



## Paul of Pyskowice's autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant\**

Hanna WOJTCZAK\*\*

### ABSTRACT

The subject of the present article is a critical edition of an autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* by Paweł of Pyskowice († ca. 1467), an eminent Kraków scholar. The question is preserved on a loose two-leaf fold and is now attached to Paul's commentary on *Isagoge* contained in cod. BJ 1900, held in the manuscript collection of the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow. This question, however, does not form a coherent part of cod. BJ 1900. On the basis of the hand testimony and taking into account the fact that the quire was not bound together with the codex, the probable time frame of the *quaestio* with its accompanying glosses is 1423–1445. The degree of originality of this autonomous question cannot be determined at the present stage of research, nor has a text been found that may have been a direct source for Paul. Only two fragments incorporated by Paul without any references have been identified. Their ultimate source is Albert the Great. There are two apparatuses in the edition: *fontium*, which contains the identification of direct and indirect quotations of the source texts; editorial, which shows corrections, deletions, additions, marginal glosses and *lacunae* due to paper decay.

### KEYWORDS

Cod. BJ 1900; Albertus Magnus; opinio Platonis, opinio Vicklefistarum, opinio Aristotelis; universale in potentia; universale secundum actum; universale in re, post rem, ante rem; universale pro eius formali/materiali/essentiali significato

---

\* The presented study is one of the results of the project No. 0092/NPRH3/H11/82/2014 entitled *Źródła doktrynalne nauczania ars vetus na Uniwersytecie Krakowskim w I poł. XV wieku. Część pierwsza: Kategorie*, carried out under the National Programme for the Development of the Humanities funded by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (now the Ministry of Education and Science).

\*\* Prof. Ph.D. (habil.) Institute of Philosophy, University of Silesia in Katowice, E-mail: [hanna.wojtczak@us.edu.pl](mailto:hanna.wojtczak@us.edu.pl).

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The subject of the present edition is the autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* by Paweł of Pyskowice († ca. 1467),<sup>1</sup> an eminent Kraków scholar of the first half of the fifteenth century.<sup>2</sup> The question is written and preserved on a loose two-leaf fold and is now attached to Paul's commentary on *Isagoge* contained in cod. BJ 1900, held in the manuscript collection of Jagiellonian Library in Krakow. This question, however, does not form a coherent part of cod. BJ 1900. Nevertheless, the question folio numbering is adjusted to the folio numbering of the cod. BJ 1900.

The codex folios were numbered twice<sup>3</sup> in modern times and the said quire was moved in it; and that is the reason why this issue requires further insight.

According to the old folio numbering, only the leafs belonging to the quire were numbered, while the pastedowns attached to the codex were given the number of the preceding leaf, with the letter extension "a", "b". At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the folio numbering was changed so that it also numbered the pastedowns continuously.

When the old folio numbering was applied, the quire discussed here was placed on f. 22ar–22bv, (i.e. after f. 22v; according to the present numbering f. 24v) and was attached to the question *Utrum universalia realia in essendo sint ponenda*. Now this quire is on f. 31r–32v and is attached to the question *Utrum universalia subsistant, id est utrum universalia sunt substantiae*.

The quire is dimensionally matched to the whole codex but externally differs from its integral leafs. It is darker, and its edges are damaged, with significant paper loss and worn-out folds. It also lacks drawn margins. All this suggests that it functioned independently from the start. It has yet to be discovered when and why it was put into cod. BJ 1900, and one can only say with certainty that it happened after it was bound, i.e. after 1423.

It is also unknown when Paul composed the question recorded in this quire. On the basis of the hand testimony, it can only be said that the main text is written with Paul's younger hand (from the time of his activity at the Faculty of Arts, which he started as a scholar in 1422) but more comprehensively than the entire cod. BJ 1900. In the period of his theological studies (finished in 1445), some marginal glosses, corrections and one sentence at the end (f. 32r) were added by his later hand. The diagram of the division of universals that

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Maciej Stanek Ph.D. who made many helpful suggestions for the improvement of this paper. I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Krystyna Krauze-Błachowicz who kindly read the edition.

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see: Wojtczak, 2018: 15–22; see also: Wojtczak & Krauze-Błachowicz, 2022: 311–328.

<sup>3</sup> During the first folio numbering, a correction was made for folios 30–81, which were originally given numbers 32–83.

follows was also drawn by Paul's hand, but it is difficult to identify the time of its composition. Based on this information, and taking into account the fact that the quire was not bound together with the codex, the probable time frame of the *quaestio* with its accompanying glosses is 1423–1445.

This autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* included in the added quire occupies two and a half pages. Since it was written without the upper, lower and partly outer margins, the fragments of the text in it are lost due to the destruction of the edges of the pages.

Because of the partial destruction of paper, some fragments of the question cannot be reconstructed, most of all in the section, in which Paul presented arguments justifying his conclusions.

The degree of originality of this autonomous question cannot be determined at the present stage of research, nor has a text been found that may have been a direct source for Paul.<sup>4</sup> Only two fragments incorporated by Paul without any references have been identified. Their ultimate source is Albert the Great, although it cannot be said with certainty whether Paul knew them directly or second-hand. The first passage resembles the text from the commentary of Ps.-Thomas Aquinas *De universalibus ‘Universale’*,<sup>5</sup> transcribed with minor changes from Albert the Great's work *De intellectu et intelligibili*,<sup>6</sup> whom, incidentally, Ps.-Thomas Aquinas quotes in this context.<sup>7</sup> The second one has its source in Albert the Great's commentary on *Isagoge*.<sup>8</sup> The very same Albert's passage is also found in the question *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* by Stephen of Páleč<sup>9</sup> and in *Utrum tantum quatuor sunt quaestiones...* by Mauritius de Benessow.<sup>10</sup>

## PRINCIPLES OF EDITION

The edition is based on the only surviving manuscript, cod. BJ 1900. In the text presented here, the spelling has been standardised to Classical Latin. The Punctuation is not taken from any national language, and all the marks are put

<sup>4</sup> One of its fragments was certainly copied, as evidenced by the deletion of the phrase resulting from the *homoioteleuton*; see: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32* (ed. in this issue of *Argument: Biannual Philosophical Journal*, pp. 482–490).

