



## Discussion on the existence of universals in Paul of Pyskowice's autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* preserved in cod. BJ 1900\*

Hanna WOJTCZAK\*\*

Krystyna KRAUZE-BŁACHOWICZ\*\*\*

### ABSTRACT

The problem of the ontological status of universals is one of the most important topics of the medieval discussion, which was also attended by Paweł of Pyskowice, a scholar from Kraków in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. He addressed this question in his very extensive commentary on *Isagoga* (preserved in cod. BJ 1900, mostly in Paul's handwriting), whose authorship was for years wrongly attributed to Benedict Hesse. In this commentary, 9 questions were devoted to the so-called difficult Porfirian questions. Two of them bear the title *Utrum universalia subsistant*. The same title is also given to the stand-alone question (written in Paul's handwriting but loosely attached to cod. BJ 1900) which is the subject of this paper. Although it repeats the subject of two questions belonging to the commentary, it definitely differs from them — not only in substance but also in form. At the beginning, Paul presents three realistic positions: two extreme ones, i.e. Platonic and Wyclifist, and a moderate one — Aristotelian. Referring to them, he adopts the Aristotelian solution, according to which there is no universal *in essendo* separated from individual things. Paweł analyses universals on two levels: the metaphysical or epistemological, and the logical.

---

\* 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). We would like to thank Maciej Stanek Ph.D. who made many helpful suggestions for the improvement of our paper and Professor Marek Gensler for revising the English translation of our text.

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

\*\*\* Ph.D. (habil.), associate professor, Institute of Philosophy, University of Warsaw. E-mail: kmkrauze@uw.edu.pl.

## KEYWORDS

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

## PAUL OF PYSKOWICE AND HIS PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS

Paul of Pyskowice († ca. 1467) — the author of the question *Utrum universalia subsistant* — added to cod. BJ 1900,<sup>1</sup> belongs to the most eminent Krakow scholars of the first half of the fifteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

Although contemporary literature refers to him mainly as a theologian (he began his theological studies around 1431 and completed his doctorate in 1445), his almost 30-year-long relationship with the Faculty of Arts in Krakow cannot be overlooked. It is there that he matriculated in 1412, received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1417 and his master's degree in 1422. It was then that he began his teaching activities, which he continued (probably with a few interruptions)<sup>3</sup> until at least 1443, and possibly until 1445.<sup>4</sup>

Material evidence of Paul's long-term work at the Faculty of Arts is cod. 1900 (according to the new folio numbers — 1r–310r),<sup>5</sup> preserved in the Jagiellonian Library collection. The codex contains his commentaries on two works of the Old Logic set: Porphyry's *Isagoge* and Aristotle's *Categories* and a loosely attached autonomous short question *Utrum universalia subsistant*. All these texts (including the above mentioned question) are primarily written by Paul's hand and the changing flow of his handwriting<sup>6</sup> proves that he edited the main body of these treatises between 1421 and 1423. Later, over the next 20 years or so (also when he was a theology student, but not later

<sup>1</sup> In this study, when referring to manuscripts belonging to the collection of the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow, we limit ourselves to giving only the shelf mark of the codex, while when quoting manuscripts from other libraries, we also give the place of their location.

<sup>2</sup> For the most recent findings on Paul's scholarly biography, see: Wojtczak, 2018b: 15–22. Previously, his life and work were the subject of only a few publications, the most important of which include: Włodek, 1965: 142–168; Zwiercan, 1980; Wielgus, 1992: 86–88; Markowski, 1996: 153–155.

<sup>3</sup> Taking into account the fact that Paul held the post of dean of the Faculty of Arts only once as late as 1430, i.e. eight years after obtaining his master's degree, and that it was probably only in 1431 that he began his theological studies, it cannot be ruled out that, after he had served his obligatory two-year regency, in 1424–1427, for reasons unknown to us today, he did not perform any duties at the Faculty of Arts in Krakow.

<sup>4</sup> Wojtczak, 2018b: 16–17.

<sup>5</sup> At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the folio numbering was changed. However, in the literature, most references to cod. BJ 1900 refer to the old numbering.

<sup>6</sup> On the surviving testimonies to the character of Paul's handwriting see: Wojtczak, 2018b: 25–26.

than 1445), he revised and supplemented his work by writing in the margins or on the blank pages and on fiches. These texts preserved in cod. BJ 1900 are, therefore, a rare testimony to the many years of scholarly work on his manuscript, at the same time being the only identified philosophical works by Paul of Pyskowice so far.

#### THE COMMENTARIES

Paul's commentaries on *Isagoge* and *Categories* are one of the most extensive surviving medieval works on this subject. Suffice to say that they occupy 272 finely written folios (*recto-verso*), often with wholly used margins, and 38 accompanying pastedowns. Some sections of them were written by at least two hands other than Paul's, further complicating historical research aimed at establishing the context in which these texts were written. They show the influence of two earlier Krakovian *Quaestiones super artem veterem*. The first, anonymous,<sup>7</sup> were written in 1405–1406, and their author was probably one of the foreign educated (perhaps in Leipzig or Prague) professors belonging to the first academic staff of the renewed University of Krakow.<sup>8</sup> The author of the other one, written around 1416, was Benedict Hesse,<sup>9</sup> to whom the works preserved in cod. BJ 1900 were erroneously attributed over the years.<sup>10</sup>

Although these commentaries inspired Paul, he drew very freely on the work of his predecessors. He greatly expanded the scope and context of the topics they addressed and the method of exposition, giving his commentaries the form of *lectiones cum quaestionibus*, namely, a literal interpretation of the quoted authoritative text (*textus cum glossis, divisio, expositio*), combined with

<sup>7</sup> These are preserved in cod. BJ 1941.

