760a, 760b; S 274 = J 760b; S 275 = J 760b, 761a; S 276 = J 761a; S 277 = J 761a, 761b; S 278 = J 761b; S 279 = J 762a; S 280 = J 762a; S 283 = J 762b; S 284 = J 762b

(2) Alexander BROADIE, *The Shadow of Scotus. Philosophy and Faith in Pre-Reformation Scotland* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995) (= B)

S 276 = B 9; S 277 = B 9, 10

(3) J.C.A. GASKIN, “Hume on religion”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, ed. David Fate NORTON (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 313-344 (= G1)

S 282 = G1 318, 319

(4) Charles TALIAFERRO, “Philosophy of Religion”, in *The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Nicholas BUNNIN and E.P. TSUI-JAMES (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 443-481 (= T)

S 285-286 = T 476

(5) Richard TAYLOR, “Introduction”, in *The Ontological Argument. From St. Anselm to Contemporary Philosophers*, ed. Alvin PLANTINGA (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1965), pp. vii-xviii (= Ta)

S 287 = Ta vii; S 288 = Ta vii

(6) Brian DAVIES, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) (= D1)

S 288 = D1 55-56; S 289 = D1 56, 57; S 290 = D1 57, 60; S 291 = D1 61; S 298 = D1 58, 59, 71; S 299 = D1 71; S 307 = D1 98; S 308 = D1 98, 99, 100

(7) Frederick COPLESTON, *A History of Philosophy*, vol. 2: *Medieval Philosophy. Augustine to Scotus* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1950) (= C)

S 292 = C 255, 256

(8) Baruch A. BRODY, “Introduction”, in *Readings in the Philosophy of Religion. An Analytic*

---

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Danielle LAYNE contributed with the identification of most of the sources for this entry.

- Approach*, ed. Baruch A. BRODY (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 2-11 (= Br)  
S 292-293 = Br 4
- (9) J.L. MACKIE, *The Miracle of Theism. Arguments for and against the Existence of God* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982) (= M)  
S 294 = M 41-42; S 302 = M 82, 85; S 303 = M 85, 86; S 304 = M 88, 92; S 305 = M 95-96, 97; S 306 = M 98, 99, 101
- (10) John COTTINGHAM, *Descartes* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986) (= Co)  
S 294-295 = Co 59
- (11) Allen W. WOOD, *Kant's Rational Theology* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978) (= Wo)  
S 295 = Wo 106; S 296 = Wo 106-107
- (12) John F. WIPPEL, "Metaphysics", in *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. Norman KREZMANN and Eleonore STUMP (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 85-127 (= Wi)  
S 301 = Wi 113, 114
- (13) David BLUMENFELD, "Leibniz's ontological and cosmological arguments", in *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*, ed. Nicholas JOLLEY (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 353-381 (= Bl)  
S 301 = Bl 364; S 302 = Bl 367
- (14) J.C.A. GASKIN, *Hume's Philosophy of Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1978) (= G2)  
S 307 = G2 12
- (15) Edward R. WIERENGA, *The Nature of God. An Inquiry into Divine Attributes* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989) (= Wie)  
S 312 = Wie 12; S 313 = Wie 13, 14, 15-16; S 324 = Wie 202, 203, 204, 205, 207; S 325 = Wie 207, 208
- (16) Louis P. POJMAN (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology* (2nd ed.; Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1994) (= P)  
S 314 = P 265a-265b; S 315 = P 265b, 266a, 266b; S 316 = P 246a; S 317 = P 246b, 247a; S 318 = P 247a, 247b; S 330 = P 296-297, 298; S 331 = P 298; S 338 = P 419a, 419b; S 339 = P 419b, 420a; S 340 = P 436a, 436b
- (17) Brian DAVIES, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) (= D2)  
S 320 = D2 103, 104, 106
- (18) Paul HELM, "God and Spacelessness", in *Philosophy* 55 (1980), pp. 211-221 (= He)  
S 321 = He 211
- (19) Richard SWINBURNE, *The Coherence of Theism* (rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) (= Sw)  
S 322 = Sw 219-220; S 323 = Sw 220, 221
- (20) Nelson PIKE, "Introduction", in *God and Evil. Readings on the Theological Problem of Evil*, ed. Nelson PIKE (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 1-5 (= Pi)  
S 325 = Pi 1
- (21) R. Douglas GEIVETT, *Evil and the Evidence for God. The Challenge of John Hick's Theodicy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993) (= Ge)  
S 326 = Ge 16-17, 20, 21; S 327 = Ge 21

(22) Donald RUTHERFORD, *Leibniz and the Rational Order of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) (= R)

S 327 = R 18

(23) Michael PETERSON, William HASKER, Bruce REICHENBACH and David BASINGER, *Reason and Religious Belief: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991) (= PHRB)

S 327 = PHRB 104

(24) Linda ZAGZEBSKI, "Introduction", in *Rational Faith. Catholic Responses to Reformed Epistemology*, ed. Linda ZAGZEBSKI (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), pp. 1-13 (= Z)

S 336 = Z 5, 4; S 337 = Z 4

(25) Terrence W. TILLEY, *The Wisdom of Religious Commitment* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1995) (= Ti)

S 343 = Ti 77, 78; S 344 = Ti 79

(26) Mark WYNN, "Religious language", in *Companion Encyclopedia of Theology*, ed. Peter BYRNE and James Leslie HOULDEN (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 413-432 (= Wy)

S 345 = Wy 413; S 346 = Wy 420, 423; S 347 = Wy 424, 425, 424, 425 [sic]; S 348 = Wy 425, 426-427

#### EXAMPLES:

JORDAN, p. 761a: "After about 500 AD, philosophy is subsumed within the three monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, Islam. It is subsumed, not abolished. The most important thinkers of the three religions carried on teaching and wrote works that engaged the legacy of ancient philosophy powerfully and creatively. But they understood their teaching and their writing not as philosophy, but as the study of divine law, as interpretation of divine revelation, as the codification and clarification of religious traditions."

STONE, p. 275: "After AD 400 philosophy became subsumed within the three monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The most important thinkers of these three religions carried on teaching and wrote works that substantively engaged with the legacy of ancient thought. But they understood their teaching and their writing not as philosophy *per se*, but as the study of divine law, as an interpretation of divine revelation, or as the codification and clarification of their own religious traditions."

WIPPEL, p. 114: "The third way consists of two major steps and is based on the possible and the necessary. Step one begins with the observation that we experience things that are capable of existing and not existing since they are subject to generation and corruption."

STONE, p. 301: "Of these arguments, the third way (*tertia via*) consists of two steps and is concerned with the modal notions of possibility and necessity. The first step begins with the observation that we experience things that are capable of existence and non-existence and are subject to generation and corruption."

POJMAN, p. 246a: "For any proposition, God knows whether it is true or false. That is, all God's beliefs are justified and true. He holds no false beliefs at all. Certain questions immediately arise from the notion of omniscience. For example, much of our descriptive or propositional knowledge depends on knowledge by acquaintance, experiential knowledge. But experiential knowledge is particular to the individual experiencer. I cannot experience *your* taste of chocolate ice cream or feel *your* headache, so how can God be said to know our experiences if they are ours?"

STONE, p. 316: "For any proposition, God knows whether it is true or false; that is, God's beliefs are justified and true and God holds no false beliefs. Certain questions immediately arise from this definition. For example, some propositional knowledge depends upon experiential knowledge, but experiential knowledge is particular to an individual knower. If I cannot experience how your coffee tastes to you, for example, how can God be said to know our experiences if they are truly ours?"

SWINBURNE, pp. 219-220: "Thus my tie has changed if it was clean yesterday, but is not clean today. But although everything which 'changes' in the ordinary sense does seem to 'change' by the Cambridge criterion, the converse is not true."

STONE, p. 322: "Thus my suit has changed if it was dry-cleaned yesterday but is not clean today. The point here is that everything which 'changes' in the real sense of that term does seem to change according to the Cambridge criterion but not vice versa."

---

### Case 2 (1998)

Martin STONE, "Casuistry", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 2 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 227b-229a (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Werner STARK, "Casuistry", in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas, Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, vol. 1, ed. Philip P. WIENER (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968), pp. 257b-264a (= St)

S 227b-228a = St 257b

EXAMPLE:

STARK, p. 257b: "In its narrowest sense, it refers to the use of subtle definitional distinctions in the handling of ethico-legal or purely ethical problems with the aim of drawing fine dividing lines between what is permissible and what is not. As this technique has at times been applied in order to excuse crimes and sins and to exculpate criminals and sinners...."

STONE, pp. 227b-228a: "In its narrowest sense, casuistry refers to the use of subtle definitional distinctions in the handling of the problems of moral theology, with the aim of drawing fine dividing lines between what is and is not permissible at the level of action. The technique has at times been used to excuse crimes and sins, thereby exculpating the immoral...."

---

### Case 3 (1999)

M.W.F. STONE and T. VAN HOUTT, "Probabilism and Its Methods: Leonardus Lessius and his contribution to Jesuit casuistry", in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 75 (1999), pp. 359-394 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 371 = K 124, 125; S 372 = K 125-126, 127; S 373 = K 127, 128; S 374 = K 128-129; S 375 = K 129; S 376 = K 131-132; S 377 = K 132-133; S 378 = K 133, 134; S 379 = K 135-136, 137-138; S 380 = K 138-139; S 381 = K 139-140

EXAMPLE:

KANTOLA, pp. 128-129: "It is interesting that Medina considers that intersubjective or extrinsic probability, *i.e.* probability by authorities, also renders an opinion 'safe' (*tuta*). In the case that two contradicting probable opinions exist, both are, essentially speaking, safe; the more probable opinion is more safe, but this does not imply that the less probable one is not safe to a degree."

STONE, p. 374: “Medina considers that intersubjective or extrinsic probability, i.e., probability based on authorities, also renders an opinion ‘safe’ (*tuta*). In a case in which two conflicting probable opinions exist, both are, essentially speaking, safe; the more probable opinion is safer but this does not imply that the less probable opinion is not ‘safe’ to some degree.”

#### Case 4 (2000)

Martin W.F. STONE, “The origins of probabilism in late scholastic thought: a prolegomenon to further study”, in *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales* 67 (2000), pp. 114-157 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) John MAHONEY, *The Making of Moral Theology. A Study of the Roman Catholic Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) (= M)

S 117 = M 136

(2) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 118 = K 15-16; S 119 = K 16, 26, n. 4, 27; S 120 = K 27-28; S 121 = K 28, 29, 30; S 122 = K 30-31, 58; S 123 = K 60-61; S 124 = K 61, 65-66; S 125 = K 66, 67; S 128 = K 79, 80; S 129 = K 80-81, 85, n. 4, 85-86; S 130 = K 86, 87-88; S 131 = K 90-91; S 132 = K 91-92, 93; S 133 = K 93-94; S 134 = K 94-95; S 135 = K 95-97; S 136 = K 97-98; S 137 = K 101-102; S 138 = K 103; S 139 = K 103-105; S 140 = K 105, 106; S 141 = K 106-108; S 142 = K 108; S 143 = K 109; S 144 = K 112; S 145 = K 112; S 146 = K 112-113; S 147 = K 113, 114; S 148 = K 114, 115; S 149 = K 116-117; S 150 = K 117-118; S 151 = K 118-119; S 152 = K 119-120; S 153 = K 121; S 154 = K 122

(3) Robert PASNAU, “Olivi on Human Freedom”, in *Pierre de Jean Olivi (1248-1298)*, ed. Alain BOUREAU and Sylvain PIRON (Paris: J. Vrin, 1999), pp. 15-25 (= P)

S 127 n. 35 = P 19

#### EXAMPLES:

KANTOLA, p. 30: “Another 13th century writer, Boethius of Dacia, is more explicit when presenting this kind of justification in respect to the notion of probability as approvability by qualified authorities. In the third book of his *Quaestiones super librum Topicorum*, Boethius of Dacia lays down some rules of thumb that help one to judge what is the best alternative in some problematic situations. Boethius of Dacia says, among other things, that if we have to choose between a *unanimous opinion of experts* and an opinion opposite to it, it is better to follow the opinion of the experts. This is the case because it is *probable* that a unanimous opinion of the experts is true.”

STONE, p. 121: “Another thirteenth-century philosopher Boethius of Dacia (fl. 1260) is even more explicit in respect to the notion of probability as approvability by the authorities. In the third book of his *Quaestiones super librum Topicorum*, he provides a series of guidelines to help one judge what is the best alternative in some problematic situations. Among other things, Boethius of Dacia holds that if we have to choose between the unanimous opinion of experts and an opinion opposite to it, it is better to follow the opinion of the experts. This is the case because it is probable that such an opinion is true....”

KANTOLA, p. 108: “For the purpose of this study, it is interesting that Buridan’s analysis of will is considerably concentrated on the question of the certainty of deliberation. As long as the result of practical consideration is uncertain, it is possible that a person prefers further deliberation.”



STONE, p. 142: “For the purposes of this paper, it is interesting that Buridan’s analysis of the will is concentrated on the question of the certainty of deliberation. He is of the view that as long as a practical consideration is uncertain, it is possible that our *voluntas* will recommend further deliberation.”