<sup>5</sup> Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus “Universale”*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932).

<sup>6</sup> Albertus Magnus, *De intellectu et intelligibili* (ed. Borgnet, 1890a: 493a–b).

<sup>7</sup> Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, n. 12.

<sup>8</sup> Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b: 24a–b).

<sup>9</sup> For the critical edition of the question, see: Stephanus de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavlíček, 2021: 318–336).

<sup>10</sup> Mauritius de Benessow, *In Isagogen*, qu. 5 (Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, cod. V H 14, f. 8v–9r).

according to logical sense. There are two kinds of quotation marks in the text. Double quotation marks are used for source quotations (both verbatim and *ad sensum*). Single quotation marks are used to indicate the material supposition. Some titles and subtitles were added in square brackets in order to facilitate reading.

There are two apparatuses in the edition:

- *fontium*, which contains the identification of direct and indirect quotations of the source texts;
- *criticus*, which shows corrections, deletions, additions, marginal glosses and *lacunae* due to the decay of paper.

As mentioned above, the leaf on which the question is written has been partly damaged, making it impossible to read some of the glosses and the words ending or beginning individual verses. Missing words or their endings that could be surmised from the context in which they occur have been inserted into the text (signalled by square brackets). In places where reconstruction was impossible, a dagger has been placed to indicate the text destruction.

In several places, conjectures have been introduced, signalled by square brackets, to restore the correct meaning of the text. One of these deserves special attention. It concerns the *notabile* in the section in which Paul discusses three kinds of universale — *ante rem*, *in re* and *post rem* — and the problem regards his classification of the described types into *post rem* and *in re*.

In the *notabile*, he first discusses universals *ante rem*; secondly, he characterises universals understood in terms of their reference to the intellect; thirdly, he presents those with *esse in singularibus*. He calls the universals understood in the second of the ways described as *in re*, while in the third: *post rem*. Such classification deviates from the standard distribution of universals, and, above all, it is incompatible with Paul's characterisation of their different types. This applies especially to the third way of understanding them and to the second possibility within the second way of referring to intellect (*alio modo refertur ad intellectum cognoscentem*). *Corrolarium responsale* to the third conclusion, in which Paul (in the context of Aristotle's universal as inseparable from singulars) refers to the third way of understanding the universal, also indicates the misclassification of universals in the final part of the *notabile*.

The indirect source of this error is probably the treatise of Albert the Great, who considers *formae in re* as second in order, and the ones abstracted by the intellect (*post rem*) as third.<sup>11</sup> In the manuscript, the words “*post rem*” are followed by a proofreading mark, probably introduced by Paul himself. The mark may indicate a transposition of the text or refer to a marginal gloss that was added in the margin. Unfortunately, the margin has been destroyed along

---

<sup>11</sup> See below: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalia subsistant ex cod.* BJ 1900, f. 31r–32 (ed. in this issue of *Argument: Biannual Philosophical Journal*, pp. 482–490).

the entire length of the page, and only insignificant word endings of the gloss remain. It is, therefore, impossible to determine whether Paul wished to reorder the classification elements, having found his notation to be erroneous, or whether he somehow referred to the new division in the gloss.

Given the above analysis, a significant conjecture was introduced, namely, the order of the names of the second (as *post rem*) and third (as *in re*) universals has been changed following their characterisation as presented by Paul.

## DESCRIPTIO MANUSCRIPTI<sup>12</sup>

Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, cod. BJ 1900, Lat., 1423–1424, chart., 22x15,5 cm, ff. 310+I (32v, 42v, 46r, 72v, 77v, 79r–79v, 81v, 87v, 89r–90v, 109v, 116v, 133v, 138v, 156r, 177r–177v, 186v, 224r, 251r–252v, 290v vacua), non minus quam tribus manibus plerumque Pauli de Pyskowice manus exaratus (exceptis ff. 5r–7r, 15r–18r, 45r–45v, 60v–62r, 67r–69v, 72r, 80r–80v, 83r–83v, 91v, 94r, 100v–101v, 150v–106r, 108v–110r, 111r–111v, 125r–127v, 134v–135r, 137v, 139r–139v, 229r–229v, 233r, 236r, 237r–237v, 239v–240v, 243v–244r, 250r–253r, 256v, 268r, 288v–289r, 304v–306v, 309r–310v); integ. sup. int. register studentium Univ. Crac. ex 1467–1469: *Johannes de Palocz, Johannes de Cassovia, Simon de Costan, Ladislaus de Karol, Johannes de Szczemna, Blasius de Tono*, infra una inscriptio *Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth*; integ. inf. int. nomen studentis: *Georgius de Nova Civitate et una partim illegibilis glossa; in f. protect. Ir probationes pennae et quinque notae, prob. ad logicam spectantes; in f. protect. Iv: duae notae de subiecto considerationis philosophiae naturalis et eius distinctione a metaphysica, probationes pennae et maniculis, probatio actus legis cum propriis nominibus: abbas Matthias de Lubin, Johannes noster, Laicus de Posnania*.

1) 1r–30v; 33r–155v: PAULUS DE PYSKOWICE, COMMENTUM SUPER “ISAGOGEN” PORPHYRII cum textu eiusdem (incompleto) necnon quaestionibus, glossis et posterioribus additionibus (fere Pauli de Pyskowice).

(f. 1r–18r: Quaestiones introductoryae in logicam in generali et in Porphyrio in speciali) *Utrum logica sit scientia?*

(f. 18v–149r:<sup>13</sup> Textus Porphyrii) <*C>um sit necessarium*

(f. 18v–151v: Expositio) *Iste liber secundum aliquos principali sui descriptione dividitur in tres tractatus*

<sup>12</sup> Magis particularis descriptio ms. BJ 1900 cf. Wojtczak, 2018: 57–59.