<sup>8</sup> A conservative hypothesis attributing the authorship of the commentaries in cod. BJ 1941 to Francis of Brzeg was formulated by Stanek, 2013: 215–216, n. 47.

<sup>9</sup> Benedict Hesse's *Commentaries on the Old Logic* are preserved in three manuscript copies: BJ 2037, BJ 2043, BJ 2455 which, following Mieczysław Markowski, are described and analyzed in catalogues and literature as works *secundum Benedictum Hesse*. See among others: Markowski, 1967: 77–100; Markowski & Włodek, 1972: 95–96, 122. Previously, scholars made the correct attribution of these texts; see e.g.: Tarnowska, 1961: 253. In cod. BJ 2455, there are two colophons that clearly identify Hesse as the author (*causa efficiens, pronunciata per*) of the commentaries preserved there; see: cod. BJ 2455, f. 219r, 292r. For information on the authorship of these commentaries and a discussion and description of the codices, see: Wojtczak, 2019: 31–37, 60–69, 91–95, English summary: 83–90.

<sup>10</sup> The erroneous attribution of these commentaries was made by Mieczysław Markowski in the 1960s. See: Markowski, 1967: 77–100. In 1996, Paul of Pyskowice was identified for the first time as the author of the texts preserved in cod. BJ 1900, as indicated by Wojtczak, 1997: XIX. The source evidence for the conjecture formulated at that time was provided by Stanek, 2014: 39. For more on this subject, see: Wojtczak, 2018a: 115–120; Wojtczak, 2018b: 22–25.

questions.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the internal structure of Paul's *quaestiones* is different. They comprise *rationes* (with answers to them, i.e. *responsiones*), *notabilia*, *dubitatioes*, and *quaestiunculae*. They form thematically ordered groups but lack formal regularity. Within a single question, there are several different arrangements of these elements. Some of them were, as mentioned above, added later and are often only loosely linked thematically to the question to which they are attached.

#### THE AUTONOMOUS QUESTION

The autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* bears no resemblance to Paul's commentaries either in terms of used doctrinal sources or method of exposition. Moreover, it does not form a coherent part with cod. BJ 1900: it is a two-leaf quire now loosely attached to the codex, or more precisely to the second *lectio* of Paul's *Isagoge* commentary.<sup>12</sup> 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>13</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>14</sup> transcribed with minor changes from Albert the Great's work *De intellectu et intelligibili*,<sup>15</sup> whom, incidentally, Ps.-Thomas Aquinas quotes in this context.<sup>16</sup> The second one has its source in Albert the Great's commentary on *Isagoge*.<sup>17</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 Pálec<sup>18</sup> and in *Utrum tantum quatuor sunt quaestiones...* by Mauritius de Benessow.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>11</sup> This genre of scholarly literature was characteristic of the period 1230–1260 (see: Del Punta, 1998: 142–143), but it was utterly alien to the milieu of the University of Krakow.

<sup>12</sup> See: cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32v (formerly f. 22ar–22br).

<sup>13</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* (in this issue pp. 482–490).

<sup>14</sup> Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus 'Universale'*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932).

<sup>15</sup> Albertus Magnus, *De intellectu et intelligibili* (ed. Borgnet, 1990: 493a–b).

<sup>16</sup> Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus 'Universale'*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932).

<sup>17</sup> Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b: 24a–b).

<sup>18</sup> For the critical edition of the question, see: Stephanus de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 318–336).

<sup>19</sup> Mauritius de Benessow, *In Isagogen*, qu. 5 (Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, cod. V H 14, f. 8v–9r).

Other uncertainties include the time at which (in relation to the commentary as a whole) Paul's question was composed, what its function was, or for what purpose it was formulated, bearing in mind that he had already discussed the problem of universals at length in his *Isagoge* commentary.

## THE PROBLEM OF UNIVERSALS IN THE COMMENTARY ON *ISAGOGE*. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Paul devoted the entire second *lectio*<sup>20</sup> (13 leaves) of his commentary on *Isagoge*<sup>21</sup> to the problem of universals.<sup>22</sup> It is bestowed with many, sometimes very extensive, glosses, mostly written with Paul's late hand. This *lectio* consists of the second paragraph of Porphyry's commented text<sup>23</sup> a short *expositio*<sup>24</sup> and the following eleven questions (some of which are written by a hand other than Paul's):

1. Utrum Porphyrius a quaestionibus difficilibus se abtineat et mediocres coniectat seu pertractat.<sup>25</sup>
2. Utrum universalia subsistant.<sup>26</sup>
3. Utrum universalia in essendo sunt ponenda.<sup>27</sup>
4. Utrum universalia sint praeter conceptus et signum ad placitum.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v–38r (formerly f. 20v–33r).

<sup>21</sup> Paul of Pyskowice's commentary directly related to the text of Porphyry's *Isagoge* can be found in cod. BJ 1900, f. 18v–155v (formerly f. 16v–123v).