### Case 5 (2000)

M.W.F. STONE, “The soul’s relation to the body: Thomas Aquinas, Siger of Brabant and the Parisian debate on monopsychism”, in *History of the Mind-Body Problem* (London Studies in the History of Philosophy), ed. Tim CRANE and Sarah PATTERSON (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 34-69 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Richard C. DALES, *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) (= D)

*Main text:* S 36 = D 4-5, 13, 15, 16, 19; S 37 = D 19, 20, 45, 46. *Endnotes:* S9 = D 5 n. 7; S13 = D 13 n. 1; S14 = D 13 n. 3; S15-16 = D 15 nn. 8-9; S17 = D 16 n. 11; S19 = D 16 & n. 12; S20 = D 17 n. 14; S21 = D 15-16 & n. 10; S22 = D 25 & n. 31; S23 = D 29, 30 & n. 45; S24 = D 35, 31 & nn. 48-49; S25 = D 36 & n. 60, n. 63; S26 = D 38, 41 n. 75; S41 = D 10; S86 = D 121, 127 & n. 12, n. 25

(2) Edward P. MAHONEY and James SOUTH, “Aristotelianism, Renaissance”, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 404b-413b (= MS)

S 38 = MS 407b

(3) Fernand VAN STEENBERGHEN, “The Second Lecture. Monopsychism”, trans. John F. WIPPEL, in Fernand VAN STEENBERGHEN, *Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1980), pp. 29-74 (= FvS)

*Main text:* S 38-39 = FvS 31-32; S 41 = FvS 33-34; S 42 = FvS 34, 35, 36-37; S 43 = FvS 37-38, 38-39; S 44 = FvS 39-40, 41, 42; S 46 = FvS 45-46, 44, 46-47; S 47 = FvS 47, 48-49; S 48 = FvS 49, 50-51, 52; S 49 = FvS 52-53, 54, 55-56; S 50 = FvS 56-57, 59, 60 & n. 9; S 51 = FvS 60-61, 61-62; S 52 = FvS 62, 63-64. *Endnotes:* S65 = FvS n. 3; S71 = FvS 38; S98-99 = FvS 51

(4) John BUSSANICH, “Themistius”, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 9 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 324b-326a (= B)

S 39 = B 325a; S 40 = B 325a-b

(5) R.W. SHARPLES, “Alexander of Aphrodisias”, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 169b-176a (= Sh)

S 39 = Sh 171b; S 40 = Sh 171b-172a

(6) B. Carlos BAZÁN, “The Human Soul: Form and Substance? Thomas Aquinas’ Critique of Eclectic Aristotelianism”, in *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 64 (1997), pp. 95-126 (= Ba)

*Main text:* S 40-41 = Ba 103-105. *Endnotes:* S49-54 = Ba nn. 22-27; S55-56 = Ba n. 29; S57-60 = Ba nn. 31-34

(7) John F. WIPPEL, *Medieval Reactions to the Encounter between Faith and Reason* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1995) (= W)

*Main text:* S 45 = W 14, 15; S 52 = W 15; S 53 = W 41, 42-43, 44; S 54 = W 44, 45, 46, 47, 48; S 55 = W 48, 51-52. *Endnotes:* S85 = W n. 27; S110-111 = W n. 29; S116 = W 41 & n. 99; S117 = W n. 100; S122 = W 45-46 & n. 109; S124-125 = W nn. 111-112; S127, 129 = W n. 120

## EXAMPLES:

DALES, p. 10: “And in *De generatione animalium* 2, 3 (736a), after discussing how the matter supplied by the mother is formed by the vital heat supplied by the father so that first the vegetative soul, having existed potentially in the semen, comes into being actually, and the sensitive soul similarly comes into actual being after having existed potentially in the vegetative, Aristotle concludes that the intellective soul cannot have been generated internally. ‘It remains,’ he says, ‘that the intellect...’”

STONE, p. 61, n. 41: “After discussing how the matter supplied by the mother is formed by the vital heat supplied by the father so that first the vegetative soul, having existed potentially in the semen, comes into being actually, and the sensitive soul similarly comes into actual being after having existed potentially in the vegetative, Aristotle concludes that the intellective soul cannot have been generated internally. He says, ‘It remains, then, that the intellect...’”

WIPPEL, p. 41: “We have some knowledge of this work owing to the testimony of the Renaissance philosopher, Agostino Nifo. Insofar as we can judge from the excerpts and references given by Nifo, in this treatise Siger’s thought on the human intellect had developed somewhat, but in it he still defended unicity of the possible intellect.<sup>99</sup>” [Note 99, p. 97: “On this see B. Nardi, *Sigieri di Brabante nel pensiero del rinascimento italiano* (Rome, 1945), especially pp. 17-24, 46-47.”]

STONE, p. 68, n. 116: “We have some knowledge of this work owing to the testimony of the Renaissance philosopher, Agostino Nifo (1469/1470-1538). In this treatise, Siger’s thought had developed somewhat although he still defended the unicity of the intellect. See B. Nardi, *Sigieri di Brabante nel pensiero del rinascimento italiano* (Roma: Edizioni Italiana, 1945), pp. 17-24, and 46-7....”

---

### Case 6 (2000)

M.W.F. STONE, “Theology, philosophy and ‘science’ in the thirteenth century: The case of Albert the Great”, in *The Proper Ambition of Science* (London Studies in the History of Philosophy), ed. M.W.F. STONE and Jonathan WOLFF (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 28-55 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) David C. LINDBERG, *The Beginnings of Western Science. The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context, 600 B.C. to A.D. 1450* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) (= L)

*Main text:* S 29 = L 216; S 30 = L 216-217, 224, 226; S 31 = L 226, 227; S 32 = L 229; S 33 = L 230. *Endnotes:* S11 = L 219-221 & n. 12

(2) Mark D. JORDAN, “Albert the Great and the Hierarchy of Sciences”, in *Faith and Philosophy* 9:4 (1992), pp. 483-499 (= J)

*Main text:* S 32 = J 484 & n. 5; S 33 = J 485; S 34 = J 483-484; S 35 = J 484-485 & nn. 9-10, n. 12; S 36 = J 485-486 & n. 15, n. 18; S 37 = J 486-487 & nn. 20-23; S 38 = J 487-488 & n. 24; S 39 = J 488 & n. 26; S 40 = J 488-489 & nn. 29-33; S 41 = J 488-489 & nn. 36-39; S 42 = J 490-491 & n. 40, n. 42, n. 44; S 43 = J 491-492 & nn. 48-49, nn. 52-53; S 44 = J 492-493 & n. 54; S 45 = J 493-494 & nn. 63-64; S 46 = J 494-495. *Endnotes:* S1 = J n. 1; S6 = J n. 3; S28 = J n. 7; S39 = J n. 14; S40 = J n. 17; S42 = J n. 27; S43 = J n. 28; S45 = J n. 34; S46 = J n. 35; S47 = J n. 46; S50 = J n. 51; S51 = J n. 55; S52 = J n. 56; S53 = J n. 58; S54 = J n. 60; S55 = J n. 61; S56 = J n. 62

## EXAMPLES:

LINDBERG, p. 217: "Various documents address the fate of Aristotle's works during the next twenty-five years. They reveal that the bans of 1210, 1215, and 1231 were partially successful for a time, but that they began to lose their effectiveness around 1240. One reason for this may have been Gregory IX's death in 1241...; another may have been a growing awareness among the Parisian masters of arts that they were losing ground (and reputation) to their counterparts at Oxford..."

STONE, p. 30: "Other documents address the fortunes of Aristotle's works at this time. They reveal that while the bans of 1210, 1215, and 1235 were moderately successful, they began to lose their effectiveness around 1240. One reason for this may have been Gregory's death in 1241, while another may have been the growing awareness among the Parisian masters that they were losing ground to their colleagues in Oxford..."

JORDAN, p. 495: "I noted at several points that his language becomes heavily charged whenever he describes the ascent to the top of the hierarchy. The pertinent passages of *On the Intellect* are filled with lyrical quotations from potent authorities, and the corresponding parts of other treatises repeat these or tell affecting stories of philosophical seeking. In the *Summa*, the reader is given a doctrine about the rhetorical character of theology. Because theology makes explicit the teleology of the ascent, and because it offers the only sure way of ascending, theological language must be variously persuasive. So too are Albert's remarks on the hierarchy of sciences."

STONE, p. 46: "I have noted at several points above that Albert's language becomes heavily charged whenever he describes the ascent to the top of the hierarchy. The pertinent passages of *De intellectu* are filled with lyrical quotations from numerous *auctoritates*: Pseudo-Dionysius, Augustine, Apuleius, to name but a few, and the corresponding parts of the other treatises repeat these remarks. In the *Summa*, the reader is given a doctrine about the rhetorical charter [sic] of theology. Because theology makes explicit the teleology of ascent, and because it offers the only sure way of ascending, theological language must be variously persuasive. So too are Albert's remarks on the hierarchy of the sciences."

---

### Case 7 (2000)<sup>6</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, "The adoption and rejection of Aristotelian moral philosophy in Reformed 'Casuistry'", in *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy* (London Studies in the History of Philosophy), ed. Jill KRAYE and M.W.F. STONE (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 59-90 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Donald SINNEMA, "The Discipline of Ethics in Early Reformed Orthodoxy", in *Calvin Theological Journal* 28 (1993), pp. 10-44 (= DS)

*Main text*: S 61 = DS 10, 11, 12; S 62 = DS 12, 14-15; S 63 = DS 15, 16, 17, 18; S 64 = DS 21, 23-24; S 65 = DS 29-30; S 66 = DS 32; S 67 = DS 32-33; S 68 = DS 33-35; S 69 = DS 35-36; S 70 = DS 36-37; S 71 = DS 37-38; S 72 = DS 38-39; S 73 = DS 39-40, 20; S 74 = DS 20-21 & n. 49; S 75 = DS 41-42; S 76 = DS 42-43. *Endnotes*: S16 = DS n. 1; S18-19 = DS nn. 4-5; S20 = DS n. 9; S22 = DS nn. 13-14; S24 = DS n. 15; S25 = DS nn. 16-17; S26 = DS n. 18; S27 = DS 15-16 & nn. 21-22, nn. 24-25; S30 = DS n. 26; S31 = DS n. 32; S32 = DS n. 31; S33 = DS n. 33; S34 = DS n. 52; S35 = DS n. 62; S36 = DS n. 63; S38 = DS 29; S40 = DS n. 80, n. 83; S41 = DS n. 81; S42 = DS 32 & n. 82; S43 = DS 32; S44 = DS 33; S45-48 = DS 33; S49 = DS n.

---

<sup>6</sup> The editor of *Calvin Theological Journal*, Arie LEDER, made us aware, in February 2010, of the plagiarism of Donald SINNEMA's article.

88; S50 = DS 34; S51 = DS n. 89; S52 = DS n. 90; S53 = DS 34-35; S54 = DS n. 91; S55-56 = DS 35; S57 = DS 35-36; S58-59 = DS 36; S61 = DS n. 94; S62-63 = DS 37; S64-68 = DS 38; S69-73 = DS 39; S74 = DS n. 45; S75 = DS 20 & n. 46; S76 = DS n. 48; S77 = DS n. 49; S80 = DS n. 97; S81 = DS n. 98; S82 = DS n. 99; S83 = DS n. 102; S84 = DS n. 104; S85 = DS n. 107

(2) Albert R. JONSEN and Stephen TOULMIN, *The Abuse of Casuistry. A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) (= JT)

Main text: S 77 = JT 153, 154, 155; S 78 = JT 155, 324, 325. Endnotes: S11 = JT 120; S89 = JT 373 n. 5; S90 = JT 132, 133; S91 = JT 373 n. 6, 150

EXAMPLE:

SINNEMA, p. 11: "Faced with the pressing need for curriculum materials in the new Protestant schools, Melanchthon wrote textbooks for many of the disciplines, including ethics. These tended to be compendia of Aristotle's works, corrected and supplemented at points by the truths of biblical revelation. During the course of his career, Melanchthon lectured on Aristotle's *Ethics* at least eight times, beginning in 1527-28.<sup>4</sup>" [Note 4: "Karl Hartfelder, *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Berlin: A. Hofmann, 1889), pp. 558-65."]

STONE, p. 61: "Faced with the pressing need for curriculum materials in the new Protestant schools and universities, Melanchthon wrote textbooks for many disciplines including ethics. These tended to be compendia of Aristotle's works, corrected and supplemented at points by the assumed verities of biblical revelation. During the course of his career, Melanchthon lectured on Aristotle's *Ethics* at least eight times, beginning in 1527-28.<sup>18</sup>" [Endnote 18: "K. Hartfelder, *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae*, Berlin, A. Hoffmann, 1889, pp. 558-65."]

### Case 8 (2000)

Martin STONE, "Response", in *Referring to God: Jewish and Christian Philosophical and Theological Perspectives*, ed. Paul HELM (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), pp. 120-128 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Colette SIRAT, *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) (= Si)

S 121 = Si 33; S 122 = Si 33, 34; S 123 = Si 34

(2) Michael L. PETERSON, "The problem of evil", in *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion*, ed. Philip L. QUINN and Charles TALIAFERRO (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1997/1999), pp. 393-401 (= P)

S 126 = P 393, 394

EXAMPLE:

PETERSON, p. 394: "The underlying strategy is this: in order to show that two propositions *p* and *q* are consistent, one must find a third proposition *r* which is consistent with *p* and, conjoined with *p*, entails *q*. This would show that *p* and *q* are possibly true together. Hence, in order to rebut the alleged inconsistency, Plantinga's approach is to find a proposition whose conjunction with (1) is consistent and entails (2). He carefully argues that it is possible that God has a morally sufficient reason for creating a world containing moral evil."

STONE, p. 126: "The underlying strategy he adopted was to argue that in order to show that two propositions *p* and *q* are consistent, one must find a third proposition *r* which is consistent with *p* and, conjoined with *p*, entails *q*. Such a proposition would show that *p* and *q* are possibly true together. Hence in order to rebut the inconsistency though [sic] to exist by holding (1) and (2) together, Plantinga's approach is to find a proposition whose conjunction with (1) is consistent

and entails (2). So he argues that it is possible that God has a morally sufficient reason for creating a world containing moral evil....”

### Case 9 (2001)<sup>7</sup>

Martin W.F. STONE, “Moral Psychology After 1277. Did the Parisian Condemnation Make a Difference to Philosophical Discussions of Human Agency?”, in *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277. Philosophie und Theologie an der Universität von Paris im letzten Viertel des 13. Jahrhunderts. Studien und Texte* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia 28), ed. Jan A. AERTSEN, Kent EMERY, Jr. and Andreas SPEER (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), pp. 795-826 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Tony DODD, *The Life and Thought of Siger of Brabant, Thirteenth-Century Parisian Philosopher. An Examination of His Views on the Relationship of Philosophy and Theology* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998) (= D)

S 798 = D 300, 301, 302, 303; S 799 = D 303, 304, 305, 307, 308, 322; S 800 = D 322, 323, 324, 325, 328, 329

(2) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 801 = K 79; S 802 = K 79-80; S 803 = K 80-81; S 804 = K 81-82; S 805 = K 85-86; S 806 = K 86, 87-88, 90-91; S 807 = K 91-92; S 808 = K 93-94; S 809 = K 94; S 815 = K 95; S 816 = K 95-96; S 817 = K 96-98, 102, 101; S 818 = K 101-102

(3) Eleonore STUMP, “Aquinas’s Account of Freedom: Intellect and Will”, in *The Monist* 80 (1997), pp. 576-597 (= St)

S 802 = St 593

(4) Roland J. TESKE, S.J., “The Will as King over the Powers of the Soul: Use and Sources of an Image in the Thirteenth Century”, in *Vivarium* 32 (1994), pp. 62-71 (= T)

S 809 = T 62; S 810 = T 62-63 & nn. 1-2, n. 4; S 811 = T 63-64 & n. 9; S 812 = T 64-66; S 813 = T 66, 69; S 814 = T 69-70

(5) Mary E. INGHAM, “The Condemnation of 1277: Another Light on Scotist Ethics”, in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 37 (1990), pp. 91-103 (= I)

S 819 = I 94, 95 & n. 5, n. 9; S 820 = I 96-97 & n. 13, n. 15; S 821 = I 97-98 & nn. 18-19, n. 21; S 822 = I 98, 99-100 & n. 22, n. 20, n. 24; S 823 = I 100-101 & n. 25, n. 27; S 824 = I 101 & n. 23

#### EXAMPLES:

TESKE, p. 64: “There are at least three passages in which William develops the image of the will as king and ruler. In *De anima* he maintains that the will has the power of command (*imperium*) and “cannot be prevented against its will from its proper operation, which is to will.” The concupiscible and irascible powers that we share with animals....”