<sup>13</sup> Textus Porphyrii in f. 18v, 22v, 38v, 53v–54r, 63r, 64v, 67r, 71v, 78v, 85r, 86r, 91r, 95v, 98r, 99v, 103r, 104r, 110r, 111v, 112r, 113r, 113v, 114v, 115v, 117v, 118v, 120r, 121v, 123r, 125r, 126v, 127v, 128v, 131r, 132r, 132v, 134r, 137r, 141v, 144r, 149r.

(f. 18v–149r: Quaestiones) *Utrum notitia Porphyrii sit necessaria ad quattuor, scilicet: ad praedicamenta, ad definitionem, ad assigantionem definitionum et ad demonstrationem*

2) 156v–310v: PAULUS DE PYSKOWICE, COMMENTUM SUPER “PRAEDICAMENTA” ARISTOTELIS cum textu eiusdem necnon quaestionibus, glossis et posterioribus additionibus (fere Pauli de Pyskowice).

(f. 156v–161r: Lectio introductory in “Praedicamenta”) *Iste est liber ‘Praedicamentorum’ Aristotelis, cuius subiectum est praedicamentum*

(f. 161r–310r:<sup>14</sup> Textus “Praedicamentorum”) *Aequivoca dicuntur*

(f. 161r–309v: Expositio) *In ista parte Philosophus iam prosequitur primum antepraedicamentum*

(f. 165v–310v: Quaestiones) *Quaeritur, quae sit definitio termini aequivoci*

(f. 310v: Colophon) *Et sic est finis “Praedicamentorum”, pro quo laus et gloria sit Deo glorioso in saecula, benedictae venerandaeque matri suae virginis Mariae Sanctissimae et dilectae(?) virginis beatae Katherinae et sancto patri Stanislao nec non gloriosae dominae Mariae Magdalena. Et haec summa “Praedicamentorum” est finita.*

3) 31r–32r: PAULUS DE PYSKOWICE, QUAESTIO “UTRUM UNIVERSALIA SUBSISTANT” cum glossis marginalibus et posterioribus additionibus manu Pauli de Pyskowice scriptis.

(f. 31r–32r): *Utrum universalia subsistant. Notandum tres sunt quaestiones*

## SIGNA ET ABBREVIATIONES

	initium folii
[...]	correctio/additio editorum
(?)	dubium
abbrev.	abbreviatio, abbreviationis
abs.	absit, absunt
add.	addidit

<sup>14</sup> Textus Aristotelis in f. 161r, 167v, 170r, 173v, 175v, 179r, 180v, 183r, 194v, 197r, 202r, 203r, 204r, 206v, 207v, 208v, 210v, 212v, 216r, 218v, 224v, 226r, 227v, 229r, 229v, 230v, 238r, 240v, 241r, 242v–243r, 246r–v, 249r, 250r, 253r, 253v, 256v, 262r, 264v–265v, 268r, 270v, 272v, 274r, 275r, 277r, 278r, 279r, 285r, 292v, 295r, 296r–v, 301r, 303r, 304r, 304v, 304v–305r, 305r, 305v, 305v–306r, 306r, 306r–v, 306v–307r, 307v, 308r, 308v, 310r.

ann.	annotatio
c.s.	cum signo
cap.	caput
cf.	confer
chart.	charta, chartae
col.	columna, columnae
corr.	correxit
corrup.	corruptus, corruptio
del.	delevit, deletio
dist.	distinctio
dex.	dexter
e.g.	exempli gratia
ed.	editio, edidit
cit.	citatatus
hom.	homoioteleton
infr.	infrascripsit
litt.	littera, litterae
marg.	margo
metr.	metrum
ms.	manuscriptus
n.	nota
nr.	numerus
p.	pagina
praem.	praemisit
prob.	probabiliter
PL	Patrologia Latina
r	recto

rep.	repetitiv
sc.	scilicet
scr.	scripsit
Sent.	Sententiae
sin.	sinister
spec.	specialiter
supr.	suprascriptus
t.	tomus
theol.	theologia
v	verso
†	textus corruptus

## RULES OF QUOTING CLASSICAL SOURCE-TEXTS

The quotations from classical authors deviate from the APA style, and we use the most common — as we believe — way of citing them. For Aristotle's works, besides his name, we recall the title of a given text, its internal structure (Roman number for book and Arabic number for capitulum) and Bekker numbering. In the case of the edited works of medieval scholars, the footnotes contain author's name, the title of the quoted work and its internal structure, and — as minimum — page number occurring in the edition. Finally, while quoting manuscript sources, the footnotes contain not only author's name and the title of quoted work, but also a complete localisation of the manuscript (city and library), its shelfmark and folios-range.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Abbreviations:

ALD = Aristoteles Latinus Database. Turnhout: Union Académique Internationale KUL/BREPOLiS (online).

PL = Migne, J.P. (Ed.). (1841–1865). *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina.* (Vols. 1–217). Parisiis: Migne.

### Manuscript sources:

Mauritium de Benessow, *In Isagogen*. Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, cod. V H 14, ff. 1r–45v.