<sup>22</sup> Paul devoted two introductory questions preceding the main commentary on *Isagoge* to the problem of the universal, considered as an object of knowledge, see: cod. BJ 1900, f. 11v (formerly 10v): "Utrum universale sit subiectum in Porphyrio" (written entirely with Paul's hand); f. 16r (formerly 14r): "Utrum de universalibus est scientia" (written entirely with Paul's early hand); f. 12r (partly written with Paul's hand).

<sup>23</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): "Istarum rerum speculatione compendiosam tradicionem tibi faciens temptabo breviter velu introductionis modo ea quae ab antiquis dicta sunt aggredi, altioribus quidem quaestionibus abstinens... x ...illud vero quemadmodum de his ac de propisitis probabiliter antiqui tractaverin, et horum maxime Peripatetici, tibi nunc monstrare temptabo"; see: Porphyrius, *Isagoge*, 1.7–1.16 (eds. Minio-Paluelo & Dod, 1966).

<sup>24</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v); written entirely by Paul's early hand.

<sup>25</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v); written entirely by Paul's early hand.

<sup>26</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 23r–24r; formerly f. 21r–22r); the title of the question and accompanying marginal glosses are written by Paul's hand, the main text in its entirety is written by a different hand.

<sup>27</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 24r–28r; formerly f. 22r–26r); a fragment of the main text (f. 25v in full — 26r half page; f. 28r two fragments) and marginal glosses written by Paul's hand.

<sup>28</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 29r–29v; formerly f. 27r–27v); entirely written by Paul's hand.

5. Utrum univeralia subsistant, id est utrum universalialia sint substantiae, id est utrum per se stant in rerum natura.<sup>29</sup>
6. Utrum universalialia sint<sup>30</sup> in solis nudis, puris intellectibus.<sup>31</sup>
7. Utrum universalialia sint in nudis intellectibus.<sup>32</sup>
8. Utrum universalialia sint in puris intellectibus.<sup>33</sup>
9. Utrum universalialia sint corporea vel incorporea.<sup>34</sup>
10. Utrum universalialia sint sensibilia vel insensibilia.<sup>35</sup>
11. Utrum definitio universalis sit bene posita.<sup>36</sup>

Questions 2–10 have already been partially problematized in the literature on the subject<sup>37</sup> (however, with Hesse incorrectly indicated as their author).

The first question is introductory and discusses formal issues related to the questions posed by Porphyry, which, according to tradition, Paul divides into easier (*mediocres*)<sup>38</sup> and more difficult (*difficiliores*).<sup>39</sup> The demarcation criterion between these questions is their belonging to particular fields of knowledge — logic or metaphysics — and thus, the answer to a differently understood question *quid est* (“quaestio ‘quid est’ potest considerari dupliciter”). Logic asks for the meaning of the name (“‘quid nominis’ exprimens quod per nomen significatur”) and as such includes easy questions. On the other hand, metaphysics asks what a thing is (“quid rei, quaerens quidditatem rei”) and deals with difficult questions.

Among the questions listed by Porphyry, the easier ones are those concerning the *quid nominis* definition of “genus”, “species”, “definition”, “accidens”,

<sup>29</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 29v–30v; formerly f. 27v–28v); entirely written by Paul’s hand; a fragment of the question title (“id est utrum per se stant in rerum naturam”) overwritten.

<sup>30</sup> In ms. *sit*.

<sup>31</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 30v–33v; formerly f. 28v–29v); the first part of the question (f. 30v) and accompanying glosses written by Paul’s hand; the remainder of the main text written with a different hand.

<sup>32</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 33v–34r; formerly f. 29v–30r); the second part of the question (f. 34r) written by Paul’s hand; the initial part of the question written by a different hand.

<sup>33</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 34v; formerly f. 30v); entirely written by Paul’s hand.

<sup>34</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 36r–36v; formerly f. 31r–31v); entirely written by Paul’s hand.

<sup>35</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 36v–37v; formerly f. 31r–32v); entirely written by Paul’s hand.

<sup>36</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 38v; formerly f. 33v); entirely written by Paul’s hand.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g.: Markowski, 1967: 73–166; Markowski, 1968: 125–132.

<sup>38</sup> In his glosses, he also uses the term *faciles* to describe them.

<sup>39</sup> Paul uses *difficiles*, *difficiliores*, *difficilimae* interchangeably.

and “properties”.<sup>40</sup> Whereas the difficult ones concern existence and essence<sup>41</sup> of universals, or more precisely genera and species, since Porphyry’s questions directly refer to them only.<sup>42</sup>

Paul points to two solutions justifying this narrowing of the subject of metaphysical questions. In the first he emphasizes that of all the universals — genus, species, specific difference, accident, and property — the last three predicate *in quale*, and only the first two predicate *in quid*. Therefore, the questions of existence mainly apply to them, because, as Paul states, they “seem more to exist” (“ista quae praedicantur in quid magis videntur exsistere”).<sup>43</sup> Secondly, he notes that although the question *quid est* directly concerns only genus and species, it also applies implicitly to the other three universals, for they are either contained in genus and species or can be reduced to them.<sup>44</sup>

Porphyry (inspired, as Paul states, by Plato’s thought) pointed out three such difficult questions in his treatise, which, however, (precisely due to their metaphysical nature) he left unanswered.<sup>45</sup> Following his immediate predecessors,<sup>46</sup> Paul raises four questions built on Porphyry’s three.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “per quaestiones mediocres intelliguntur quaestiones quaerentes de (*scr.* genere *sed del.*) definitione generis vel speciei, differentiae etc.”