STONE, p. 811: “...there are, to my knowledge, at least two passages in which he deploys the image of the will as king or ruler. In his “*De anima*” William argues that the will has the power of command (*imperium*) and “cannot be prevented against its will from its proper activity, which is to will”. The concupiscible and irascible powers of the soul that humans share with animals....”

<sup>7</sup> William O. DUBA contributed to the identification of sources for this entry.

INGHAM, p. 101: “The Scotist portrait of the eternal lawgiver echoes biblical imagery and presents divine freedom under an innovative human model: the free, rational legislator. This dynamic image portrays divine freedom as an ongoing reality. Divine *posse* is *potest*, not *potuit*: it is not a question of what God could do or could have done, but what He can indeed do now.”

STONE, pp. 823-824: “Scotus’s portrayal of the eternal lawgiver clearly resembles biblical imagery and presents divine freedom through the model of a free and rational legislator. Such an image depicts divine freedom as an ongoing reality. Divine *posse* is *potest* not *potuit*, it is not a matter of what God could do or could have done, but what He can do now.”

### Case 10 (2001)

M.W.F. STONE, “The Angelic Doctor and the Stagirite: Thomas Aquinas and Contemporary ‘Aristotelian’ Ethics”, in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 101 (2001), pp. 97-128 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Denis J.M. BRADLEY, “John Finnis on Aquinas ‘The Philosopher’”, in *The Heythrop Journal* 41:1 (2000), pp. 1-24 (= B)

S 100 n. 12 = B 7; S 126 = B 19

(2) Ralph MCINERNEY, *Aquinas on Human Action. A Theory of Practice* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1992) (= M1)

S 102-103 = M1 161-162, 163, 162; S 104 = M1 162, 163

(3) Vernon J. BOURKE, “Aquinas”, in *Ethics in the History of Western Philosophy*, ed. Robert J. CAVALIER, James GOUINLOCK and James P. STERBA (London: The Macmillan Press, 1989), pp. 98-124 (= Bo)

S 104 = Bo 103

(4) Anthony KENNY, “Introduction”, in *Aquinas: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Anthony KENNY (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), pp. 1-12 (= K)

S 105 n. 26 = K 11

(5) Michael Bertram CROWE, *The changing profile of the natural law* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977) (= C)

S 105 = C 184; S 106 = C 184; S 112 = C 183, 179-180 & nn. 45-47; S 113 = C 183-184; S 114 = C 184-185; S 115 = C 185, 186; S 116 = C 186; S 117 = C 186-187; S 118 = C 187, 188; S 120 = C 188; S 121 = C 188, 189; S 122 = C 189; S 124 = C 189, 190; S 125 = C 190

(6) Ralph MCINERNEY, *Ethica Thomistica. The Moral Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas* (rev. ed.; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997) (= M2)

S 106 = M2 38-39; S 107 = M2 39-40

(7) Daniel Mark NELSON, *The Priority of Prudence: Virtue and Natural Law in Thomas Aquinas and the Implications for Modern Ethics* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992) (= N)

S 107 = N 106; S 108 = N 106, 107; S 109 = N 107; S 118 = N 41; S 119 = N 41-42; S 120 = N 42-43

(8) R.A. ARMSTRONG, *Primary and Secondary Precepts in Thomistic Natural Law Teaching* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966) (= A)

S 111 = A 165, 166

(9) Joseph BOYLE, “Natural Law and Ethics of Traditions”, in *Natural Law Theory: Contempo-*

rary Essays, ed. Robert P. GEORGE (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 3-30 (= Boy)

S 115 n. 45 = Boy 23, 26

(10) Kai NIELSEN, "An Examination of the Thomistic Theory of Natural Moral Law", in *Natural Law Forum* 4 (1959), pp. 44-71 (= Ni)

S 122 & n. 65 = Ni 55-56

#### EXAMPLES:

MCINERNEY, *Aquinas on Human Action*, pp. 161-162: "No less a scholar than René Antoine Gauthier, editor and translator (with Jean Yves Jolif) of the *L'Ethique à Nicomaque* and editor of the critical Leonine edition of St. Thomas's *Sententiae super libros Ethicorum* insists that St. Thomas must be put in the forefront of those who did violence to Aristotle's thought by forcing it into the Procrustean bed of Christian theology. If Gauthier is right, then the Aristotelianism found in Thomas can be of interest only to theologians. Aristotelians, and indeed historians of philosophy, would have to recognize it as an abuse of Aristotle for purposes unshared by the Stagirite."

STONE, pp. 102-103: "...no less a scholar than René Antoine Gauthier O.P., joint author with Jean Yves Jolif O.P. of the acclaimed French translation and commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and editor of the critical Leonine edition of Thomas's *Sententiae super libros Ethicorum* (Commentary on Aristotle's *Ethics*). Gauthier insists that Thomas must be at the forefront of those who have done most violence to Aristotle's thought by forcing it into the Procrustean bed of Christian theology. If Gauthier is right, then the 'Aristotelianism' found in Thomas's work can only be of peripheral interest to theologians, as historians of philosophy would have to recognise Thomas's appropriation as an abuse of Aristotle for purposes unshared by the Stagirite."

CROWE, p. 185: "This being so, it is little wonder that there should exist great differences between the morals of one society and another. St. Thomas instances the Germans in Caesar's *De bello gallico* who did not consider theft unlawful "although it expressly contradicts the natural law" and the morals castigated by St. Paul in the first chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans*. Such moral variations do not involve a denial of the natural law; they are due to the complexity with which the natural law is faced, to the corruption of human nature that takes advantage of that complexity...."

STONE, pp. 114-115: "This being so, it is hardly surprising that there should exist great differences between the morals of one society and another. Thomas instances the Germans in Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*, Book VI, 23, who did not consider brigandage unlawful 'although it expressly contradicts the natural law', and the morals castigated by St. Paul in the first chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans*. Such moral variations do not involve a denial of the natural law; they are due to the complexity with which the natural law is faced, to the corruption of human nature that takes advantage of that complexity...."

---

### Case 11 (2001)

M.W.F. STONE, "Augustine and medieval philosophy", in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. Eleonore STUMP and Norman KRETZMANN (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 253-266 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Mark D. JORDAN, "Augustinianism", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 559b-565a (= J)

S 255 = J 561b; S 256 = J 561b-562a; S 257 = J 562a, 562b; S 258 = J 562b, 563a; S 259 = J

563a; S 260 = J 563b, 564a; S 261 = J 564a (\*)

(2) William J. COURTENAY, "Augustinianism at Oxford in the Fourteenth Century", in *Augustiniana* 30 (1980), pp. 58-70 (= C)

Main text: S 255-256 = C 59; S 259 = C 59-60; S 262 = C 65. Endnotes: S2 = C 58

(3) Alexander BROADIE, "Henry of Ghent", in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted HONDERICH (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 351b (= B)

S 258 = B 351b

(4) M.J. INWOOD, "Duns Scotus, John", in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted HONDERICH (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 208a-209a (= I)

S 258 = I 209a

(5) Christopher OCKER, "Augustinianism in Fourteenth-Century Theology", in *Augustinian Studies* 18 (1987), pp. 81-106 (= O)

S 260 = O 90; S 261 = O 90-91

(6) E.L. SAAK, "Milleloquium Sancti Augustini", in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. FITZGERALD, O.S.A. (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), pp. 563a-b (= Sa)

S 261-262 = Sa 563a

#### EXAMPLES:

JORDAN, p. 562b: "They understood Augustine to teach that God had inserted into matter, at the moment of creation, intelligible patterns that could be actualized over time. So, for example, Bonaventure holds that the souls of non-rational animals and of plants were created not out of nothing nor simply out of some pre-existing matter, but rather 'in the manner of a seed'. They were created, in other words, by actualizing an active potency in matter, which serves as a 'seed bed' of such potencies. After the moment of creation, animal souls are reproduced without divine intervention by the natural actualization of such 'seed-like reasons'."

STONE, p. 258: "They understood Augustine to teach that God had infused into matter, at the moment of creation, intelligible patterns that could be actualized over time. Bonaventure, for example, held that the souls of non-rational animals and of plants were created not *ex nihilo* and not simply out of pre-existing matter, but rather in the manner of a seed. In other words, these souls were created by actualizing an active potency in matter. After the moment of creation, animal souls were reproduced without divine intervention by the natural actualization of these "seminal reasons"."

(\*) [STONE, endnote 1, p. 263: "The very same point is made by Jordan (1998)... I am grateful to Eleonore Stump for drawing my attention to Jordan's article. The present study was written before I became acquainted with this intelligent paper."]

OCKER, p. 91: "Although Gregory could call the cooperation of the human will with this special, additional influence a "coefficiency," he did not believe that the *auxilium speciale* effected a moral and spiritual restoration of fallen human nature. Even under the reforming influence of spiritual grace, the will is unable to love God above all else."

STONE, p. 261: "Although Gregory could call the co-operation of the human will with this special additional influence a "coefficiency," he did not hold that the *auxilium speciale* effected a moral and spiritual restoration of fallen human nature. Even under the reforming aspect of spiritual grace, the will is unable to love God above all else."



**Case 12 (2001)**

M.W.F. STONE, “The Debate on the Soul in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century: A Reply to William Charlton”, in *Whose Aristotle? Whose Aristotelianism?* ed. R.W. SHARPLES (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 78-104 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Mark D. JORDAN, “Aristotelianism, Medieval”, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 393b-404b (= J)

S 80 = J 394b-395a; S 81 = J 395a

(2) Norman KRETZMANN, *The Metaphysics of Creation. Aquinas’s Natural Theology in Summa Contra Gentiles II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998) (= K1)

S 82 = K1 251-252 n. 68, 296; S 83 = K1 296-297; S 84 = K1 298

(3) Norman KRETZMANN, “Philosophy of mind”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*, ed. Norman KRETZMANN and Eleonore STUMP (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 128-159 (= K2)

S 84 = K2 131; S 85 = K2 131, 133; S 86 = K2 133-134; S 87 = K2 134-135; S 88 = K2 135-136

(4) Richard C. DALES, *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) (= D)

S 89 = D 99; S 90 = D 99-100, 101; S 91 = D 101-102; S 92 = D 102-103; S 93 = D 103-105; S 94 = D 105-106

(5) Edward P. MAHONEY and James SOUTH, “Aristotelianism, Renaissance”, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 404b-413b (= MS)

S 95-96 = MS 407b

(6) Fernand VAN STEENBERGHEN, “The Second Lecture. Monopsychism”, trans. John F. WIPPEL, in Fernand VAN STEENBERGHEN, *Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1980), pp. 29-74 (= FvS)

S 96 = FvS 31-32; S 98 = FvS 34, 35, 38; S 99 = FvS 38-39, 40, 43, 48; S 100 = FvS 48-49, 50; S 101 = FvS 51, 54, 55-56; S 102 = FvS 56-57, 63-64; S 103 = FvS 64

(7) B. Carlos BAZÁN, “The Human Soul: Form and Substance? Thomas Aquinas’ Critique of Eclectic Aristotelianism”, in *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 64 (1997), pp. 95-126 (= Ba)

S 97 = Ba 104-105; S 98 = Ba 105

**EXAMPLE:**

BAZÁN, p. 105: “This definition of the soul as form of the body is *analogical*; it allows for only an imperfect understanding of the different kinds of soul (*diminute facit cognoscere*), and, consequently, requires specific adjustments for each level of life, vegetative, sensitive and human.”

STONE, p. 97: “It is important to note that this definition of the soul as the form of the body is *analogical*; it allows for only an imperfect understanding of the different kinds of soul (*diminute facit cognoscere*), and consequently, requires specific adjustments for each level of life, vegetative, sensitive, and human.”

**Case 13 (2002)**

M.W.F. STONE, "Aristotelianism and Scholasticism in Early Modern Philosophy", in *A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven NADLER (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 7-24 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Edward P. MAHONEY and James SOUTH, "Aristotelianism, Renaissance", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 404b-413b (= MS)

S 10 = MS 405b, 406a, 406b; S 11 = MS 406b; S 13-15 = MS 407b, 408a-b, 409a-410a

(2) Heikki MIKKELI, "The Foundation of an Autonomous Natural Philosophy: Zabarella on the Classification of Arts and Sciences", in *Method and Order in Renaissance Philosophy of Nature: The Aristotle Commentary Tradition*, ed. Daniel A. DI LISCIA, Eckhard KESSLER and Charlotte METHUEN (Aldershot: Ashgate 1997), pp. 211-228 (= M)

S 11-12 = M 219-220

(3) Charles H. LOHR, "Metaphysics and natural philosophy as sciences: the Catholic and the Protestant views in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries", in *Philosophy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Conversations with Aristotle*, ed. Constance BLACKWELL and Sachiko KUSUKAWA (Aldershot: Ashgate 1999), pp. 280-295 (= L)

S 12 = L 289, 290-291, 293; S 13 = L 295

(4) Eckhard KESSLER, "The Intellectualive Soul", in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. SCHMITT, Quentin SKINNER and Eckhard KESSLER (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 485-534 (= K)

S 15 = K 514, 515

(5) Roger ARIEW, "Aristotelianism in the 17th Century", in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward CRAIG, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 386b-393a (= A)

S 21-22 = A 387a-b

**EXAMPLE:**

MAHONEY and SOUTH, pp. 408b-409a: "While those who read Alexander and Simplicius would have found the human soul to be many, that is, one soul for each human being, the interpretation of Averroes was quite different. The theory of the human soul that emerged from Averroes' *Long Commentary on Aristotle's 'On the Soul'* was that each human being had an individual sensitive soul and a set of internal senses that were numerically distinct in each human being. On the other hand, there was numerically only one intellect for the entire human race, and that intellect served as the 'intellective soul' for each human being."