## Modern editions:

- Albertus Magnus. (1890a). *De intellectu et intelligibili* (vol. 9, pp. 477a–521b). In: A. Borgnet (Ed.). *B. Alberti Magni opera omnia*. Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives.
- Albertus Magnus. (1890b). *Liber de praedicabilibus* (vol. 1, pp. 1a–148b). In: A. Borgnet (Ed.). *B. Alberti Magni opera omnia*. Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives.
- Aristoteles. (1831a). *De anima* (pp. 209a–229b). In: *Aristoteles latine interpretibus variis. Academia Regii Borussica*. Berolini: apud Georgium Reimerum.
- Aristoteles. (1831b). *De caelo* (pp. 143a–165b). In: *Aristoteles latine interpretibus variis. Academia Regii Borussica*. Berolini: apud Georgium Reimerum.
- Aristoteles. (1968). *Analytica posteriora*. (L. Minio-Paluello & B.G. Dod, Eds.). Bruges-Paris: Desclee de Brouwer. [Reprint edition: (1995). Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill)] (=ALD IV.1–4).
- Aristoteles. (1990). *Physica. Translatio vetus*. (F. Bossier & J. Brams, Eds.). (=ALD VII.1).
- Aristoteles. (1995). *Metaphysica*. (G. Vuillemin-Diem, Ed.). Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill (=ALD XXV.3.2).
- Augustinus Hipponensis. (1845). *Soliloquia* (col. 869–904). In: J.P. Migne (Ed.). *Sancti Aureli Augustinus opera omnia. Tomus primus*. Parisiis: Migne (=PL. Vol. 32).
- Boethius. (1934). *De consolatione philosophiae* (=Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 67). (W. Weinberger, Ed.). Wien: Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.
- Iohannes de Fonte. (1974). *Auctoritates Aristotelis Senecae, Boethii, Platonis, Appuleii Africani, Porphyrii et Gilberti Porretani* (pp. 111–335). (J. Hamesse, Ed.). In: J. Hamesse, *Les Auctoritates Aristotelis. Un florilège médiéval: Étude historique et édition critique*, Louvain–Paris: Publications Universitaires — Béatrice Nauwelaerts.
- Petrus Lombardus. (1971). *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*. (T. 1, pars 2). Grottaferrata (Rome): Collegi S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas.
- Ps.-Beda. (1862). *Sententiae* (col. 965–1090). In: J. P.Migne (Ed.). *Venerabilis Bedae opera omnia. Tomus primus*. Parisiis: Migne (=PL Vol. 90).
- Ps.-Thomas de Aquino. (1932). *De universalibus «Universale»*. (C. Ottaviano, Ed.). Romae. Retrieved from: <https://www.corpusthomisticum.org/xun.html> (18.11.2022).
- Stephanus de Palecz. (2021). *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (pp. 318–336). In: O. Pavliček. Stephen of Páleč's works on universals, with a critical edition of his question *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus. Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen age*, 88, 287–336.

## Studies:

- Wojtczak, H. (2018). *Paul of Pyskowice's Commentary on Aristotle's 'Categories'*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Wojtczak, H & Krauze-Błachowicz, K. (2022). Discussion on the existence of universals in the autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* by Paul of Pyskowice preserved in cod. BJ 1900. *Argument. Biannual Philosophical Journal*, 2(12), 311–328.

## PAULUS DE PYSKOWICE

QUAESTIO UTRUM UNIVERSALIA SUBSISTANT  
EX COD. BJ 1900, F. 31R–32V

31r

## 1 [Notabile praeliminare]

Notandum: tres sunt quaestiones in numero a quibus Porphyrius vult se abstinerre. Prima est ‘si est’. Secunda est quaestio ‘quid est’. Tertia est quaestio ‘quia est?’. Et prima communiter subdividi[tur], deinde sunt quattuor.

5 *Sed diceret aliquis*: quare non ponitur quarta quaestio, scilicet ‘propter quid?’ *Respondeatur* quod ideo quia universalia sunt in ratione principii. Principia autem non habent ‘propter quid?’, quia quaerere ‘propter quid Deus est?’ non est quaerere.

10 *Sed dices*: quare prima quaestio non quaerit: utrum sunt in rerum natura vel in mente? *Respondeatur* quod ideo quia non est dubium, quin omnis res mundi sit in anima vel in rerum natura.

## [De tribus opinionibus antiquorum]

Pro quo sciendum est: apud antiquos de universalibus erant tres opiniones de quidditatibus ipsorum.

## 15 [Opinio Platonis]

Prima Platonis qui dixit universalia esse distincta a singularibus secundum esse et secundum rationem. *Et motivum ipsius erat hoc*: sicut est in intelligendo, sic est in essendo; sed sic est quod possumus intelligere hominem praeter hunc et hunc hominem; sic etiam erit in essendo quod una idea est quae est principium cognoscendi, quae est separata secundum esse et secundum rationem. 20 *Etiam* ipse imaginabatur quod [termini] singulares significant res singulares, et termini universales significant res universales. *Tertio* ipse imaginabatur rem universalem significatam per istum terminum ‘homo’ esse separatam ab omnibus hominibus singularibus. *Quarto* dixit illam rem universalem esse ideam et 25 exemplar repraesenta[ns] omnium hominum singularium indifferenter. *Quinto* dixit illam ideam esse perpetuam. *Sexto* dixit quod illud concurreret ad cuiuslibet hominis singularis productionem seu generationem (et [sic] de aliis

5 Similes considerationes de “difficilibus” quaestionibus de quibus Porphyrius vult se absitnere apud Mauritium de Benessow, *In Isagogen*, qu. 5 (*Utrum tantum sunt quattuor quaestiones*), rat. 1 (Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, cod. V H 14, f. 8v).