<sup>41</sup> Paul stresses that Porphyry’s original “difficult” questions are not only about whether they are but also about *quidditas*. See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 23r; formerly 21r): “Quando unus vult cognoscere an quaestiones sint metaphysicales, debet videre an tales quaerunt de quidditate rerum [...]. Modo istae sunt huiusmodi”.

<sup>42</sup> See: Porphyrius, *Isagoge*, 1.10–11. (eds. Minio-Paluelo & Dod, 1966).

<sup>43</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 23r; formerly 21r): „Porphyrius, secundum aliquos, solum se abstinere ab istis quaestionibus solum ad ista duo universalium, scilicet generis(!) et speciei(!). Et ratio est, quia ex quo genus et species solum habent modum praedicandi in quid, et ergo videtur quod solum videtur se abstinere ab istis quaestionibus difficilissimis quoad ista duo. Et ergo solum exprimit ista duo in littera et non alia, eo quod ista duo praedicantur in quid et alia in quale. Modo ista quae praedicantur in quid magis videntur subsistere quam ista quae praedicantur in quale. Et ideo ista duo exprimit in littera, alia autem tria quae praedicantur in quale videntur habere esse in alio”.

<sup>44</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 23r; formerly 21r): “Secunda ratio, quia alia tria videntur esse in istis duobus, ut differentia quae est aptitudine in genere, actu in specie, et proprium est in specie, et accidens in hiis simul. Vel quia ista tria reducuntur in ista duo”.

<sup>45</sup> See: Porphyrius, *Isagoge*, 1.8–14 (eds. Minio-Paluelo & Dod, 1966).

<sup>46</sup> See e.g.: Anonymous, *Quaestiones Cracovienses super ‘Isagogen’ Porphyrii* (cod. BJ 1941, f. 22v).

<sup>47</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “Notandum: [...] per quaestiones difficiliore intelliguntur quaestiones quae ponuntur in littera. Et sunt quattuor”. See also: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “et istas tres quaestiones movet Auctor in littera. Sed prima (*supr.*) potest subdividi, et sic sunt quattuor”.

The first basic one, which is the assumption for all the others, is “Do universals exist?”.<sup>48</sup> From the affirmative answer follows the second question, concerning the mode of their existence, namely, whether they exist in the intellect or outside it: “Si sint, utrum sint in solis nudis intellectibus vel in puris intellectibus, vel sint in re ad extra extra intellectum, id est posito quod sint, utrum sint solum in intellectu humano, vel divino, vel in rebus”.<sup>49</sup> There are two ambiguous phrases in the question quoted here.

The first concerns the adjective *solus* and the adverb *solum*. In the Boethius’ translation of Porphyry’s source text, we read: “in solis nudis purisque intellectibus posita”.<sup>50</sup> These adjectives listed in the context of intellects (*solus*, *nudus*, *purus*) are most frequently interpreted by scholastics<sup>51</sup> as three different intellects or ways of being in them. The adjective *purus* defines the divine intellect — *nudus* — while human — *solus* — refers to concepts to which nothing from the side of things corresponds, e.g. chimera. On the other hand, Paul first uses the adjective *solus* in his two-part question, and he changes it to the adverb *solum* while explaining this phrase.<sup>52</sup> All this changes the meaning of

<sup>48</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “Utrum universalis sint”.

<sup>49</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v).

<sup>50</sup> See: Porphyrius, *Isagoge*, 1.11–12 (eds. Minio-Paluelo & Dod, 1966).

<sup>51</sup> See: Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus ‘Universle’*, n. 14 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932): “Alio modo formantur questiones Porphyrij, ut queratur utrum universalis sunt res extra animam in solis intellectibus, ita quod nichil correspondeat eis a parte rei extra animam, sicut Chimere. Vel sint in nudis intellectibus, ita quod insint intellectui ipsi a creacione sua; et tunc dicuntur esse in nudo intellectu, quia intellectus in sua creacione est quasi tabula nuda in qua nichil est depictum. Sive sint in puris intellectibus, idest in intellectu divino, qui purus est eo quod fantasie non est permixtus”. See also: Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 2 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b: 19a–b): “Et dico solis intellectibus per exclusionem rerum, ita quod non in rebus sint. Nudos autem dico intellectus ab appendiciis materiae separatos, qui illorum tantum sunt, quae nunquam in materia fuerunt [...] Puros autem voco intellectus ex parte intelligibilis, ad quod nihil movet nisi solius intelligentiae lumen, et non phantasma receptum. Sunt tamen qui aliter ea quae dicta sunt, interpretantur dicentes, quod in solis intellectibus sunt illa quoad nos, quae utrum sint et quomodo esse habeant, solus scit intellectus. Et tale esse in intellectu universalis habere dixerunt illi qui vocabantur Nominales [...]. Nudos autem vocant intellectus, qui ad scibile quod accipiunt non habent praescriptos habitus, qui disponant intellectum ad speculationem eorum quae in ipso sunt [...]. Puros autem dicunt intellectus, qui mediante phantasmate non accipiuntur. Sunt autem adhuc qui hoc referunt ad intellectum causantem et cognoscentem [...]. Et dicunt quod in solis intellectibus sunt, quae esse non habent nisi in lumine illius intelligentiae. Et sunt illi qui dicunt universalis, non nisi ideale habere esse secundum quod universalis sunt [...]. Hi autem nudos dicunt intellectus separatos ab imaginibus, quas imprimunt in materiam. Puros autem dicunt, eo quod impuritati naturalium principiorum in causando non permiscetur, sed ex suo lumine producant formas universales, quae per distantiam ab ipsis impuritati materialium principiorum permiscetur, et tunc particulantur et determinantur”.