STONE, p. 13: "While those Aristotelians who read Alexander and Simplicius would have found the human soul to be many, that is, one soul for each human being, the interpretation of Averroes was quite different. His theory set out in his *Long Commentary on Aristotle On the Soul* was that each human being had an individual sensitive soul and a set of internal senses that were numerically distinct in each human being. On the other hand, there was numerically only one intellect for the entire human race, and this intellect served as an "intellective soul" for each human being."

**Case 14 (2002)**

M.W.F. STONE, "Practical Reason and the Orders of Morals and Nature in Aquinas's Theory of the *Lex Naturae*", in *Mind, Metaphysics, and Value in the Thomistic and Analytical Traditions*,

ed. John HALDANE (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp. 195-212 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Carlos STEEL, “Natural Ends and Moral Ends According to Thomas Aquinas”, in *Finalité et intentionnalité: Doctrines Thomiste et perspectives modernes*, ed. J. FOLLON and J. MCEVOY (Paris: J. Vrin & Leuven: Peeters, 1992), pp. 113-126 (= St)

*Main text:* S 196 = St 113; S 197 = St 114-115; S 198 = St 115; S 199-203 = St 115-121; S 204 = St 121-122, 122-123; S 205-207 = St 123-126. *Endnotes:* S4 = St 113; S5 = St n. 2, n. 1; S6-7 = St nn. 2-3; S9-24 = St nn. 4-19; S26-28 = St nn. 21-23; S30-31 = St nn. 26-27; S33-37 = St nn. 28-32; S39 = St n. 33; S41-42 = St nn. 34-35; S43-48 = St nn. 37-42; S50 = St n. 44

EXAMPLE:

STEEL, p. 122: “However, here again it must be emphasized that this ‘object’ is not the objective or the external act taken in itself, in its own nature, but only insofar as it involves a certain relation to reason. As examples of such acts, which are evil from the lack of ‘suitable object’, Thomas cites *tollere aliena* (to take what belongs to another)...”

STONE, p. 204: “Here again it must be stressed that the ‘object’ under discussion is not the external act taken in itself, but a certain relation to reason. As examples of such acts, which are evil for lack of a suitable object, Thomas cites *tollere aliena* (taking what belongs to another)...”

---

### Case 15 (2003)

M.W.F. STONE, “Henry of Ghent on Freedom and Human Action”, in *Henry of Ghent and the Transformation of Scholastic Thought: Studies in Memory of Jos Decorte*, ed. Guy GULDENTOPS and Carlos STEEL (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), pp. 201-225 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Roland J. TESKE, S.J., “Introduction”, in Roland J. TESKE, S.J., *Henry of Ghent, Quodlibetal Questions on Free Will. Translated from the Latin with an Introduction and Notes*, pp. 1-22 (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1993) (= T)

S 205 = T 6, 7; S 206 = T 7; S 207 = T 8-9; S 208 = T 9; S 217 = T 9, 10; S 218 = T 10-11; S 219 = T 11-12; S 220 = T 12, 13-14; S 221 = T 14-15; S 222 = T 15; S 223 = T 16, 17, 18; S 224 = T 18-19; S 225 = T 19-20

(2) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 206 = K 85-86; S 207 = K 86; S 208 = K 86, n. 8, 87-88; S 209 = K 88, n. 14; S 210 = K 79; S 211 = K 79-80; S 212 = K 80-81, 82; S 213 = K 90-91, n. 29, 91; S 214 = K 91-92; S 215 = K 92, 93-94; S 216 = K 94, 92

(3) Eleonore STUMP, “Aquinas’s Account of Freedom: Intellect and Will”, in *The Monist* 80 (1997), pp. 576-597 (= St)

S 210 = St 593

EXAMPLE:

STUMP, p. 593: “For Aquinas, human freedom depends on human cognitive capacities and on the connection of the will to those capacities. Consequently, as long as human acts of will originate in those faculties, those acts count as voluntary and free, even if the agent couldn’t have done otherwise in the circumstances or the act of will is necessitated by natural inclinations of intellect and will.”

STONE, p. 210: “For this reason, *liberum arbitrium* for Thomas will depend on human cognitive capacities, such as choice or *electio*, and on the connection of the will to those capacities. Accordingly, as long as human acts of will originate in those faculties, such acts will be ‘voluntary’ and ‘free,’ even if the agent could not have done otherwise in those circumstances, or the act of volition was necessitated by certain natural inclinations of intellect and will.” [Here Stone inserts n. 29, which has a reference to Stump’s article, but not to p. 593: “This aspect of Thomas’s discussion is brought out in convincing and attractive detail by E. Stump in ‘Aquinas’s Account of Freedom: Intellect and Will,’ in: *The Monist*, 80 (1979) [sic], pp. 576-597, esp. 587-592”.]

---

### Case 16 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, “Moral psychology before 1277: The will, *liberum arbitrium*, and moral rectitude in Bonaventure”, in *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (London Studies in the History of Philosophy), ed. Thomas PINK and M.W.F. STONE (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 99-126 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) John F. QUINN, “The Moral Philosophy of St. Bonaventure”, in *The Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1974), pp. 39-70 (= Q)

*Main text*: S 103 = Q 41, 42; S 104 = Q 42, 45, 46; S 105 = Q 46, 48, 49; S 106 = Q 50, 51, 52; S 107 = Q 52, 53; S 108 = Q 53, 54; S 109 = Q 54 & n. 37, 55 & n. 38; S 110 = Q 55, 56. *Endnotes*: S34 = Q n. 7; S35 = Q n. 10; S38 = Q n. 18; S42 = Q n. 21; S43 = Q n. 21; S44 = Q n. 26; S53 = Q n. 34; S54 = Q n. 35; S56 = Q n. 36; S59 = Q n. 37; S61-62 = Q n. 38

(2) Bonnie KENT, *Virtues of the Will: The Transformation of Ethics in the Late Thirteenth Century* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1995) (= Ke)

*Main text*: S 107 = Ke 101. *Endnotes*: S51-52 = Ke 101 nn. 10-11

(3) James P. REILLY Jr., “Rectitude of Will and the Examined Life”, in *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, vol. 4, ed. Jacques Guy BOUGEROL et al. (Grottaferrata [Roma]: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974), pp. 655-71 (= R)

*Main text*: S 110 = R 660-661; S 111 = R 661, 668-669; S 112 = R 669. *Endnotes*: S67 = R n. 23; S68 = R n. 24, n. 22; S69 = R n. 25; S70 = R n. 27; S71 = R n. 28

#### EXAMPLE:

QUINN, p. 54: “When judging according to the eternal law, human reason does not err, for this is the noblest act of the superior reason. It can err by deviating from that law and attending inordinately to the good of the soul, or by allowing the inferior reason to seek inordinately the good of the sense appetites by ignoring the natural instinct of *synderesis*. Human reason is always right in its moral judgments only when consulting the eternal law from which it receives the rules or first principles of moral truth, i.e., of natural law. In applying those rules to particular actions, reason needs the direction of moral virtue.”

STONE, pp. 108-109: “When judging according to the eternal law human reason does not err. For this is the noblest act of superior reason. It can err, however, by deviating from that law and attending inordinately to the good identified by the sensory appetites and corporeal inclinations which in effect entails bypassing the natural instinct of *synderesis*. Human reason is correct in its moral judgements only when it effectively consults and understands the requirements of the eternal law, a body of knowledge that it can come to know by means of the first principles of practical reason or the natural law. Should reason then attempt to apply these rules to the level of action, it needs to be policed and thoroughly conditioned by the dispositions of moral virtue.”

---

**Case 17 (2004)**

Martin W.F. STONE, "In the Shadow of Augustine: The Scholastic Debate on Lying from Robert Grosseteste to Gabriel Biel", in "*Herbst des Mittelalters*"? *Fragen zur Bewertung des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts* (Miscellanea Medievalia 31), ed. Jan A. AERTSEN and Martin PICKAVÉ (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), pp. 277-317 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Julius A. DORSZYNSKI, *Catholic Teaching about the Morality of Falsehood* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948) (= D)

S 279 = D 18, 19-20; S 280 = D 20

(2) Boniface RAMSEY, O.P., "*Mendacio, De/Contra mendacium*", in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. FITZGERALD, O.S.A. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), pp. 555a-557a (= R)

S 280 = R 555b

(3) Thomas FEEHAN, "Augustine's Own Examples of Lying" [= *Augustinian Studies* 22 (1991), pp. 165-190], in *Norms of Faith and Life* (Recent studies in early Christianity 3), ed. Everett FERGUSON (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999), pp. 333-358 (= F)

S 281 = F 335, 341, 350; S 282 = F 341

(4) G.R. EVANS, *Getting It Wrong: The Medieval Epistemology of Error* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) (= E)

S 282 = E 199; S 283 = E 200

(5) Marcia L. COLISH, *Peter Lombard*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1994) (= C)

S 284 = C 512-513; S 285 = C 513

(6) Lesley SMITH, "The *De decem mandatis* of Robert Grosseteste", in *Robert Grosseteste and the Beginnings of a British Theological Tradition*, ed. Maura O'CARROLL (Rome: Istituto Storico dei Cappuccini, 2003), pp. 265-288 (= Sm)

S 286 = Sm 280-281, 282; S 287 = Sm 282

(7) John F. QUINN, "Bonaventure and our Natural Obligation to Confess the Truth", in *Franciscan Studies* 35 (1975), pp. 194-211 (= Q)

S 294 = Q 205; S 295 = Q 205, 206

(8) Hester GELBER, "I Cannot Tell a Lie: Hugh of Lawton's Critique of William of Ockham on Mental Language", in *Franciscan Studies* 44 (1984), pp. 141-179 (= G)

S 307 = G 154-155; S 308 = G 155-156

(9) John L. FARTHING, *Thomas Aquinas and Gabriel Biel: Interpretations of St. Thomas Aquinas in German Nominalism on the Eve of the Reformation* (Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 9; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988) (= Fa)

S 314 = Fa 81; S 315 = Fa 81, 82; S 316 = Fa 83-84

**EXAMPLE:**

GELBER, p. 156: "What Ockham seems to mean here is that someone who lies, first judges that proposition "p" is false, then asserts "p" in spoken form, and finally understands that the spoken proposition is false. Although as a proffered lie, the proposition "p" exists without an assertion of its falsity, yet in the process of lying, "p" never exists in mental language without such an assessment. What distinguishes knowledge about a lie from knowledge about other false propositions is that it is knowledge that a particular spoken sentence is false. A concept corresponding to the words "hoc verbum" represents the spoken lie in the mind, rather than the proposition exactly as spoken with its implicit implication of being true."

STONE, p. 308: “By this Ockham intends that someone who lies, first judges the proposition *p* is false, then asserts *p* in spoken form, and finally understands that the spoken proposition is false. As an uttered lie, the proposition *p* exists without an assertion of its falsity, yet in the process of lying, *p* never exists in mental language without such an assessment. Seen thus, what distinguishes cognisance about a lie from knowledge of other false propositions is that it is knowledge that a particular spoken sentence is false. A concept corresponding to the words *hoc verbum* represents the spoken lie in the mind, rather than the proposition exactly as spoken with its implicit implication of being true.”

---

### Case 18 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, “Scrupulosity and Conscience: Probabilism in Early Modern Scholastic Ethics”, in *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, ed. Harald E. BRAUN and Edward VALLANCE (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 1-16 and 182-188 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

Main text: S 6 = K 124-125; S 7 = K 125-126, 126-127; S 8 = K 127-128; S 9 = K 128-129; S 10 = K 131; S 11 = K 131-132, 133, 134; S 12 = K 134-135; S 13 = K 135-137; S 14 = K 137-140; S 15 = K 140. Endnotes: S26-28 = K 124 nn. 1-3; S29 = K 125 n. 4; S30-31 = K 125 nn. 6-7; S32-33 = K 126 nn. 8-9; S35-36 = K 126 nn. 10-11; S37 = K 127 n. 13; S39 = K 127 n. 14; S40 = K 128 n. 15; S43 = K 128 n. 16; S44-46 = K 129 nn. 17-19; S51-53 = K 131 nn. 1-3; S54-56 = K 132 nn. 4-6; S57-59 = K 133 nn. 7-9; S60-61 = K 134 nn. 11-12; S62-64 = K 135 nn. 14-15; S65-68 = K 136 nn. 17-20; S70-71 = K 137 nn. 25-26; S72-74 = K 138 nn. 28-30; S75 = K 139 n. 31; S77 = K 139 n. 32; S78 = K 140 n. 33; S80 = K 140 n. 34

EXAMPLE:

KANTOLA, p. 135: “However, when there is reasonable *doubt of some fact* upon which one’s moral decision depends, *this* doubt does not make the question about that fact irrelevant or indifferent. Doubt in relation to fact must always be taken very seriously.”

STONE, p. 12: “When, however, there is reasonable doubt of some fact upon which one’s moral decision depends, this doubt does not make the question about that fact irrelevant or indifferent. Doubt in relation to fact, Suárez emphasises, must always be taken very seriously.”

---

### Case 19 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, “The Scope and Limits of Moral Deliberation. *Ratio recta*, natural law, and conscience in Francisco Suárez”, in *Imagination in the Later Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, ed. Lodi NAUTA and Detlev PÄTZOLD (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), pp. 35-57 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Jaime FERNÁNDEZ-CASTAÑEDA, S.J., “Right reason in Francis Suarez”, in *The Modern Schoolman* 45 (1968), pp. 105-122 (= F-C)

S 39 = F-C 106, 107, 108; S 40 = F-C 108-109; S 41 = F-C 109-110, 111; S 42 = F-C 111, 112; S 43 = F-C 112; S 44 = F-C 112-113; S 45 = F-C 113, 115; S 46 = F-C 115

(2) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 47 = K 131; S 48 = K 131-132; S 49 = K 132-133; S 50 = K 133, 134; S 51 = K 134-135; S

52 = K 135-136; S 53 = K 136-138; S 54 = K 138-139; S 55 = K 139-140

EXAMPLE:

FERNÁNDEZ-CASTAÑEDA, p. 113: "Following St. Thomas, Suarez equates the actual judgments of right reason with natural law because right reason, as it was defined above, 'lays commands or prohibitions upon the human will regarding what must be done as a matter of natural law [*ex naturali jure*].' After a series of proofs from Scripture and the Fathers, Suarez seeks a rational support for his theory in several arguments...."

STONE, p. 44: "Following Thomas Aquinas, Suárez equates the actual judgements of *recta ratio* with *ius naturale* because it imposes commands or prohibitions upon the human will regarding what must be done *ex naturali jure*. After a series of authoritative opinions and supplementary proofs from Scripture and the Fathers, Suárez grounds his theory in several mutually enforcing arguments...."