2 in numero ] *supr.* 4 -tur ] *chart. corrup.* 13 erant ] *rep.* 17 rationem ] *praem.* essentiam *sed del.* 18 quod ] *post scr. non, sed supra non punctum appetat, prob. ut signum del.* 20 quae] *scr.* quare *sed del. et in marg. sin. corr.* 21 termini ] *chart. corrup.* 25 -ns ] *chart. corrup.* 25 quinto ] *corr. ex quarto* 27 sic ] *chart. corrup.*

- speciebus universi) et ad scientiarum acquisitionem, quia tales ideae influebant in animam scientiam. Et sic ipse dixit quod anima fuisse creata cum omni scientia, ut dicitur primo *Posteriorum*. Et ratio eius erat ista, id est: "dans formam dat omnia etc.".
- Sed breviter: ista opinio non valet tenendo communem modum [loquendi de] universalibus, cum sit reprobata a Philosopho septimo *Metaphysicae* et in aliis locis. Etiam ad eam sequitur hanc esse falsam: 'Sor est homo', quod est falsum et contra ipsummet Platonem qui eam concessit. Sed consequentia propositur, quia secundum istam opinionem praedicatum et subiectum istius propositionis supponunt pro diversis, quia subiectum supponit pro homine singulari, praedicatum autem pro homine universalis supponit distincto ab homine singulari. Modo quaelibet propositio affirmativa, cuius subiectum et praedicatum non supponunt pro eodem, est falsa; sed praedicta est huiusmodi; igitur...  
 40 Consequentia tenet in Darii(?). Maior patet ex communi regula logicorum. Sed [minor est] ipsius Platonis.

[Opinio Vicklefistarum]

- Secunda opinio erat Eraclitanorum et Vicklefistarum [quae] imaginabatur subtilius dicens oppositum in aliquo primae opinioni, scilicet quod tale universale [non esset distinctum], sed esset coniunctum singularibus secundum esse et rationem recte (sicut ist[e] terminus 'homo' universalis subordinatur in significando uni conceptui communi indifferenter repraesent[anti] omnium hominum singularium, ita iste terminus 'homo' significat ad extra unam naturam communem seu [universalem], scilicet naturam humanam, non tamen

29–30 Cf. Aristoteles, *Analytica posteriora* I, 71a30–31. 30 Sententia "dans formam dat omnia consequentia formam" vere frequenter allegata fuit apud diversos commentatores, qui diversimodo ascribunt eam: Aristoteli (*Metaphysica* VIII; *De caelo* IV; *Physica* VIII) et Averroei. E.g Ps.-Beda, *Sententiae* (PL 90, col. 986): "Dans formam, dat omnia consequentia formam (VIII Phys.). Intelligitur uno modo: Dans formam dat omnia consequentia necessaria ad formam, modo scire, et virtutes non sunt necessariae ad formam, quia sunt de bene esse ipsius formae, eo quod sint formae accidentales perficientes ipsum intellectum. Alio modo sic intelligitur et melius: Dans formam dat sibi formaliter, vel virtualiter, omnia consequentia formam; nam sic Deus dat scientiam virtualiter, quia creavit formam intellectivam, sic quod habet naturalem inclinationem ad acquirendum scientiam". 32 Diversa loca septimi *Metaphysicae* possunt hic revocari. Cf. e.g. Aristoteles, *Metaphysica* VII, 6, 1031a16–18 quod est contra tertiam probationem hic allegatam; 8, 1033b26–34a1 in isto loco argumentum Aristotelis specialiter est contra sextam probationem hic allegatam; 13, 1039a1, 15, spec. contra probationem secundam. 33 Cf. e.g. Aristoteles, *Metaphysica* XIII, 4, 1079a2–14; 5, 1079b32–1080a1.

28–30 et ad scientiarum ... omnia etc. ] add. in marg. sin. c.s. 31–32 loquendi de ] chart. corrup. 40 Darii ] primo scr. secunda primae postea corr. in tertia primae, sed primae del. et infr. Baroco, quod ultimo corr. 41 minor est ] chart. corrup. 43 Eraclitanorum ] scr. Eraclitarum sed supr. -norum 43 non esset distinctum ] chart. corrup. 45 non esset distinctum ] chart. corrup. 45 coniunctum singularibus ] post esset scr. con(....) singularibus sed del. 46 –e ] chart. corrup. 47 –anti ] chart. corrup. 49 universalem ] chart. corrup.

50 separatam ab hominibus singularibus, sed eis o[mnibus] coniunctam et comunicantem, existentem de substantia eorum), et quod sit idem essentialiter, sed differen[s] suppositaliter.

Pro quo sciendum: tales de ista opinione ponunt differentiam inter suppositum significat[i] et inter significatum termini, quia significatum termini communis vocatur ad quod terminus primo et principaliter est impo[situs] ad significandum, sicut significatum istius termini ‘homo’ est natura communis, videlicet humanitas, sed suppositum significati dicitur illud ad quod terminus secundario est impositus ad significandum Sortem, Platonem etc.

Quomodo imaginantur essentiam divinam esse coniunctam tribus personis  
60 individuis non distinctis essentialiter, sed bene suppositaliter seu personaliter.

Haec opinio, li[cet] sit nimium subtilis et difficilis, tamen ipsa non bene stat, quia secundum eam opporteret concedere quod in eodem tempore et in qualibet parte temporis eadem res esset, etenim(?) esset in diversis locis, verbi gratia eadem humanitas universalis existens in Sorte existente Cracoviae et  
65 Platone existente Pragae. Et sequitur quod eadem esset salv[ata] in Paulo et damnata in Iuda. (Est fatua, quia ponit imaginationem impossibilem; hoc impossibile est apprehendere intellectu in praesenti via, ut patet de sancto Augustino). Et Sor non posset annihilarci nisi individua eiusdem sensu cum ipso annihilarentur, nam essentia eorum vel part[es] eorum annihilarentur, scilicet eadem humanitas. Patet  
70 igitur, quod nullum universale significat aliquam [rem], quae non sit signum mentale, vocale vel scriptum, distinctam a rebus singularibus significatis per eundem universalem. Et notanter dicitur ‘signum’ quod essentiale (?) non sit signum mentale etc., quia nihil prohibet | †

Conclusio: significare conceptum animae † subordinatur(?) in significato  
75 distinctum † a rebus significatis per eundem terminum. Probatur conclusio, quia dato opinato conclusionis hoc esset aliter duorum terminorum(?).

Sed isti sunt improbati, igitur etc.