<sup>52</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in ‘Isagogen’*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 34v; formerly f. 30v).



Porphyry's statement. Paul is aware of this ambiguity, which he expresses in the sixth point of the *lectio* two. He states in it that the Porphyrian formulation *solis* in the context of the intellect can be understood as existing only in the mind or as the intellect itself, specifically *intellectual fictus*.<sup>53</sup> He adds that this phrase is used in the first sense in the Porphyrian question.

The second ambiguity mentioned is the expression *in re ad extra intellectum*. It cannot be ruled out that Paul, by asking the question in this way, intended to highlight that existence outside the intellect is not tantamount to existence in things, the more so because questions 3 and 4 refer to these terms.

The third question — i.e., whether universals are corporeal, extended, and divisible, or vice versa, incorporeal and indivisible — follows from the supposition that universals are in things (*in re ad extra*) that are not signs.<sup>54</sup> However, assuming the existence of universals outside the intellect (*extra intellectum*) and disregarding whether they are bodily, one can, according to Paul, formulate a fourth question, namely whether they are in individual things or actually separated from them. He attributes the last position to Plato and his successors.<sup>55</sup>

Paul devotes the nine (listed at the beginning of this paragraph) questions of *lectio* two to these four difficult questions. He considers the first difficult question to be related to qu. 2–5 of the commentary; the second one is addressed within qu. 6–8; the third is answered in qu. 9, and the fourth is decided in qu. 10. The ending of *lectio* two is qu. 11 regarding the definition of a universal, according to which: “Universale est kathegorema univocum, incomplexum, non transcendens, quod aptum natum est esse in pluribus, id est quod aptum natum est significare plura univoce, divisim, essentialiter, et suppositaliter distincta quorum unum non est pars alterius”.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 30v; formerly f. 28v): “Utrum universalia sint in solis, nudis, puris intellectibus. Pro cuius intellectu sciendum: ly solis capitur dupliciter. Uno modo exclusive, et sic capiendo quaestionem (*in ms. quaestio*) pro prima parte tantum (*scr. patet sed del.*) quaerit: utrum universalia sint in solis intellectibus [...] Alio modo capitur non exclusive, et sic «solus (*scr. solis sed cor.*) intellectus» idem est quod fictus intellectus. Et tunc erit sensus quod universalia sunt in solis puris intellectibus, id est in fictis intellectibus”. On this subject (with an incorrect attribution to B. Hesse), see: Markowski, 1970: 104–105.

<sup>54</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “Secunda quaestio: posito, quod universalia sint in rebus ad extra condistincta a signis, utrum sunt(!) (*in ms. nunc apparet verbum corporalia sed ista lectio est falsa*) extensa et divisibilia et corporalia, vel incorporalia et indivisibilia”.

<sup>55</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 22v; formerly f. 20v): “Tertia quaestio: posito quod sint extra intellectum, sive ponantur corruptibilia vel incorruptibilia, utrum sint in singularibus posita vel sint a singularibus realiter separata, sicut posuit Plato et sui sequaces”.

<sup>56</sup> Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 38v; formerly f. 33v).

As can be seen from the list above, the questions entitled *Utrum universalia subsistant* occur twice in Paul's commentary on *Isagoge* (qu. 2 and 5), and the autonomous question has the same title. While qu. 2 and 5 have been the subject of modern analysis, the autonomous one loosely attached to cod. BJ 1900 had not previously caught the attention of any researcher.

## THE PROBLEM OF UNIVERSALS IN THE AUTONOMOUS QUESTION *UTRUM UNIVERSALIA SUBSISTANT*

Although the autonomous question repeats the topic of the two that belong to the commentary, it differs markedly from them in both content and form. Most of all, it lacks the structure of a dialectical dispute typical for Paul's questions, in which *rationes* with answers (*responiones*), *dubitationes*, and *notabilia* play a central role. Instead, in the autonomous question, Paul presents an orderly exposition (similar in form to the standard late medieval *corpus quaestionis*) consisting of notes, conclusions, and corollaries,<sup>57</sup> the pattern of which is as follows:

1. Posing the question.
2. Presentation and explanation of the problem.
3. Discussion of three realist positions.
4. Resolution of the question.
  - 4.1. *Notabile* — preliminary terminological arrangements and the division of the *universale* with respect to the different ways of its understanding as a reference point for the conclusions.
  - 4.2. Three conclusions concerning the three initial positions and demonstrating the truth or falsity of those opinions.
  - 4.3. Arguments for the conclusions, with accompanying corollaries (*corrolaria* and *corrolarium responsale*).<sup>58</sup>

### POSITION AND EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM

Paul begins his approach with the statement, standard for medieval commentaries on *Isagoge*, that Porphyry refrains from answering the three questions he poses concerning the ontic status of universals. However, instead of Porphyry's

<sup>57</sup> The final conclusions and corollaries are formally similar to those occurring at the end of Stephen of Pálec's question. See: Stephanus de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 333–335). Its editor notes that Pálec's question is atypical of the Prague environment; see: Pavliček, 2021: 297.