---

### Case 20 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, "Philosophy and Religion in Western Thought", in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Maryanne Cline HOROWITZ, vol. 4 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004), pp. 1795a-1798a (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Mark D. JORDAN, "Religion, history of the philosophy of", in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted HONDERICH (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 759a-763b (= J)  
S 1795a = J 760a-760b; S 1795b = J 760b-761a; S 1796a = J 761a, 761b; S 1796b = J 761b, 762a; S 1797b = J 762b

EXAMPLE:

JORDAN, p. 762a: "The second complication in the relations of philosophy to theological topics arose from fierce disputes over the conclusions of the new sciences. The condemnation of Galileo is the most famous example in these quarrels, though also the most misunderstood. Religious opposition to the philosophical implications of new science made philosophic authors cautious in expressing their views."

STONE, p. 1796b: "The second complication in the relations of philosophy to theological issues arose from fierce disputes over the conclusions of the *nova scientia*, or 'new science.' The condemnation of Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) is one well-known example. Opposition to the metaphysical implications of the new science in certain religious quarters made many philosophers cautious in expressing their views."

---

### Case 21 (2004)

Martin STONE, "Philosophy of religion", in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Maryanne Cline HOROWITZ, vol. 4 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004), pp. 1804a-1806b (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Mark D. JORDAN, "Religion, history of the philosophy of", in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Ted HONDERICH (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 759a-763b (= J)

S 1804a = J 759b

(2) J.C.A. GASKIN, "Hume on religion", in *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, ed. David Fate NORTON (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 313-344 (= G)

S 1805a = G 319

(3) Charles TALIAFERRO, "Philosophy of Religion", in *The Blackwell Companion to Philosophy*, ed. Nicholas BUNNIN and E.P. TSUI-JAMES (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), pp. 443-481 (= T)

S 1805b = T 476

EXAMPLE:

TALIAFERRO, p. 476: "There are currently efforts to explore cross-cultural philosophy of religion, to articulate feminist challenges to traditional religions, to address postmodern versions of religion, and to consider a host of practical, moral and social problems from the standpoint of a philosophically articulate religious ethic, focusing on environmental, medical and political concerns."

STONE, p. 1805b: "At the turn of the twenty-first century, there are efforts to explore cross-cultural philosophies of religion, to articulate feminist challenges to traditional religions, and to consider many political, moral, and social problems from the standpoint of a religiously motivated ethics or political theory."

---

### Case 22 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, "[Philosophy:] Relations to Other Intellectual Realms", in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Maryanne Cline HOROWITZ, vol. 4 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004), pp. 1779a-1783a (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) John PASSMORE, "Philosophy", in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Paul EDWARDS, vol. 6 (New York, Macmillan, 1967), pp. 216b-226a (= P)

S 1779a = P 216b; S 1779b = P 216b, 217a

(2) Steven NADLER, "Introduction", in *A Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven NADLER (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), pp. 1-3 (= N)

S 1781b = N 2; S 1782a = N 2

EXAMPLE:

NADLER, p. 2: "What we tend to think of now as 'philosophy,' a broad but relatively precise discipline distinct from what we call 'the sciences' and 'religion' and characterized by certain kinds of (apparently unresolvable) questions, would have struck an early modern thinker as unreasonably narrow. The term 'philosophy' included in the seventeenth century a great deal more than it does today, including much of what we take to be the physical and biological sciences."

STONE, p. 1781b: "That said, what in the early twenty-first century tends to be thought of as philosophy—a broad but relatively precise discipline distinct from the humanities, sciences, and religion and characterized by certain kinds of difficult and even irresolvable questions—would have struck an early modern thinker as a definition all too parsimonious in scope. The term *philosophy* in the seventeenth century included a great deal more than it does in the twenty-first, and this complicates any attempt to clarify the relationship of philosophy to other forms of human leaning [sic] in the early modern period. Philosophical learning would include the physical and biological sciences...."

---

### Case 23 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, "The Nature and Scope of Ordinary Morality: Some Reflections in the Spirit of Aurel Kolnai", in *Exploring the World of Human Practice: Readings in and about the Philoso-*



*phy of Aurel Kolnai*, ed. Zoltán BALÁZS and Francis DUNLOP (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004), pp. 281-295 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Robert B. LOUDEN, *Morality and Moral Theory: A Reappraisal and Reaffirmation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) (= L)

*Main text*: S 282 = L 118; S 283 = L 118, 116. *Endnotes*: S3 = L 118; S4-5 = L 116; S6 = L 116-117

(2) Jean-Paul SARTRE, *Existentialism*, trans. Bernard FRECHTMAN (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947) (= SF)

S 286 = SF 29-30; S 287 = SF 30

(3) John RAWLS, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971) (= R)

*Endnotes*: S8 = R 51 n. 26

#### EXAMPLES:

LOUDEN, p. 118: "...sorting through of the intuitions and beliefs people already have about the subject at hand, combined with an attempt to preserve the beliefs that are internally consistent: 'We must, as in all other cases, set down the appearances [*ta phainomena*], and after first working through the puzzles, go on to prove, if possible, the truth of all the common beliefs [*panta ta endoxa*]... (NE 1145b2-7; cf. EE 1235b12-18)."

STONE, pp. 282-283: "...sorting through the intuitions and beliefs agents already have about the nature of human action, and second with an attempt to preserve those existing beliefs and opinions about action which can be demonstrated to be internally consistent. Thus in book VII of the *Nicomachean Ethics* he writes: 'We must, as in all cases, set down the appearances [*ta phainomena*], and after first working through the puzzles, go on to prove, if possible, the truth of all the common beliefs [*panta ta endoxa*]...<sup>3</sup>' [Note 3, p. 294: "1145b2-7; cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 1235b12-180 [sic]."]

SARTRE/FRECHTMAN, pp. 29-30: "...for example, on his way to England he might, while passing through Spain, be detained indefinitely in a Spanish camp; he might reach England or Algiers and be stuck in an office at a desk job. As a result he was faced with two very different kinds of action: one concrete, immediate, but concerning only one individual; the other concerned an incomparably vaster group, a national collectivity...."

STONE, p. 286: "For example, on his way to England he might, while in transit through Spain, be detained indefinitely in a Spanish camp; he might reach England or Algiers and be stuck in an office at a desk job. As a result he was faced with two very different kinds of action: one concrete, immediate, but concerning only one individual; the other concerning an incomparably vaster group, a national collective....<sup>15</sup>" [Note 15, p. 295: "Sartre, *op.cit.* [in note 14: "Jean-Paul Sartre, *L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme*, Paris: Edition Nagel, 1970, first published 1947."], pp. 39-42. My translation."]

---

#### Case 24 (2004)

M.W.F. STONE, "Making Sense of Thomas Aquinas in the Sixteenth Century: Domingo de Soto on the Natural Desire to See God", in *Platonic Ideas and Concept Formation in Ancient and Medieval Thought*, ed. Gerd VAN RIEL, Caroline MACÉ and Leen VAN CAMPE (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004), pp. 211-232 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Lawrence FEINGOLD, *The Natural Desire to See God According to St. Thomas Aquinas and His Interpreters* (Roma: Pontificia Universitas Sanctae Crucis, 2001) (= F)

S 216 = F 15; S 218 = F 329-330; S 219 = F 330; S 220 = F 331; S 221 = F 331-332; S 222 = F 332, 334; S 223 = F 334-335; S 224 = F 335-336; S 225 = F 336-337; S 226 = F 337-338; S 227 = F 338; S 228 = F 338-339; S 229 = F 339-340; S 230 = F 340-341; S 231 = F 341

EXAMPLE:

FEINGOLD, p. 335: "In order to make sense of Soto's interpretation, one would have to assume that St. Thomas's analysis of the elicited desire of the will to know causes is only used in these texts in order to manifest the underlying *innate* desire of the will (or intellect), independently of knowledge."

STONE, p. 224: "In order to commend the substance of Soto's position, one would have to assume that Thomas' analysis of the elicited desire of the will to know causes is only used in these texts in order to clarify the underlying innate appetite of the will (or intellect) independently of knowledge."

---

### Case 25 (2005)

M.W.F. STONE, "Michael Baius (1513-89) and the Debate on 'Pure Nature': Grace and Moral Agency in Sixteenth-Century Scholasticism", in *Moral Philosophy on the Threshold of Modernity* (Synthese Historical Library 57), ed. Jill KRAYE and Risto SAARINEN (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005), pp. 51-90 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) J.F. SOLLIER, "Baius (or de Bay), Michel", in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 2 (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), pp. 209b-212a (= So)

S 55 = So 209b; S 57 = So 209b; S 58 = So 209b, 210a; S 63 = So 210a; S 64-65 = So 210a; S 66 = So 210b

(2) P.J. DONNELLY, "Baius and Baianism", in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 2 (2nd ed.; Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2003), pp. 18b-21b (= D)

S 59 = D 19b; S 60 = D 19b, 20a; S 61 = D 20b; S 62 = D 20b, 21a; S 64 = D 19a

(3) Henri DE LUBAC, S.J., *Augustinianism and Modern Theology*, trans. Lancelot SHEPPARD (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1969) (= dL)

S 69 = dL 123; S 70 = dL 124, 126, 127; S 71 = dL 127; S 72 = dL 128, 129; S 73 = dL 130, 131; S 74-81 = dL 133-147

(4) Lawrence FEINGOLD, *The Natural Desire to See God According to St. Thomas Aquinas and His Interpreters* (Roma: Pontificia Universitas Sanctae Crucis, 2001) (= F)

S 71 = F 218; S 72 = F 219

EXAMPLE:

DE LUBAC, p. 146: "There was nothing here preventing Soto from affirming, in an unpublished passage, quoted by Fr Bricio Torres,<sup>121</sup> that 'even if God had not decided to grant the beatific vision to the creature, he would not have been unjust to it, because he owed it nothing'. He then launched out into various hypotheses on the subject. All the theologians to whom Soto wished to remain faithful had admitted this before he did, at least implicitly, by saying that the beatific vision is a gratuitous gift." [de Lubac, n. 121: "*Op. cit.*, pp. 65-6; cf. pp. 84-5."]

STONE, p. 80: "There was nothing here preventing Soto from affirming that even if God had not decided to grant the beatific vision to the first man, he would not have been unjust, because God owed the first man nothing. Soto then launched into various hypotheses on the subject. All the sources to which he wished to remain faithful had admitted this before him, at least implicitly, by saying that the beatific vision is a gratuitous gift."

---

**Case 26 (2005)**

M.W.F. STONE, “Moral Philosophy and the Conditions of Certainty: Descartes’ *Morale* in Context”, in *Metaphysics, Soul, and Ethics in Ancient Thought: Themes from the Work of Richard Sorabji*, ed. Ricardo SALLES (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), pp. 507-550 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Jill KRAYE, “Conceptions of Moral Philosophy”, in *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, vol. 2, ed. Daniel GARBER and Michael AYERS (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 1279-1316 (= Kr)

S 511 = Kr 1300; S 512 = Kr 1300-1301; S 513 = Kr 1301 & n. 142, 1314 n. 141; S 514 = Kr 1314 n. 142; S 515, 516 = Kr 1302; S 531 = Kr 1302; S 532 = Kr 1302-1303

(2) James FRANKLIN, *The Science of Conjecture. Evidence and Probability before Pascal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) (= F)

S 520-521 = F 69-70 (\*)

(3) Ilkka KANTOLA, *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times* (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1994) (= K)

S 521 n. 51 = K 112 n. 7; S 529 = K 143, 173-174, 21; S 530 = K 21-22, 174, 173

(4) Vance G. MORGAN, *Foundations of Cartesian Ethics* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1994) (= M)

S 532 = M 23; S 533-534 = M 25-26; S 534 = M 18; S 535 = M 26-27; S 536-537 = M 27, 24; S 537 = M 24, 27-28; S 538 = M 28, 29; S 539 = M 29-30; S 540 = M 30-31

**EXAMPLES:**

KRAYE, p. 1301: “Nevertheless, the axiomatic method of geometry slowly began to appear in ethical works. One of the first was Niels Hemmingsen’s *De lege naturae apodictica methodus* (1562). On the basis of the law of nature, which dictated that those things which preserve nature are required by it, Hemmingsen proposed certain immutable, infallible, and indubitable axioms, such as the principle that virtue was to be sought and vice avoided.”

STONE, p. 512: “...the axiomatic method of geometry in works of moral philosophy was used sparingly. One of the first attempts to use the method was the *De lege naturae* (1562) of Niels Hemmingsen (1513-1600). On the basis of specifying an idea of ‘a law of nature’, a maxim that dictated that those things preserved by nature are required by it, Hemmingsen proposed certain immutable, infallible, and indubitable axioms, such as the principle ‘that virtue was to be sought and vice avoided’.”

FRANKLIN, pp. 69-70: “In general one should have moral certainty that a proposed course of action is right before doing it. To acquire moral certainty, one should consider what usually happens, what the authorities say, and what one’s learning suggests.”

STONE, p. 521: “In general one should have *certitudo moralis* that a proposed course of action is licit before doing it, and to acquire such practical confidence one should consider what usually happens, what the best authorities say, and what one’s learning suggests.”

(\*) [STONE, p. 519, n. 41: “...see... J. Franklin... and his more recent book, *The Science of Conjecture: Evidence and Probability before Pascal* (Baltimore, 2002), 64-101. This work came to my attention after completing the present essay.”]

MORGAN, p. 24: “Even if he did once hold this optimistic opinion, however, it is clear that by the later years of his life Descartes had become convinced that his philosophical enterprise would never be completed in his lifetime. In either case, a problem arises: How is one to direct

one's moral conduct in the indefinite absence of the perfect moral system, which cannot be formed until metaphysics and physics have been completed?"

STONE, pp. 536-537: "Even if he did once hold this optimistic opinion, it is clear that by the end of his life Descartes had become convinced that his philosophical enterprise would never be completed. In either case, a problem arises: how is one to direct one's moral conduct in the indefinite absence of the perfect moral system, which cannot be constituted until metaphysics and physics are complete?"