31v

66–67 Cf. Augustinus Hipponensis, *Soliloquia*, II, 3 (PL 32, col. 886): “una eademque res, et arbor et paries esse non potest. Quamvis enim singulis nobis singula esse videantur, necesse est unum nostrum imaginationem falsam pati”.

50 -mnibus ] chart. corrup., possibiliter etiam -mmino 52 -s ] possibiliter etiam -tem chart. corrup. 54 -i ] chart. corrup. 55 -situs ] chart. corrup. 59 quomodo ] scr. isto modo modo sed corr., id est: del. isto et corr. primum modo in quo, sed signum abbrev. suprapositum non del. 61 -cet ] chart. corrup. 63 esset ] scr. et erit sed corr. 65 -ata ] chart. corrup. 66–67 est fatua ... Augustino ] add. in marg. sin. est fatua, sc. ‘Haec opinio est fatua’. Haec glossa in marg. sin. iuxta verbum Quomodo initium habet sed ad textum Haec opinio...in Iuda refertur. 69 -es ] chart. corrup. 70 rem ] chart. corrup. 72 essentiale ] abbrev. dubia indicat aequale vel aequalis, vel in caelo, in caelis. 73 † ] chart. corrup., abs. circa 12 litt. 74 conclusio ] chart. corrup. 74 † ] signum (1–2 litt) illegibile, chart.corrup. 74–75 conceptum ... significatis ] haec est secunda (fere illegibilis) pars primi versus chart. 31v, quae corrup. est 75 † ] chart.corrup. circa 6 litt. illegibiles. 77 etc. ] post scr. sed tamen pro clariori intellectu istarum sed del., quia haec sententia hom. fuit (vide infra in textu).

[Opinio Aristotelis]

- † Sed tertia est opinio media inter istas duas, et est ipsius Aristotelis, quae est  
 80 melior, consistens in medio, sicut virtus, dicens quod universale est separatum  
 a singularibus secundum rationem, sed non secundum rem seu secundum esse,  
 quia secundum esse est coniunctum singularibus.

[Determinatio Pauli]  
 [Divisio dicendorum]

- 85 Sed tamen pro intellectu clariori istarum opinionum est ponendum unum  
 notable ex quo inferam tres conclusiones pro veritate vel falsitate dictarum  
 opinionum.

[Notabile]

- Pro quo sciendum: universale esse in rebus intelligitur dupliciter. Uno modo  
 90 secundum actum, alio modo secundum potentiam, ut super res fundatur intentio universalitatis.

Modo universale in potentia est sine omni operatione intellectus. Patet, quia illud quod est res cui potest applicari intentio [universalitatis] est in re ante operationem intellectus; sed universale in potentia est huiusmodi; ergo sequitur quod universale in potentia est sine omni operatione intellectus.

Sed universale secundum actum non est sine operatione intellectus. Probatur sic, quia universale in actu potest sumi quantum ad primam intentionem quae est intellectio rei secundum proprium modum essendi rei; universale sumitur quantum ad secundam intentionem qua aliqua res intelligitur esse in pluribus secundum communem et extraneum modum essendi. Modo utroquemodo universale in actu est per abstractionem intellectus a singularibus, quia omnis abstractio est per intellectum agentem, ergo universale est in actu cum operatione intellectus, sed non in potentia. Patet, quia Sor est in potentia universale, sed non in actu, eo quod isto modo est singulare.

105 [De triplici modo considerationis universalis]

Hoc est tantum dicere ex isto notabili quod universale potest tripliciter considerari.

**89–104** De universali considerato secundum actum et secundum potentiam apud Ps.-Thomam de Aquino, *De universalibus ‘Universale’*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932). **106–107** Cf. Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b, p. 24a): “Nos autem quantum sufficit praesenti intentioni ista solventes, dicimus quod universale triplicem habet considerationem, scilicet secundum quod in seipso est natura simplex et invariabilis: et secundum quod refertur ad intelligentiam et secundum quod est in isto vel in illo”. Idem textus

**79** † ] in principio versus (seu in marg. sin.) illegibilis litt., quae prob. ad glossam pertinet. Haec tota glossa propter corrup. chart., illegibilis est. **79** istas ] praem. litt. d sed del. **89** universale ] rep. sed del. **93** universalitatis ] universalis in ms. **103** potentia ] post scr. in sed del.

Uno modo consideratur prout universale est natura simplex invariabilis secundum se dans esse, nomen et rationem, et nihil habens alienae naturae admixtum. Et sic solum ei illa conveniunt quae sunt de definitione eius. Et hoc universale moderni vocant *ante rem*, sicut sunt species rerum in mente divina existentes antequam prodirent in esse. Unde Boethius in *De consolatione philosophiae*: „Pulchrum pulcherrimus ipse mundum gerens mente similemque imaginationem formans”. Et secundum Platonem huiusmodi universalia dicuntur esse ideae etc.

Secundo modo universale consideratur ut refertur ad intellectum, et hoc duplíciter. Universale consideratur ut refertur ad intellectum causantem, scilicet ad intellectum intelligentiae primae agentis, et sic convenit ei quod sit radius simplex purus et immaterialis, incorruptibilis et immobilis. Quod autem istud lumen primae intelligentiae(?) sit in istis inferioribus, ipsi probant auctoritatate Psalmistae: „signatum est lumen vultus tui Domine etc.” Magister (?) in primo(?). Et hoc modo formae dantes esse rebus per modum luminum intelliguntur,