<sup>58</sup> Below the question, Paul added a note on the epistemological sources of Wycliffe's view and a scheme for classifying universals.

*quaestiones difficiles*, Paul refers to methodological questions concerning the object of demonstrative cognition:<sup>59</sup> “si est, quia est, quid est” and “propter quid est”, widespread in the Middle Ages. He considers the latter inappropriate in relation to principles and thus to the universals associated with them, which, he argues, “sunt in ratione principii”. Therefore, there are three questions which, in his view, Porphyry posed and did not answer: (1) about the existence of universals (*si est*), (2) about what (*quid*) they are, i.e., their essence (*quid-ditas*) and (3) about their factual justification (*quia*).<sup>60</sup>

#### PRESENTATION OF THREE REALIST POSITIONS

Proceeding to a detailed analysis of the essence of universals, Paul refers to three realist conceptions: two extreme ones, i.e. the Platonic and the Wyclifian, and the moderate Aristotelian. Nevertheless, here he does not mention solutions that were widespread in the fifteenth century in the Krakow and Prague circles, and which drew from either Buridanist terminism or Ockhamist conceptualism,<sup>61</sup> although he does not avoid using their characteristic terministic language.

Among the positions mentioned above, the Aristotelian solution is the closest to his own; Paul calls it intermediate and compares it to a fair balance in the order of the virtues. He does not critically evaluate this view and limits himself to stating that, according to this view the universal is separated from individuals conceptually, but not in terms of being, since, as far as being is concerned, it is related to them.<sup>62</sup>

While putting forward the first statement, namely that universals are separated from individuals both in terms of being and conceptually, Paul relies

<sup>59</sup> Medieval commentators derive these questions from Aristotle’s *Posterior Analytics*, II, 1, 89b22–23: “quaerimus autem quattuor: quod sit, cur sit, an sit et quid sit”.

<sup>60</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio* Utrum universalia subsistant *ex cod. BJ 1900*, f. 31r–32v (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

<sup>61</sup> As Markowski points out, these two versions of nominalism were distinguished in Krakow and Prague. The Krakow example is the anonymous commentary on *Isagoge*, preserved in cod. BJ 2118, f. 322v: “Prima opinio nominalium fuit eorum, qui dicuntur conceptiste, quorum princeps fuit Occam [...] Secunda opinio nominalium fuit eorum, qui dicti sunt terministe, quorum princeps nunc est Biridanus” (quoted by: Markowski, 1971: 14, 30). The Prague example is Martin of Łęczycza’s commentary on *Isagoge* (Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, cod. V H 14, f. 52v–53r): “Secunda vero opinio est conceptistarum, que ponit universale esse tantum modo in conceptu, unde universale secundum conceptistas est conceptus sine ypostasi ex tenui similitudine singularium collectus. Tercia opinio est terministarum, qui ponunt universale tantum esse in terminis scriptis, vocalibus vel mentalibus” (quoted by: Markowski, 1989–1990: 102).

<sup>62</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio* Utrum universalia subsistant *ex cod. BJ 1900*, f. 31r–32v (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

upon, as he thinks, Plato's assumption of the parallelism of being and its mental apprehension ("sicut est in intelligendo sic est in essendo"). Also, he adds, among other things, that according to this approach, individual terms denote individual things and universal terms denote universal things. Paul uses the latter thesis in his arguments to refute Plato's position, declaring that the statement "Socrates is a man" is false when following those assumptions.

Referring instead to the views of the Wycliffians and, as he puts it, the "Heracliteans",<sup>63</sup> he states that, according to them, the universal signifies a single common nature inseparable from individuals, being, at the same time, in many subjects (*suppositaliter*).

According to this view, the universal term, e.g. "man", primarily signifies a common nature (humanity), and secondarily individuals (Socrates, Plato). These latter are at the same time the *suppositum* for the common nature that belongs to their substance. Such a position, as Paul says, leads to absurd conclusions, e.g. that the same humanity would be saved in Paul and condemned in Judas.<sup>64</sup>

#### WAYS OF UNDERSTANDING UNIVERSALS

In resolving the question, Paul begins with *notabile* in which the existence of the universal in things (*esse in rebus*) can be understood as actual or potential from the perspective of the mental apprehension of universality (*intentio universalitatis*),<sup>65</sup> having its basis in things ("ut supra res fundatur intentio universalitatis").