---

### Case 27 (2005)<sup>8</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, "'Initium omnis peccati est superbia'. Jean Gerson's Analysis of Pride in his Mystical Theology, Pastoral Thought, and Hamartiology", in *In the Garden of Evil. The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Papers in Mediaeval Studies 18), ed. Richard NEWHAUSER (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2005), pp. 293-323 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Lawrence C. BECKER, "Pride", in *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence C. BECKER and Charlotte B. BECKER (New York: Garland, 1992), pp. 1013b-1015b (= B)

S 293-294 = B 1015a

(2) J.F. PROCOPÉ, "'Initium omnis peccati superbia'", in *Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987. Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom and his Greek Contemporaries, Augustine, Donatism and Pelagianism* (Studia Patristica 22), ed. Elizabeth A. LIVINGSTONE (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), pp. 315-320 (= P)

S 298 = P 316; S 299 = P 316-317; S 300 = P 317; S 301 = P 317, 318, 319; S 302 = P 319-320; S 303 = P 320

(3) John C. CAVADINI, "Pride", in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. FITZGERALD, O.S.A. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), pp. 679b-684a (= C)

S 303-304 = C 682b-683a

(4) Brian Patrick MCGUIRE, "Introduction", in *Jean Gerson: Early Works*, trans. Brian Patrick MCGUIRE (Classics of Western Spirituality 92; New York: Paulist Press, 1998) (= M)

S 304 = M 39; S 305 = M 39, 40, 41; S 306 = M 41, 42, 43, 44, 45; S 307 = M 45, 46, 49

(5) D. Catherine BROWN, *Pastor and laity in the theology of Jean Gerson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) (= Br)

S 309-310 = Br 65; S 311 = Br 65, 66; S 312 = Br 66-67; S 313 = Br 67; S 314 = Br 126; S 315-316 = Br 126-128; S 317 = Br 128, 129; S 318 = Br 129, 130; S 319-321 = Br 130-131

#### EXAMPLE:

BROWN, p. 129: "Pride in one's own abilities, possessions and virtues generally leads one to despise others not so well endowed. This leads Gerson to the discussion of another traditional set of daughters of pride. First there is despising *per se*; disdaining others because they lack the goods of fortune and grace that one has oneself; being ashamed of one's poor friend. Less straightforward is the question of judging others. In the *Modus brevis confitendi* he suggests..."

STONE, pp. 317-318: "Pride in one's own abilities, possessions, and virtues can further occasion the formation of a pejorative outlook on others not so well blessed. This leads Gerson to a discussion of the offspring of pride which include despising and disdaining others because they

---

<sup>8</sup> Richard NEWHAUSER contributed to the identification of sources for this entry.

lack the good fortune and graces belonging to oneself, and being ashamed of one's less fortunate companions. Much more complicated is the issue of judging others. In the *Modus brevis confitendi* he suggests...."

---

### Case 28 (2006)<sup>9</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, "Adrian of Utrecht and the University of Louvain: Theology and the Discussion of Moral Problems in the Late Fifteenth Century", in *Traditio* 61 (2006), pp. 247-287 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Rudolf Branko HEIN, "Gewissen" bei Adrian von Utrecht (*Hadrian VI.*), *Erasmus von Rotterdam und Thomas More: Ein Beitrag zur systematischen Analyse des Gewissensbegriffs in der katholischen nordeuropäischen Renaissance* (Studien der Moraltheologie 10; Münster: Lit verlag, 1999) (= H)

S 249 n. 1 = H 175 n. 1; S 250-260 = H 175-182; S 261 = H 183; S 262-271 = H 183-191; S 275-281 = H 193-199; S 282 = H 199, n. 156, 199-200; S 283-285 = H 200-202; S 286 = H 202-203, n. 178

EXAMPLE:

HEIN, p. 200, n. 159: "...daß Adrian keinen direkten Rekurs auf Wilhelm von Ockhams Positionen unternimmt und scheinbar diesen wichtigen Vertreter der *Via Moderna* völlig außen vor läßt. Meiner Ansicht nach liegt dieses Faktum nicht so sehr in seiner generellen Ablehnung des Nominalismus begründet als vielmehr im Lehrverbot der Löwener Fakultät, die sowohl Ockhams als auch Buridanus' Schriften aus dem Lehrbetrieb zu verbannen suchte, aber wohl bis 1497 mehrere Anläufe zur Durchsetzung dieses Vorhabens benötigte. – Vgl. Anm. 27 [= Vgl. De Jongh, *Faculté* 56; Greiteman, *Via* 27. Durch weitere Bestimmungen 1480, 1486 und 1497 wird das Dozieren nominalistischer Positionen in der philosophischen (Artes-) und theologischen Fakultät praktisch unmöglich gemacht]. Das sehr vereinzelte Auftauchen von Buridanus-Verweisen ist am ehesten erklärbar durch die Beschränkung auf wenige Aussagen seines aristotelischen Ethik-Kommentares. Vgl. hierzu QQ VI, a. 1 ad rat. ante opp. 2 (fol. 52<sup>va</sup> G)."

STONE, p. 283, n. 181: "Adrian makes no direct reference to William of Ockham's views and apparently ignores other aspects of the *via moderna*. In my view, the omission of the Venerable Inceptor is based not so much on Adrian's general rejection of nominalism as on the prohibition in the faculty at Louvain, which not only forbade the use of the works of both Ockham and Buridan for teaching but led to several initiatives to ensure that it was carried out up to 1497 at least (see n. 38 above [= See De Jongh, *Faculté*, 56, and N. Greiteman, "Via antiqua en via moderna op de universiteiten van Engeland, Frankrijk en Duitschland," *Studia Catholica* (Roermond) 6 (1929/30): 149-63, and 7 (1930/31): 25-40, esp. 27. Further decrees in 1480, 1486, and 1497 in practice made the teaching of nominalist views in the faculties of Arts and Theology more and more difficult.]). The rare occurrence of references to Buridan is largely to be explained by the fact that they are limited to a few passages from his commentary on Aristotle's *Ethics*; see QQ VI (n. 4 above), a. 1 ad rat. ante opp. 2 (fol. v<sup>a</sup> 52 G)."

---

<sup>9</sup> Rudolf Branko HEIN contributed with material for this entry.

**Case 29 (2006)**<sup>10</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, "Truth, deception, and lies: Lessons from the casuistical tradition", in *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 68 (2006), pp. 101-131 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Sissela BOK, *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life* (Hassocks, Sussex: The Harvester Press Ltd., 1978) (= B)

S 106 = B 35-36

(2) Martin DZELZAINIS, "Bacon's 'Of Simulation and Dissimulation'", in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. Michael HATTAWAY (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), pp. 233-240 (= D)

S 110 = D 235

(3) Winfried SCHLEINER, *Medical Ethics in the Renaissance* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1995) (= Sc)

S 113 = Sc 21-22

(4) Johann P. SOMMERVILLE, "The 'new art of lying': equivocation, mental reservation, and casuistry", in *Conscience and casuistry in early modern Europe*, ed. Edmund LEITES (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 159-184 (= So)

S 114 = So 161-162; S 115 = So 162, 167; S 116 = So 167, 168; S 117 = So 168, 169, 168 n. 16; S 118 = So 169-170; S 119 = So 170; S 120 = So 171-172; S 121 = So 172; S 122 = So 173; S 123 = So 173; S 125 = So 174; S 126 = So 174, 175; S 127 = So 175, 176, 178; S 128 = So 176; S 129 = So 176

(5) Elliot ROSE, *Cases of Conscience. Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans under Elizabeth I and James I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) (= R)

S 119 = R 94 & n. 3

(6) John TRENTMAN, "Mental Language and Lying", in *L'homme et son univers au moyen âge* (Philosophes Médiévaux 27), ed. Christian WENIN (Louvain-la-Neuve: Éditions de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie, 1986), pp. 544-553 (= T)

S 122 = T 549; S 123 = T 549-550; S 124 = T 550

(7) Albert R. JONSEN and Stephen TOULMIN, *The Abuse of Casuistry. A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) (= JT)

S 125 = JT 200; S 128 = JT 214, 384 n. 37

## EXAMPLES:

SOMMERVILLE, p. 167: "In essence, the proponents of verbal equivocation claimed that it is not lying to make a statement which possesses both true and false meanings, provided that it is true according to your sense (*sensus*) or meaning (*intentio*). It did not matter that you recognized that your words also bore a sense in which they were false."

STONE, p. 116: "Supporters of verbal equivocation claimed that it was not lying to make a statement which possesses both true and false meanings, provided that it was true according to your sense (*sensus*) or meaning (*intentio*). It did not matter whether one recognised that one's utterance also bore a sense in which it was false."

TRENTMAN, p. 550: "Here Suárez might have done well to have taken greater heed of the doctrine of his countryman, Bañez, who argued that it is impossible to lie to oneself or to another,

---

<sup>10</sup> Carlos STEEL contributed to the identification of sources for this entry.

e.g., God, whom one cannot hope to deceive. Thomas Sanchez also followed this tendency to internalize the problem of lying. Building again on the distinction between spoken and written words and mental language, he argued that the *intentio* is all that matters; speech, strictly speaking, is entirely interior; conventional signs (spoken and written words) are related only *mere materialiter*, in effect accidentally, to the lie.”

STONE, p. 124: “Here Suárez might have done well to have followed the teaching of his fellow Spaniard Domingo Bañez who asserted that it is impossible to lie to oneself and to another, e.g. God, who one cannot hope to deceive. Tomás Sanchez also followed this tendency to internalise lying. Building again on the distinction between spoken and written words and mental language, he argued that the *intentio* is all that matters, speech *in sensu strictu* [sic] is entirely interior; conventional signs (spoken and written words) are related *mere materialiter*, in effect accidentally, to the lie.”

---

### Case 30 (2006)

Martin W.F. STONE, “The Antiquarian and the Moderniser: Giovanni Lorenzo Berti (1696-1766), Pietro Tamburini (1737-1827), and Contrasting Defenses of the Augustinian Teaching on Unbaptised Infants in Eighteenth-Century Italy”, in *Quaestio* 6 (2006), pp. 335-372 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) N.A. WEBER, “Berti, Giovanni Lorenzo”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 2 (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), p. 522a (= W)

S 343-344 = W 522a

(2) George J. DYER, *The Denial of Limbo and the Jansenist Controversy* (Pontificia Facultas Theologica, Seminarii Sanctae Mariae ad Lacum: Dissertationes ad Lauream 24; Mundelein, IL: Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1955) (= D)

S 347 = D 113; S 348 = D 114; S 349 = D 114; S 350-358 = D 114-121; S 363-372 = D 123-130

(3) Walter DRUM, “Perrone, Giovanni”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 11 (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), pp. 702a-702b (= Dr)

S 360 n. 112 = Dr 702a, 702b

(4) Owen CHADWICK, *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) (= C)

S 362 = C 403

EXAMPLE:

DYER, p. 127: “We can now see a little more clearly the active *rôle* which the question of unbaptized infants played in Tamburini’s polemic. It offered him a many-sized weapon with which he could rake and tear the Molinists he so cordially detested. Tamburini considered Molinism to be nothing else than the Pelagian heresy, somewhat modified and embellished by its authors.”

STONE, p. 368: “We can now discern much more clearly the active role which the question of unbaptised infants played in Tamburini’s polemic. It afforded him a multifacted [sic] weapon with which he could rake and tear the Molinists whom he so detested. An ardent Jansenist, Tamburini considered Molinism to be nothing less than the Pelagian heresy, somewhat modified and embellished by later day Jesuit authors.”

---

**Case 31 (2006)**

M.W.F. STONE, “Scholastic schools and early modern philosophy”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*, ed. Donald RUTHERFORD (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 299-327 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) D.J. KENNEDY, “Thomism”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 14 (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), pp. 698a-703a (= K)

S 304 = K 699a; S 307 = K 699b; S 308 = K 699b, 700a; S 309 = K 700a

(2) A.L. MCMAHON, “Alexander Natalis”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 1 (New York: The Universal Knowledge Foundation, 1913), pp. 296b-297b (= M)

S 307 = M 297a, 297b

(3) Parthenius MINGES, “Scotism and Scotists”, in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 13 (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), pp. 610a-613a (= Mi)

S 310 = Mi 611b, 612a; S 311 = Mi 612a, 612b

(4) Roger ARIEW, “Descartes and the Jesuits: Doubt, Novelty, and the Eucharist”, in *Jesuit Science and the Republic of Letters*, ed. Mordechai FEINGOLD (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 157-194 (= A)

*Main text*: S 315 = A 169. *Endnotes*: S72 = A n. 83; S73 = A nn. 86-87; S75 = A nn. 90-91

**EXAMPLES:**

KENNEDY, p. 699b: “(a) The angels and human souls are without matter, but every material composite being (*compositum*) has two parts, prime matter and substantial form. In a composite being which has substantial unity and is not merely an aggregate of distinct units, there can be but one substantial form. The substantial form of man is his soul (*anima rationalis*) to the exclusion of any other soul and of any other substantial form. The principle of individuation, for material composites, is matter with its dimensions: without this there can be no merely numerical multiplication....”

STONE, p. 307: “First was the idea that angels and human souls are without matter, but that every material composite being (*compositum*) has two parts, prime matter and substantial form. The thought here is that in a composite being which has substantial unity, and is not merely an aggregate of distinct units, there can be but one substantial form. For Thomists, the substantial form of man is his soul (*anima rationalis*), to the exclusion of any other soul and of any other substantial form. The principle of individuation, for material composites, is matter with its dimensions: without this there can be no merely numerical multiplication....”

ARIEW, p. 169: “He accepted analogical predication, siding with Thomas, but thought that a concept of being can be found which is strictly unitary, thus adopting Scotus’s position on this issue: “the proper and adequate formal concept of being as such is one.” Suárez added that this was the common opinion, defended by “Scotus and all his disciples.” Conversely, Suárez accepted the Scotist doctrine of matter’s existing without form by divine power, but sided with Thomas on the plurality of forms.... Most important, he argued against Thomas that there is a third distinction other than real and rational.”

STONE, p. 315: “For example, he accepted the doctrine of analogical predication, siding with Thomas, but thought that a concept of being (*esse*) can be found which is strictly unitary, thereby supporting the *communis opinio* defended by Scotus and his disciples. Conversely, he embraced the Scotist doctrine of matter’s existing without form by divine power, but sided with Thomas on the issue of the plurality of forms.... Against Thomas, he argued that there is a third distinction other than the ‘real and rational.’”