apud Stephanum de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 331–332). 108–110 Istud fragmentum de universalí considerato prout est natura simplex fere verbatim apud Albertum Magnum, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b, p. 24a): “Primo quidem modo simplex est natura, quae dat esse et rationem et nomen, et verissimum est inter omnia quae sunt, nihil habens alienae naturae admixtum, nec conditione alienae naturae variatum”. Idem textus apud Stephanum de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 332). 113–114 Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* III, metr. IX: “Ducis ab exemplo, pulchrum pulcherrimus ipse | Mundum mente gerens, similique in imagine formans” (ed. Weinberger, 1934, p. 63). 116–128 De universalí considerato prout refertur ad intellectum fere verbatim apud Albertum Magnum, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b, p. 24a–b): “Per hoc autem quod est in intellectu, duplíciter consideratur, scilicet aut secundum relationem ad intellectum intelligentiae primae cognoscentis et causantis ipsum, cuius illa natura simplex radius quidam est. Aut secundum relationem ad intellectum per abstractionem cognoscentem ipsum. Et primo quidem modo accedit ipsi radius et lumen intelligentiae agentis esse et simplex et purum esse, et immateriale et immobile et incorporale et incorruptibile, et perfectibile intellectus possibilis, et ejusdem possibilis intellectus esse motivum ad actum: sicut color movet visum ad actum secundum actum lucidi quod est in ipso quando secundum actum color est. Secundum autem relationem quam habet ad intellectum cognoscentem, non causantem, habet quod talis intellectus secundum quod abstrahit ipsum, agit in ipso universalitatem (quam de natura sua ante habuit) per hoc quod separat ipsum a materia et materialibus individuitatis. Et sic intelligitur quod dicit Aristoteles, quod universale est dum intelligitur: particulare vero dum sentitur. Et illud Avicennae dictum, quod intellectus in formis agit universalitatem”. Idem textus apud Stephanum de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 332). 121 Ps. 4, 7. 121 Cf. Petrus Lombardus, *Sent.* 1, dist. 1, cap. 1 (ed. Grottaferrata, 1971, p. 55).

108 uno ] corr. ex primo 111 rerum ] post scr. aeterne, sed del. 113 mente ] supr. rebus, sed istud verbum est prob. fragmentum glossae, quae iuxta hanc versum, in marg. sin., appareat. Sed haec glossa praeter rebus illegibilis est. 120 intelligentiae ] supr. 121 Magister in primo ] supr. c.s., quod indicat locum ante verbum inferioribus; sed illo loco haec sententia sensum non facit.

- quemadmodum lumen incorporeum extremitati [corporis] creati(?) causat colorem. Alio modo refertur ad intellectum cognoscentem ipsum, sicut est ipse intellectus humanus, et sic convenit ei quod intellectus in eo agat universalitatem in rebus separando ipsum universale a materialibus et individuitatibus. Et hoc est, quod dicit Aristoteles: „universale est dum intelligitur, particulare vero dum sentitur”. Et sic convenient ei praedicata intentionalia, ut ‘universale est genus’, ‘universale est species’ etc.
- 130 Tertio modo universale principaliter consideratur secundum quod habet esse in singularibus, scilicet in isto aut in isto supposito, et sic sibi convenit esse individuatum particularisatum. Et sic sibi multa accidentunt secundum condicionem materiae, eo quod infinita uni accidentunt (secundo *Physicorum* tractatu secundo). Et [universale secundo modo] vocatur secundum Modernos universale *post rem* †, eo quod fit(?) per abstractionem intellectus a singularibus. Sed universale [tertio] modo vocatur *universale in re*, et est naturalis similitudo existens in ipsis singularibus.

**127–128** Cf. Aristoteles, *Physica* I, 5, 189a5–8; cf. Iohannes de Fonte, *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, 1974, p. 142, nr. 27): “communiter dicitur universale dum intelligitur, particulare dum sentitur”. **130–133** De universalis considerato secundum quod habet esse in singularibus fere verbatim apud Albertum Magnum, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b, p. 24a): “Per hoc autem quod est in isto vel in illo, multa accidentunt ei secundum esse quorum primum est, quod est particulatum et individuatum: secundum, quod est multiplicabile, vel multiplicatum tertium autem, quod est incorporatum, et habens in se diversas passiones quibus est subjectum, et alia hujusmodi quia materiae infinita accidentunt”. Idem textus apud Stephanum de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 332). **133** Cf. Aristoteles, *Physica* II, 5, 196b28–29; cf. Iohannes de Fonte, *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, 1974, p. 146, nr. 76). **134–136** Ista assignatio (tertius modus *ut post rem*; secundus modus *ut in re*) videtur esse error, qui prob. causatus fuit mediate ex textu Alberti Magni, sc. Albertus primum enumerat tres modos considerationis universalis hoc ordine: primum *ut natura simplex*; secundum *ut refertur ad intellectum*; tertium *ut est in isto vel in illo* (vide supra ann. 13). Sed postea considerat ipsa in altero ordine, sc. primum *ut natura simplex*; secundum *ut est in isto vel in isto*; tertium *ut refertur ad intellectum*. Cf. Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b, p. 24b): “Et hoc est quod dixerunt antiqui triplices esse formas, ante rem scilicet, quae sunt formae secundum se acceptae, principia rerum existentes: et in re sive cum re ipsa, quae sunt formae existentes in ipsis, dantes eis nomen et rationem, per id quod sunt aptae esse in multis et universales, non tamen secundum quod sunt in illis: secundum enim quod sunt in illis, particularizatae et individuatae et ad singularitatem ductae sunt. Sunt etiam formae *post rem*, quae sunt forma per abstractionem intellectus ab individuantibus separata et in quibus intellectus agit universalitatem”. Idem textus apud Stephanum de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 332).

**123** corporis ] coloris *in ms.* **130** secundum ] *post scr.* esse sed del. **133** tractatu secundo ] *supr.* **134** universale secundo modo ] iste universale *in ms.* **135** † ] hic apparet signum, quod hic debet esse glossa (*in marg. sin.*), quae autem est illegibilis propter corrup. chart. Possibile est tantum videre, quod ista glossa habet 10 versus. **136** tertio ] secundo *in ms.*

[Conclusiones responsales ad tres prius enumeratas opiniones]

Istis sic stantibus respondetur ad illas tres opiniones per tres conclusiones.

140 Prima: universale pro eius formalis significatio est separatum a singularibus secundum esse et rationem.

Secunda: universale pro eius essentiali est coniunctum singularibus.