The universal in an act arises from the activity of the intellect abstracting from individuals. Its effect can be first intentions (when a thing is apprehended in terms of its proper mode of existence), or second intentions (by means of which something — *aliqua res* — is understood as existing in many in a way

<sup>63</sup> It is not clear, whom Paul included in this group. In a similar context in his commentary on *Isagoge*, he mentions the Heracliteans once, see: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 37r; according to the old numbering 32r) and the Hussites at another time (Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1, cod. BJ 1900, f. 23v; according to the old numbering 21v). On the other hand, Benedict Hesse mentions Ockham in the analogous place, see: Benedictus Hesse, *Quaestiones super 'Isagogen' Porphyrii* (cod. BJ 2043, f. 25r). The literature on the subject shows that sometimes nominalists were called Heracliteans. On this subject see: Stanek, 2020: 234; Hoenen, 2003: 9–36, 18).

<sup>64</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalialia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32v* (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

<sup>65</sup> The phrase *intentio universalitatis* appears in the Latin translation of Avicenna's *Metaphysics*: see: Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima*, V, 1 (ed. van Riet, 1980: 228). On this topic, see i.e.: Libera, 1998: 178; Mielcarek, 2008: 165–166. Paweł Mielcarek points out that Avicenna distinguishes between the intention of the universal itself and the intention of its universality.

that is both common and external to them). On the other hand, what is in a thing regardless of the activity of the intellect and on which the *intentio universalitatis* is based is the *universale in potentia*.<sup>66</sup> We find a similar solution in Thomas Aquinas' *Sententia libri 'De anima'*, where he states that: "universalia, secundum quod sunt universalia, non sunt nisi in anima. Ipsae autem naturae, quibus accidit intentio universalitatis, sunt in rebus".<sup>67</sup>

Paul argues that it is possible to consider universals from the above division in three ways: *ante rem*, *post rem*, *in re*. The source for Paul's characterisation of the elements of this division, in the presentation of which he refers several

<sup>66</sup> See: Albertus Magnus, *Metaphysica*, 5, 6, 5 (ed. Borgnet, 1890: 362a): "Universale autem quod dicunt esse in re, est eadem forma participata a multis actu vel potentia". It is worth noting that the distinction between actual and potential universals appears also in Paul's *Isagoge* commentary. It is found in the marginal gloss (written with Paul's later hand) to the question *Utrum universalia in essendo sunt ponenda*; see: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Commentum in 'Isagogen'*, lect. 2, qu. 1 (cod. BJ 1900, f. 24r marg. sup. et dex.): "A fortiori: intellectus agens, cum sit virtus immaterialis et superior, potest apprehendere naturam Sortis praeter principia individualia, ponendo eam in intellectu possibili. Et tunc talis natura isto modo abstracta a condicionibus individuantiis dicitur universale metaphysicale in concipiendo. Et est duplex, scilicet potentiale et actuale. Et est quando res non actu stat sub condicionibus individuantiis, sed condiciones huiusmodi sunt separatae cum iuvamine intellectus agentis. Sed potentiale est quando res adhuc coniuncta est condicionibus individuantiis. Et ratio, quia tale universale fit per abstractionem intellectus agentis a condicionibus individuantiis, tunc dicitur actu universale. Sed res coniuncta huiusmodi condicionibus individuantiis dicitur universale potentiale. Sed tunc conceptus subordinatus illi naturae abstractae a condicionibus individuantiis communicans(?) omnia individua humanae naturae dicitur universale logicum, ut species vel genus".

<sup>67</sup> Thomas de Aquino, *Sent. in II De anima*, cap. 12, qu. 2 (Leonina, eds. Fratres Praedicatorum, 1984: 116b). However, the phrase *universale in potentia* does not appear in Thomas' text, but we find it in a similar context in Ps.-Thomas, who is referring to the treatise *De intellectu et intelligibili*; see: Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus 'Universale'*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932): "Unde nota, ut scribitur libro De intellectu et intelligibili, quod «forma rei potest dupliciter considerari: uno modo prout est natura diversa a natura materie, sive eius in quo est quodcumque sit illud; et alio modo prout est in materia, sive in eo in quo est individuata per hoc quod est in illo. Primo modo adhuc dupliciter consideratur; uno modo prout est essentia quedam absolute considerata in seipsa, et sic vocatur essentia, et est unum quid in se existens, nec habet esse nisi talis essentia, et sic una sola; alio modo prout ei convenit communitas secundum aptitudinem, et hoc accidit ei ex hoc quod est essentia apta nata dare multis esse, etsi numquam det illud; et sic proprie vocatur universale in potentia. Quando enim essentia communicabilis est in multis, universale est, etsi actu numquam det esse nisi uni soli, ut sol et luna. Et huiusmodi forme substanciales aliquando communicabiles sunt, et quod non communicentur accidit vel provenit ex hoc, quod tota materia cui ista forma communicabilis est continetur sub illa forma, sicut vult Aristoteles in libro De celo et mundo. Per hanc aptitudinem universale est in re, sed per actum existendi in multis non est nisi per intellectum: et ideo dixerunt Perypatetici quod universale non est nisi in intellectu referente hoc ad universale, quod est in multis et de multis secundum actum et non secundum aptitudinem solum». Hec sunt illius verba". In Albert the Great's treatise *De intellectu et intelligibili*, from which the above mentioned fragment probably comes, the phrase *universale in potentia* does not occur; see: Albertus Magnus, *De intellectu et intelligibili*, 1, 2, 2 (ed. Borgnet, 1890: 493a–b).

times to unspecified *moderni*, is Albert the Great's commentary on *Isagoge*,<sup>68</sup> perhaps (in the *post rem* part) supplemented by Thomas Aquinas' considerations. Despite Paul's undoubted dependence on these authors, and especially on Albert the Great, whose text is included verbatim in the autonomous question, it can be said with certainty that they were only an indirect source for Paul.<sup>69</sup>

According to Paul's account, the universal *ante rem* is a simple, unchanging nature, being the source of being, name and *ratio*, and having no admixture of any other nature.<sup>70</sup> He likens such universals to species existing in the mind of God before there was any individual representative of them. He also adds that Plato called such universals ideas.