**Case 32 (2006)**

Martin W.F. STONE, "Equity and Moderation: The Reception and Uses of Aristotle's Doctrine of ἐπιείκεια in Thirteenth-Century Ethics", in *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 17 (2006), pp. 121-156 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Jacques BRUNSCHWIG, "Rule and Exception: On the Aristotelian Theory of Equity", in *Rationality in Greek Thought*, ed. Michael FREDE and Gisela STRIKER (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 115-155 (= B)

S 125 n. 13 = B 117 & n. 3

(2) Max HAMBURGER, *Morals and Law: The Growth of Aristotle's Legal Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951) (= H)

S 125-126 = H 90; S 126-127 = H 91

(3) Nancy SHERMAN, *The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) (= Sh)

S 127-129 = Sh 15-16; S 129-130 = Sh 17-18; S 131 = Sh 18-19

(4) Clarence GALLAGHER, S.J., *Canon Law and the Christian Community: The Role of Law in the Church According to the Summa Aurea of Cardinal Hostiensis* (Analecta Gregoriana 208; Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1978) (= G)

S 135-137 = G 130-132; S 137-138 = G 136-137

(5) Albert R. JONSEN and Stephen TOULMIN, *The Abuse of Casuistry. A History of Moral Reasoning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) (= JT)

S 146-147 = JT 116

(6) Lawrence Joseph RILEY, *The History, Nature, and Use of EPIKEIA in Moral Theology* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology [Second Series], vol. 17; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948) (= R)

S 148-151 = R 28-32; S 151-152 = R 33-34; S 152 = R 36 & n. 60; S 153 = R 36 n. 60, 37, 39; S 154-155 = R 51-52

**EXAMPLE:**

SHERMAN, p. 15: "On Aristotle's view, then, the benefits of proceduralism never obscure the fact of written law's uneasy fit to the particular case. This emerges as the central focus of Aristotle's discussion:

In those cases, then, in which it is necessary to speak universally [*katholou*], but not possible to do so correctly, the law takes the usual case [*epi to pleon*], though it is not ignorant of the possibility of error. And it is none the less correct; for the error is not in the law nor in the legislator but in the nature of the thing, since the matter of practical affairs is of this kind from the start. (*NE* 1137b14 ff.)

Law is thus inevitably general. But it is limited as a result."

[SHERMAN, p. xiv: "Unless otherwise noted, the translations of Aristotle are my own."]

STONE, pp. 127-128: "In Aristotle's view, the putative benefits of assorted legal procedures will never disguise the fact that written laws cannot always meet the demands of particular cases. This emerges as the central focus of Aristotle's discussion at *Nicomachean Ethics* V, 10, 1137b14-19:

In those cases, then, in which it is necessary to speak universally (καθόλου), but not possible to do so correctly, the law takes the usual case (ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν), though it is ignorant [sic] of the possibility of error. And it is more or less correct; for the error is not in the law nor in the

legislator but in the nature of the thing, since the matter of practical affairs is of this kind from the start.

Law is necessarily general; and it is limited as a result of this condition.”

[STONE, p. 122 n. 4: “All translations from Greek and Latin sources are my own unless stated.”]

### Case 33 (2007)<sup>11</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, “Explaining Freedom Through the Texts of Aristotle: Pedro da Fonseca S.J. (1528-1599) on *liberum arbitrium*”, in *Der Aristotelismus in der Frühen Neuzeit – Kontinuität oder Wiederaneignung?* ed. Günter FRANK and Andreas SPEER (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007), pp. 215-257 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Marcus HELLYER, *Catholic Physics. Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005) (= H)

S 215-216 = H 22; S 218 = H 22; S 219-220 = H 23

(2) João MADEIRA, *Pedro da Fonseca’s Isagoge Philosophica and the Predicables from Boethius to the Lovanienses* [Ph.D. thesis; “Promotor: Prof. Dr. Martin W.F. Stone”] (Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Hoger Instituut voor Wijsbegeerte, November 2006) (= M)

S 229 = M 1; S 230 = M 1-2; S 231 = M 2; S 232 = M 2-3; S 233 = M 3-4; S 234 = M 5; S 235 = M 5-6, 5; S 236 = M 6; S 237 = M 6-7; S 241-242 = M 7

(3) Nuno DA SILVA GONÇALVES, S.J., “Jesuits in Portugal”, in *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture, 1573-1580*, ed. Thomas M. MCCOOG, S.J. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu & St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), pp. 705-744 (= G)

S 238 = G 731; S 239 = G 731-732

(4) António Manuel MARTINS, “Liberdade e autonomia em Fonseca”, in *Mediaevalia. Textos e Estudos*, 7-8 (1995), pp. 515-527 (= MM)

S 242 = MM 515; S 243 = MM 515-516; S 244 = MM 516-517; S 245 = MM 517; S 246 = MM 517-518; S 247 = MM 518, 520; S 248 = MM 520-521; S 249 = MM 521, 522; S 250 = MM 522, 523; S 251 = MM 524, 525; S 252 = MM 525

#### EXAMPLES:

MADEIRA, p. 5: “At his own request, Fonseca was relieved of teaching activities in 1562, in order to devote himself to the necessary research and writing of his part of the commentaries on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry and on the *Categories* of Aristotle. However, he still had other responsibilities within the Order. One of his tasks was to write a textbook to be utilised as an introduction to philosophy....”

STONE, p. 234: “At his own request, Fonseca was relieved of teaching activities in 1562, in order to devote himself to the necessary research and writing of his part of the commentaries on the ‘Isagoge’ of Porphyry and Aristotle’s ‘Categories’. However, he still had other responsibilities within the Jesuit order. One of his allotted tasks was to write a textbook to be used as an introduction to philosophy....”

MARTINS, p. 525: “Fonseca esquematiza os diversos aspectos estruturantes da acção humana em sete momentos distintos nos quais razão vontade colaboram e interagem. É importante não perder de vista que estamos perante uma compreensão teleológica do agir humano que se supõe compatível com uma teoria do bem fortemente hierarquizada. Quanto aos momentos principais

<sup>11</sup> Carlos STEEL contributed to the identification of sources for this entry.

da acção humana, considerada genericamente....”

STONE, pp. 251-252: “Fonseca schematises the diverse aspects of action in seven distinct moments in which reason and will interact and then collaborate [...]. It is important to appreciate that this scheme presents a teleological understanding of human action which is predicated on a hierarchical theory of the good. With respect to the principal moments of human action considered generically....”

---

### Case 34 (2007)

M.W.F. STONE, “The Nature and Significance of Law in Early Modern Scholasticism”, in *A Treatise of Legal Philosophy and General Jurisprudence*, vol. 6: *A History of the Philosophy of Law from the Ancient Greeks to the Scholastics*, ed. Fred MILLER, Jr. (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), pp. 335-365 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Arthur P. MONAHAN, *From Personal Duties towards Personal Rights. Late Medieval and Early Modern Political Thought, 1300-1600* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994) (= M)

S 337 = M 145-146; S 338 = M 146-147; S 339 = M 147-148

(2) Anthony PAGDEN and Jeremy LAWRENCE, “Introduction”, in *Vitoria: Political Writings*, ed. Anthony PAGDEN and Jeremy LAWRENCE (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. xiii-xxviii (= PL)

S 339 = PL xiv; S 340 = PL xiv, xv; S 341 = PL xv-xvi; S 342 = PL xxiii, xxiv; S 343 = PL xxiv-xxv, xxv-xxvi; S 344 = PL xxvi-xxvii

(3) Bernice HAMILTON, *Political thought in sixteenth-century Spain. A study of the political ideas of Vitoria, De Soto, Suárez, and Molina* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963) (= H)

S 339 = H 12; S 350 = H 182-183

(4) Marcello SÁNCHEZ-SORONDO, “Vitoria: The Original Philosopher of Rights”, in *Hispanic Philosophy in the Age of Discovery*, ed. Kevin WHITE (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997), pp. 59-68 (= S-S)

S 341 = S-S 62, 63; S 342 = S-S 63, 64

(5) Annabel S. BRETT, *Liberty, right and nature. Individual rights in later scholastic thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) (= B)

S 345 = B 142-143; S 346 = B 143, 145, 147, 150; S 347 = B 155, 156

(6) [“Front Matter”] in *Bartolomé de Las Casas, A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*, ed. and trans. Nigel GRIFFIN; introduction by Anthony PAGDEN (London: Penguin Books, 1992), pp. i-ii (= GP)

S 347-348 = GP i

(7) Mauricio BEUCHOT, O.P., *The History of Philosophy in Colonial Mexico*, trans. Elizabeth MILLÁN (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998) (= Be)

S 348 = Be 28, 29, 32, 33; S 349 = Be 35

(8) Frank Bartholomew COSTELLO, S.J., *The political philosophy of Luis de Molina, S.J. (1535-1600)* (Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. 38; Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I., 1974) (= C)

S 351 = C 202-203, 204, 205; S 352 = C 205, 206, 207, 208; S 353 = C 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 218, 219, 223; S 354 = C 223, 224

(9) Reijo WILENIUS, *The social and political theory of Francisco Suárez* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen

Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino, 1963) (= W)

S 356 = W 39, 40, 41; S 361 = W 66, 68; S 362 = W 41-42

EXAMPLE:

COSTELLO, pp. 203-204: "It was Soto who substituted *respublica* for *communitas* to remove any doubt that St. Thomas had meant a perfect society and not just any community. Statutes and other legislative acts of communities less than a perfect commonwealth are not to be considered laws in the strict sense."

STONE, p. 351: "It was Soto who had substituted *respublica* for *communitas* in order to remove any doubt that Aquinas had meant his definition of law to be applied to a perfect society and not just any legislative community. For Molina, the statutes and legislative acts of any society that fall below the standards of a perfect commonwealth are not to be considered laws in the strict sense of that term."

---

### Case 35 (2009)<sup>12</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, "Conscience in Renaissance moral thought: a concept in transition?", in *Renaissance Studies* 23:4 (2009), pp. 423-444 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Rudolf Branko HEIN, "*Gewissen*" bei Adrian von Utrecht (*Hadrian VI.*), Erasmus von Rotterdam und Thomas More: Ein Beitrag zur systematischen Analyse des Gewissensbegriffs in der katholischen nordeuropäischen Renaissance (Studien der Moralthologie 10; Münster: Lit Verlag, 1999) (= H1)

S 430-432 = H1 228-232; S 433-434 = H1 233-234

(2) Rudolf Branko HEIN, "Conscience: Dictator or Guide? – Meta-Ethical and Biographical Reflections in the Light of a Humanist Concept of Conscience", in *Moral Theology for the Twenty First Century: Essays in Celebration of Kevin Kelly*, ed. Julie CLAGUE, Bernard HOOSE and Gerard MANNION (London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 34-50 (= H2)

S 434 = H2 38; S 435 = H2 38, 39; S 436 = H2 39; S 437 = H2 39; S 438 = H2 39, 40; S 439 = H2 40; S 440 = H2 40, 41-42; S 441 = H2 42; S 442 = H2 42; S 443 = H2 42, 43

EXAMPLES:

HEIN, "*Gewissen*", p. 229: "Dabei gründet er sich auf eine Textversion bei Ambrosius, der an betreffender Stelle *corde puro* verwendet habe. *Cor* bezeichnet hier also das sittlich handelnde Subjekt selbst, welches durch das zugefügte Adjektiv (*simplex / purus*) in seiner Ganzheit sittlich qualifiziert wird. Man möchte einen ähnlichen Bedeutungshorizont vermuten, wo von einem Menschen die Rede ist, der *bona conscientia* einen um Rat suchenden zu gelehrteren Menschen schicken könne, obwohl er wisse, daß diese eine ihm entgegengesetzte Meinung vertreten. Da diese 'klassische' Wendung nicht wieder erneut auftaucht, läßt sich allenfalls mutmaßen, daß *conscientia* hier wiederum dem sittlich agierenden Subjekt zugeordnet ist, auf dessen Integrität bzw. aufrechte sittliche Überzeugung mit dem Adjektiv *bona* abgehoben werden soll...."

STONE, pp. 430-431: "He bases this view on a version of the text occurring in Ambrose, who quoted the term as *cor purus* or 'pure heart', where *cor* signifies the actual subject of the moral action, which is then qualified by the adjective that accompanies it such as *simplex* ('simple') or *purus* ('pure'). A similar attitude seems to be present in Adrian's discussion of the issue whether a person could in 'good conscience' (*bona conscientia*) send someone to seek the

---

<sup>12</sup> Rudolf Branko HEIN contributed with material for this entry.

advice of learned authorities, even though he knows that these individuals hold an opinion contrary to his own. Here we can surmise that *conscientia* also relates to the subject of the moral act, the adjective *bona* emphasizing that person's integrity or righteous moral conviction."

HEIN, "Conscience", p. 38: "*Lex naturalis*: inherent in the human mind, it is accessible to the enlightened intellect. Material content: the first formal principle,<sup>22</sup> the Golden Rule, God is to be venerated." [Hein, p. 45, n. 22: "Quis primo gustavit bonum? Intellectus, qui rationem concepit boni dormiente etiam voluntate... Primum propositum est in intellectu atque est eiusmodi: bonum quo caremus comparandum (Marsilio Ficino, *Comm. in Phil.*, cap. 37, in *Marsilio Ficino: The Philebus Commentary* [ed. and trans. M.J.B. Allen; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1975; reprint 1979, with corrections], p. 375)."]

STONE, p. 435: "After the *lex divina* was the natural law (*lex naturalis*). Inherent in the human mind, it was made accessible to the intellect enlightend [sic] by divine light. Its material content was its first formal principle, the 'golden rule' for Ficino, that God is to be venerated.<sup>73</sup> [Stone, p. 435, n. 73: "Ficino, *Comm. in Phil.*, cap. 37, in *Marsilio Ficino: The Philebus Commentary*, ed. and trans. M. J. B. Allen (Berkeley, London & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975; reprint, 1979), 375: 'Quis primo gustavit bonum? Intellectus, qui rationem concepit boni dormiente etiam voluntate.... Primum propositum est in intellectu atque est eiusmodi: bonum quo caremus comparandum.'"]