Tertia conclusio: universale pro eius materiali est separatum a singularibus secundum rationem.

145 [Probatio conclusionis 1 cum corollariis]

Conclusio prima probatur: quod formaliter est in intellectu, hoc est separatum a singularibus secundum esse et rationem; universale est huiusmodi; igitur etc. Maior patet. Et notanter dico ‘formaliter’, quia si aliquid est in intellectu obiective, non oportet quod illud sit separatum a singularibus secundum esse et rationem. Minor probatur, quia universale est in intellectu sicut albedo in superficie.

Corollarium: universale primo modo est natura communis sumpta extra intellectum. Patet ex notabili. Corollarium probatur: universale prout est natura simplex invariabilis dans omnibus aliis esse et vivere est praeter intellectum etc.

155 (patet primo *Caeli*).

Corollarium secundum: si opinio Platonis †.

[Probatio conclusionum 2–3]

Conclusio secunda probatur: quod praedicatur de aliquo directe | hoc est in eo; 32r sed universale [pro eius] essentiali est huiusmodi; ergo etc. Maior [probatur], quia praedicare hoc, est esse in hoc. Minor patet: dicendo ‘Sor est homo’ ‘hic homo’ praedicatur de S[orte]

Conclusio tertia probatur: obiectum alicuius potentiae debet proportionari potentiae; sed universale est [obiectum] intellectus; ergo debet proportionari intellectui. Maior et similiter minor patent.

155 Aristoteles, *De caelo* I, 9, 279a28–30; cf. Iohannes de Fonte, *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hammes, 1974, p. 161, nr. 30).

148 patet ] post scr. quia bene sed del. 148 et notanter ] supr. 152 universale ] corr. ex particulare. 155 patet primo Caeli ] supr. 156 † ] haec est prima pars ultimi versus chart. 31v, quae in ista parte totaliter corrupta est; abs. circa 30 litt. 158 Conclusio ... directe ] haec est secunda (fere illegibilis) pars ultimi versus chart. 31v, quae corrupta est. 159 pro eius ] scr. pro eius essentiam sed totam istam sententiam del.; supr. prob. tamen sed del.; supra tamen scr. unum(?) verbum, quod illegibile est, propter corrupt. chart. 159 essentiali ] post scr. materiali. 159–160 probatur ] chart. corrupt. 161 –orte ] chart. corrupt. 163 obiectum ] chart. corrupt.

165

## [Corollaria in 2 conclusione]

Corollarium quod sequitur ad secundam conclusionem: loquendo de universalis in causando tunc opinio Era[clitanorum] et Vicklefistarum potest sustineri, quia tale est prima intelligentia quae causat omnia singulare et conservat ipsa.

Corollarium secundum quod sequitur ad eandem conclusionem: intelli[gendo]

- 170 de universalis prout refertur ad intellectum cognoscentem opinio Vicklefis[tarum] est falsa, et ut sic eam reprobat Philosophus una cum opinione Platonis. Corollarium [patet] ex notabili.

## [Corollaria in 3 conclusione]

- Corollarium quod sequitur ad tertiam conclusionem: opinio Aristotelis loquens  
 175 † de universalibus tertio modo est simpliciter vera. Patet corollarium, quia illa tenet medium inter primam opinionem et secundam. Sed universale non est ponendum iuxta primam opinionem nec iuxta secundam, igitur iuxta tertiam. Consequentia tenet, quia solum tres opiniones sunt de i[llo], et duae sunt falsae et reprobatae in certis sensibus, igitur media est simpliciter vera et tenenda.  
 180 Corollarium secundum: idem est universale et singulare in re. Corollarium patet de †.

Corollarium tertium: universale et singulare differunt ratione. Corollarium patet [ex] praecedenti(?).

## [Corollarium responsale]

- 185 Corollarium responsale: loquendo de universalis tertio modo nullum est universale in essendo distinctum a singularibus. Corollarium [patet] ex tertia parte notabilis et ex [secundo] corollario.

\* \* \*

- 190 Motivum Wickplef heretici fuit, quia ipse credebat sensum habere virtutem disciplinae et scientiae; sed quidquid sci[tur], hoc est coniunctum singulare, et quidquid sentitur, hoc est singulare; sed universale scitur, quia scientia est universalium, sensus s[ingularium], ut patet tertio *De anima*.

191–192 Aristoteles, *De anima* II, 5, 417b22–23; cf. Aristoteles, *Analytica posteriora* I, 31, 87b37–39; cf. Iohannes de Fonte, *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (ed. Hamesse, 1974, p. 319, nr. 93).

167 -clitanorum ] chart. corrup. 169 -gendo ] chart. corrup. 170 -tarum ] chart. corrup. 172 patet ] chart. corrup. 174 conclusionem ] supr. 175 † ] chart. corrup. sed non potest dici, utrum hic aliquod verbum abs. 178 -llo ] chart. corrup. 180 secundum ] corr. in tertium 181 † ] chart. corrup. abs. prob. 1–2 litt. 182 tertium ] corr. in quartum 187 secundo ] tertio ms. 190 -tur ] chart. corrup. 190 est ] post scr. coniunctum sed del. 192 -ingularium ] chart. corrup. 192 motivum ... De anima ] hoc fragmentum manu Pauli de tempore eius studiis in theol. scriptum est.

\* \* \*

- Universale est duplex:
- 195 I. reale
- 1/ in essendo
  - 2/ in causando
    - a/ dependens
    - b/ independens
  - 200 3/ in communicando
- II. logicae
- 1/ vocale; 2/ mentale; 3/ scriptum
    - A/ simplex, in praedicando — terminus univocus etc.
    - B/ in distribuendo
      - a/ affirmativum
      - b/ negativum
    - C/ conceptu proportionabile
      - a/ prioristicum
      - b/ posterioristicum

*Edidit Hanna WOJTCZAK*