



The Academic Family Tree of Ian M. Church
PhD, St Andrews-Stirling Joint Programme, 2012
αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν



Notes

- Solid lines highlight supervisory relationships, such that if X is (i) connected to Y by a line and (ii) is below Y, then X was Y's supervisor. Dotted lines, like those connecting Kant to Hume or Beza to Calvin, signify significant, personal influences. While strictly not a part of this academic tree, these influences were noted due to the historical significance of these figures. The academic ancestors of Calvin and Hume are not explored here.
- The different colored lines used in this chart correspond to the sources that document the represented supervisory relationships. Orange represents information that was found on the Philosophy Family Tree database. Blue represents information that is found on the Mathematics Genealogy Project database. And yellow represents information that can be found on other sources (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia Britannica, etc.). Multiple sources were required to confirm yellow supervisory relationships (i.e. we can't just take Wikipedia's word for it).
- Not all supervisory relationships are listed. Many people had multiple supervisors for their graduate degree(s). I chose to only list those "lineages" I was most interested in.
- In general, supervisory relationships are simply understood in terms of who someone's official supervisor was for their doctoral work. In some cases, other formal mentoring relationships were also included (as in postdoctoral supervision); however, simply being significantly influenced by a contemporary does not count as being supervised by that person. For example, while Kant was significantly influenced by Hume, that does not mean that Hume counts as one of Kant's supervisors.
- In cases where (i) someone did not obtain a doctorate degree but (ii) clear, analogous supervisory-type relationships can be found, those analogous relationships are listed.
- As would be expected, formal supervisory relationships become increasingly difficult to accurately track the further back in history we go. Not only because the historical record becomes increasingly

- spotty—occasionally giving way to tradition, here-say, and a bit of speculation—but also because formal, contemporary understandings of supervisory relationships have to be reinterpreted.
- A few of the relationships listed here deserve additional comment:
- Anscombe did not officially complete a doctoral degree, however she studied with Wittgenstein extensively as a postgraduate student (1942-1946) and was one of his closest students and friends. She was even named as one of three literary executors of Wittgenstein's estate.
- Russell did not obtain a doctorate degree, but we can plausibly see both Ward and Whitehead as bearing the analogous supervisory relationship to Russell. Both Ward and Alfred Whitehead were the two fellowship examiners for Bertrand Russell at Cambridge. Moore collaborated with Russell extensively on their monumental work, *Principia Mathematica* (1910, 1912, 1913). Russell himself identified Ward as his "chief teacher in philosophy" (*Portraits from Memory*, 1956, pg 61).
- The connection between Christian Hermann Weisse and Johann Fichte (and subsequently the Kant and Leibniz line) is a bit convoluted. Several sources list Immanuel H. Fichte as a supervisor of Weisse insofar as I.H. Fichte provided extensive and formative epistolary correspondence to Weisse early in his career. And I.H. Fichte was the son and student of Johann Fichte.
- While it's broadly agreed that Oresme was taught by Buridan in some capacity (and was deeply influenced by the work of both Buridan and Ockham), the extent of the mentoring relationship is the subject of some scholarly debate. While many sources list Ockham as Buridan's supervisor, the evidence for the supervisory relationships leading to Ockham (and through to Hales) seems to be primarily based on tradition.