---

### Case 36 (2009)

M.W.F. STONE, "Ruard Tapper (1487-1559) on *liberum arbitrium*: Biblical Exegesis, Scholastic Theology, and Fighting the Cause of the Counter Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Louvain", in *Infant Milk or Hardy Nourishment? The Bible for Lay People and Theologians in the Early Modern Period* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 221), ed. W. FRANÇOIS and A.A. DEN HOLLANDER (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), pp. 243-296 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Rev. Valentine J. PETER, *The Doctrine of Ruard Tapper (1487-1559) Regarding Original Sin and Justification. Pars dissertationis ad Lauream in Facultate S. Theologiae apud Pontificiam Universitatem S. Thomae de Urbe* (Roma: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a S. Thoma Aq. in Urbe, 1965) (= P)

S 250 = P 19; S 251 = P 22, 21; S 252 = P 23, 24; S 253 = P 24, 25; S 254 = P 25, 26, 28; S 255 = P 28, 29, 27; S 256 = P 27-28, 122; S 257 = P 122-123; S 258 = P 30; S 277 = P 123, 124, 54, 26; S 278 = P 37-38; S 279 = P 38; S 280 = P 39, 26, 40; S 281 = P 40-41; S 282 = P 41-42; S 283 = P 42-43; S 284 = P 43; S 286 = P 44; S 287 = P 44-45; S 288 = P 45-46; S 289 = P 46-47; S 290 = P 48-49; S 291 = P 49-50; S 292 = P 50-51; S 293 = P 51-52; S 294 = P 52-54; S 295 = P 54

(2) Antonino POPPI, "Fate, Fortune, Providence and Human Freedom", in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. SCHMITT, Quentin SKINNER and Eckhard KESSLER (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 641-667 (= Po)

S 262 = Po 652, 653; S 263 = Po 654, 655, 660, 661, 654; S 264 = Po 661; S 265 = Po 661-662; S 266 = Po 662; S 268 = Po 663; S 269 = Po 663, 664; S 270 = Po 665, 666; S 271 = Po 666; S 272 = Po 666

(3) B.A. GERRISH, *The Old Protestantism and the New. Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark/Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982) (= G)

S 265 = G 11-12, 273 n. 7

(4) Richard A. MULLER, *The Unaccommodated Calvin. Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) (= M)

S 271-272 = M 166

(5) Anthony N.S. LANE, "Introduction", in *John Calvin, The Bondage and Liberation of the Will. A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighius*, ed. A.N.S. LANE, trans. G.I. DAVIES (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996), pp. xiii-xxxiv (= La1)

S 272-273 = La1 xviii

(6) Anthony N.S. LANE, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) (= La2)

S 274 = La2 183

(7) John L. MURPHY, *The Notion of Tradition in John Driedo* (Milwaukee, WI: The Seraphic Press, 1959) (= Mur)

S 275 = Mur 37; S 276 = Mur 37, 38

EXAMPLE:

PETER, pp. 52-53: "Because Tapper here indicates that sanctifying grace is an entitive habit rather than an operative one and because he says that from it flow the operative habits or virtues, one is led to conclude that for him sanctifying grace and charity are distinct as an entitive habit is distinct from an operative habit. Once again he does not come right out and state this point blank but it is his meaning. Note too that he only says it is the more probable opinion that sanctifying grace is not an operative habit."

STONE, p. 294: "Because Tapper indicates here that sanctifying grace is an entitive habit rather than an operative one, and because he says it flows from the virtues, one is led to conclude that for him sanctifying grace and charity are distinct as an entitive habit is distinct from an operative habit. Note too that he only says it is "the more probable opinion" that sanctifying grace is not an operative habit."

---

### Case 37 (2009)

M.W.F. STONE, "The Care of Souls and 'Practical Ethics'", in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Robert PASNAU, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 517-535 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Jean DUNBABIN, *A Hound of God: Pierre de la Palud and the Fourteenth-Century Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) (= D)

S 521 = D 32, 43-44

(2) Clarence GALLAGHER, S.J., *Canon Law and the Christian Community: The Role of Law in the Church According to the Summa Aurea of Cardinal Hostiensis* (Analecta Gregoriana 208; Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1978) (= G)

S 522 = G 130-131

(3) Hughes Oliphant OLD, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, vol. 3: *The Medieval Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999) (= O)

S 524-525 = O 330-331

(4) Edwin D. CRAUN, *Lies, slander, and obscenity in Medieval English literature: Pastoral rhetoric and the deviant speaker* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) (= C)

S 525-526 = C 12

(5) D. Catherine BROWN, *Pastor and laity in the theology of Jean Gerson* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) (= B)

S 533-534 = B 66-67

(6) J.B. WALKER, "Antoninus, St.", in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 1 (2nd ed.; Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2003), pp. 536a-537b (= W)

S 534 = W 537b

EXAMPLES:

GALLAGHER, pp. 130-131: "Hostiensis was, however, equally insistent that true justice must always be tempered by compassion and administered in a humane manner. While it is true that a judge is not free to alter at will statutory penalties clearly enacted by the law, he does have greater freedom where no such legal limitations exist, and in these cases Hostiensis urges him always to observe equity and adopt the course that will prove to be more humane in the circumstances.... He should always exercise compassion, even when he has to inflict punishment.... the need to temper justice with compassion is a theme that runs through the whole of the *Summa*."

STONE, p. 522: "According to Hostiensis, justice must always be tempered by compassion and administered in a humane manner. While a judge is not free to alter at will statutory penalties clearly enacted by the law, he does have greater freedom where no such legal limitations exist, and in these cases, Hostiensis urges him always to observe equity and adopt the course that will prove to be more kindhearted in the circumstances. Thus the judge should exercise compassion, even when he has to inflict punishment. The need to temper justice with compassion is a theme that runs throughout the *Summa aurea*."

CRAUN, p. 12: "'Predicare' was itself a broad term. It did, of course, signify delivering sermons, which increased in number and status during the thirteenth century. But it also conveyed, more generally, teaching others how to live a Christian life – catechesis in any form, like direct instruction and questions during confession. In all these ways, preaching was the principal means used by priests to move the laity (and, sometimes, other priests) to contrition and, then, to auricular confession. After the Fourth Lateran Council had required annual auricular confession and communion of all Christians, English diocesan statutes established a clear connection between preaching about sin in the vernacular and confession. For example, a statute from Worcester (1240) states that, since observing the Decalogue and fleeing the Seven Sins are necessary [sic] to salvation, they must assume an important role in confession, and they must be preached frequently to the people."

STONE, pp. 525-526: "...*predicare* (preaching) was a broad term. While in the first instance it signified preaching and delivering sermons – which increased in number and status as the thirteenth century developed – it also conveyed more generally teaching others how to live a Christian life, being a form of *catechesis* directly related to confessional practice. In this way, preaching was the principal means used to move the laity (and indeed other priests) to contrition, and then to confession. After the Fourth Lateran Council had required annual confession of all Christians, English diocesan statutes (to cite one example among countless others) established a clear connection between confession and preaching about sin in the vernacular. A statute from Worcester in 1240 states, for instance, that since "the Decalogue and fleeing the Seven Sins are necessary for salvation," they must assume an important role in confession, and they must be preached frequently to the people."

---

**Case 38 (2009)**

M.W.F. STONE, "Punch's riposte: the Irish contribution to early modern Scotism from Maurice

O’Fihely OFMConv. to Anthony Rourke OFMObs.”, in *The Irish Contribution to European Scholastic Thought*, ed. James MCEVOY and Michael DUNNE (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 137-191 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Fr. Cathaldus GIBLIN, OFM, “Hugh MacCaghwell OFM and Scotism at St. Anthony’s College, Louvain”, in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti. Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburgi 11-17 sept. 1966 celebrati*, vol. 4: *Scotismus decursu saeculorum* (Studia Scholastico-Scotistica 4; Roma: Commissio Scotistica, 1968), pp. 375-397 (= G)

S 147 = G 384, 395 & n. 83; S 156 = G 381, 379-380, 370 n. 27; S 167 = G 392, 380, 392; S 168 = G 392, 396 & n. 86; S 169 = G 396 & n. 84; S 170 = G 386-387, 388; S 171 = G 388-389

(2) Rev. Fr. Charles BALIC, O.F.M., *John Duns Scotus. Some reflections on the occasion of the seventh centenary of his birth* (Rome: Scotistic Commission, 1966) (= B)

S 148 = B 9, 10

(3) Fr. Benignus MILLET, OFM, “Irish Scotists at St. Isidore’s College, Rome, in the Seventeenth Century”, in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti. Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburgi 11-17 sept. 1966 celebrati*, vol. 4: *Scotismus decursu saeculorum* (Studia Scholastico-Scotistica 4; Roma: Commissio Scotistica, 1968), pp. 399-419 (= M)

S 173 = M 400, 401

EXAMPLES:

GIBLIN, pp. 388-389: “It is worthy of note that Hickey used the text of the fourth book of *Sentences* which had been corrected and emended by his master MacCaghwell in 1620, and that he followed verbatim the scholia or divisions of the text adopted by his former master.... Apart from his *Nitela Franciscanae Religionis* which he published at Lyons in 1627 under the pseudonym Dermitius Thaddaeus..., he was also the author of a work on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.”

STONE, p. 171: “Hickey used the text of the fourth book which had been corrected and emended by Cavellus in 1620, and followed verbatim the *scholia* adopted by his former teacher. Apart from his polemical *Nitela Franciscanae Religionis*, which he published under the pseudonym Dermitius Thaddaeus, Hickey also published a work on the Immaculate Conception.”

MILLET, p. 401: “Three opuscles, in octavo, on the death, the redemption and the baptism of Our Lady were published in Rome in 1655-1656 and were a by-product of Wadding’s labours, as a member of the Spanish mission, to promote the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The first and second of these little works are a commentary on the Scotist teaching concerning the preservative redemption of the Virgin Mary.”

STONE, p. 173: “Three other *opuscula* on the death, the redemption, and the baptism of the Virgin Mary, were published in Rome between 1655-1656, and yet again were the by-product of Wadding’s membership of the Spanish mission. The first and second of these tracts purport to be a commentary on Scotus’ own teaching concerning the preservative redemption of the Virgin Mary....”

---

### Case 39 (2009)<sup>13</sup>

M.W.F. STONE, “Adrian of Utrecht As a Moral Theologian”, in *De paus uit de lage landen. Adrianus VI 1459-1523. Catalogus bij de tentoonstelling ter gelegenheid van het 550ste ge-*

---

<sup>13</sup> Rudolf Branko HEIN contributed with material for this entry.



*boortejaar van Adriaan van Utrecht* (Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia 27), ed. Michiel VERWEIJ (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), pp. 19-44 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Rudolf Branko HEIN, “Gewissen” bei Adrian von Utrecht (Hadrian VI.), *Erasmus von Rotterdam und Thomas More: Ein Beitrag zur systematischen Analyse des Gewissensbegriffs in der katholischen nordeuropäischen Renaissance* (Studien der Moralthologie 10; Münster: Lit verlag, 1999) (= H)

S 21-28 = H 176-181; S 29 = H 192, 195; S 30 = H 196, 197 & n. 149; S 31-32 = H 197-198; S 33 = H 199 & n. 156; S 34-36 = H 200-202; S 37 = H 202, 203 & n. 178; S 38-42 = H 228-234

EXAMPLE:

HEIN, p. 176: “Aus einer sehr wohlhabenden Familie stammend, hatte Groote schnell die ersten Stufen der kirchlichen Karriereleiter erklimmt (Studium in Paris, 1358 dort Graduierung als MA, diplomatische Missionen, Kanonikate und Pfründe), bis er 1370 durch die Begegnung mit einem ehemaligen Studienfreund, dem Prior des Karthäuserklosters von Monnikhuizen zur Besinnung kommt. Er tritt dem Konvent für einige Jahre als Donatus bei und vertieft sich neben seiner täglichen körperlichen Arbeit in die Schriften der Mystiker und des Johannes Ruysbroek (1293-1381).”

STONE, pp. 21-22: “Having the good fortune to be born into a family of means, Groote completed the first stages of an ecclesiastical career (studies in Paris, MA there in 1358, diplomatic missions, canonry and benefices), until he was led to a spiritual conversion by a meeting with a former student friend, the Prior of the Carthusian monastery of Monnikhuizen. He entered this institution for a few years taking the name of Donatus, and alongside his daily round of manual work and prayer made a deep study of the works of mystical writers, especially John of Ruysbroeck (1293-1381).”

---

#### Case 40 (2009)

M.W.F. STONE, “The theological and philosophical accomplishments of the Irish Franciscans: from Flaithrí Ó Maoil Chonaire to Bonaventure Baron”, in *The Irish Franciscans 1534-1990*, ed. Edel BHREATHNACH, Joseph MACMAHON OFM and John MCCAFFERTY (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp. 201-220 (= S), plagiarizes:

(1) Fr. Cathaldus GIBLIN, OFM, “Hugh MacCaghwell OFM and Scotism at St. Anthony’s College, Louvain”, in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti. Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburgi 11-17 sept. 1966 celebrati*, vol. 4: *Scotismus decursu saeculorum* (Studia Scholastico-Scotistica 4; Roma: Commissio Scotistica, 1968), pp. 375-397 (= G)

S 206 = G 384; S 208 = G 379, 380; S 213 = G 392, 380; S 214 = G 387; S 215 = G 387, 388-389

(2) Fr. Benignus MILLET, OFM, “Irish Scotists at St. Isidore’s College, Rome, in the Seventeenth Century”, in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti. Acta Congressus Scotistici Internationalis Oxonii et Edimburgi 11-17 sept. 1966 celebrati*, vol. 4: *Scotismus decursu saeculorum* (Studia Scholastico-Scotistica 4; Roma: Commissio Scotistica, 1968), pp. 399-419 (= M)

S 216 = M 401

EXAMPLES:

GIBLIN, pp. 388-389: “It is worthy of note that Hickey used the text of the fourth book of *Sentences* which had been corrected and emended by his master MacCaghwell in 1620, and that he followed verbatim the scholia or divisions of the text adopted by his former master.... Apart from his *Nitela Franciscanae Religionis* which he published at Lyons in 1627 under the pseu-

donym Dermitius Thaddaeus..., he was also the author of a work on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.”

STONE, p. 215: “Hickey used the text of the fourth book which had been corrected and emended by Mac Aingil in 1620, and followed verbatim the *scholia* adopted by his former teacher. Apart from his polemical *Nitela Franciscanae Religionis* which he published under the pseudonym Dermitius Thaddaeus, which as we noted earlier sought to defend the honour of his order, Scotus, and former teacher Mac Aingil, Hickey also published a work on the Immaculate Conception.”

MILLET, p. 401: “Three opuscles, in octavo, on the death, the redemption and the baptism of Our Lady were published in Rome in 1655-1656 and were a by-product of Wadding’s labours, as a member of the Spanish mission, to promote the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The first and second of these little works are a commentary on the Scotist teaching concerning the preservative redemption of the Virgin Mary.”

STONE, p. 216: “Three other short works on the death, the redemption, and the baptism of the Virgin Mary, were published in Rome between 1655-6, and yet again, were the by-product of Wadding’s membership of the Spanish mission. The first and second of these tracts purport to be a commentary on Scotus’ own teaching concerning the preservative redemption of the Virgin Mary....”

Michael V. DOUGHERTY (Columbus, OH),  
Pernille HARSTING (København)  
and Russell L. FRIEDMAN (Leuven)<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Michael V. DOUGHERTY is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Ohio Dominican University, USA; Pernille HARSTING is General Editor of *Rhetorical Review*, Denmark (and a former Associate Research Professor of Classics at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark, and Associate Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Örebro, Sweden); Russell L. FRIEDMAN is Associate Professor of Philosophy at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.