The *post rem* universal is related to the activity of the intellect. It can be of two kinds: either it refers (*refertur*) to the causal intellect, i.e. the intellect of the first active intelligence ("ad intellectum intelligentiae primae agentis"),<sup>71</sup> or the human mind. In the first case, the universal is understood as the light of the First Intelligence, which gives being to lower things through forms (also understood in the manner of light). In the second case, the mind acquiring knowledge, such as the human mind, produces (*agat*) the universality in things, separating the universal from that which is material and individual. Like his predecessors, Paul invokes Aristotle here, according to whom (as the scholastics claim) the universal is apprehended by the intellect and the individual is perceived by the senses.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b: 24a–b). The classification and description of universals *ante rem*, *in re*, *post rem* proposed by Albert the Great, was probably widespread in the Middle Ages. In the literal wording of Albert, it appears, for example, in: Stephanus de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 332).

<sup>69</sup> The conviction of Albert's indirect only influence stems, among other things, from the fact that, in Paul's text, Albert's argument is supplemented, among other things, by an argument from the Psalmist's authority, indicating that Paul took over this argument from another text ("ipsi [i.e., moderni] probant auctoritate Psalmistae"), possibly from Thomas Aquinas. See: Thomas de Aquino, *Questiones De anima*, qu. 5, resp. (ed. Robb, 1968: 101–102): "Est ergo in anima nostra invenire potentialitatem respectu phantasmatum, secundum quod sunt repraesentativa determinatarum rerum. Et hoc pertinet ad intellectum possibilem, qui, quantum est de se, est in potentia ad omnia intelligibilia; sed determinatur ad hoc vel aliud per species a phantasmatis abstractas. Est etiam in anima invenire quamdam virtutem activam immaterialem, quae ipsa phantasmata a materialibus conditionibus abstrahit; et hoc pertinet ad intellectum agentem, ut intellectus agens sit quasi quaedam virtus participata ex aliqua substantia superiori, scilicet Deo. Unde philosophus dicit quod intellectus agens est ut habitus quidam et lumen; et in Psal. IV, dicitur: signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui, domine".

<sup>70</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalialia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900*, f. 31r–32v (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

<sup>71</sup> In the analogous place in Albert the Great, *cognoscentis et causantis* occurs instead of *agentis*.

<sup>72</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalialia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900*, f. 31r–32v (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

The universal *in re* is ontologically united with individuals and takes on numerous individual material qualities.<sup>73</sup>

#### PAUL'S CONCLUSIONS ON THREE PRESENTED POSITIONS

In the last part of the question, Paul, as he signals, intends to address the three opinions presented at the beginning, and, to this end, he formulates three conclusions:

- 1) Depending on what the universal signifies formally (*pro eius significato formali*), it is separated (*separatum*) from individuals both in being and in the intellect.
- 2) The universal is related (*coniunctum*) to individuals on account of what it signifies substantively (*pro eius essentiali*).
- 3) By virtue of what the universal signifies materially (*pro eius materiali*), it is intellectually separated (*separatum*) from individuals.

Whereas in the *notabile* the universal was considered from a metaphysical or epistemological perspective, in the quoted conclusions it is considered from a logical perspective and specifically as various kinds of *significata* of connotative and absolute terms. Although Paul does not explicitly indicate such a change in the interpretative perspective of the universals, the notions occurring in the conclusions indicate that. Namely, in the scholastic tradition, *significatum formale* and *significatum materiale* refer to the two *significata* of connotative terms, while *significatum essenziale* refers to the *significata* of absolute terms.<sup>74</sup>

Unfortunately, the state of preservation of the manuscript does not allow to fully reconstruct the drawn conclusions. The justification of the first conclusion aims to show that the Platonic universals have the character of formal significates. The destruction within this fragment makes it impossible to reconstruct Paul's thought in its entirety. From the partially preserved corollary

<sup>73</sup> See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio Utrum universalia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32v* (ed. Wojtczak, 2022: 482–490).

<sup>74</sup> All three concepts — *significatum formale*, *essentielle* and *materiale* are explained by Nicholas of Amsterdam in *Commentary on the Old Logic* (ed. Bos, 2016: 139): “terminus natus est supponere, sed significatum formale istius termini ‘albus’ est albedo, quam connotat”; see: Nicholas of Amsterdam, *Commentary on the Old Logic* (ed. Bos, 2016: 65): “praedicatio essentialis in proposito debet sumi secundum significatum essenziale termini, ut quidem significatum essenziale termini dicitur istud ad quod terminus directe impositus est ad significandum”; see: Nicholas of Amsterdam, *Commentary on the Old Logic* (ed. Bos, 2016: 138): “materiale significatum huius termini ‘albus’ est res cui inhaeret albedo”; see: Nicholas of Amsterdam, *Commentary on the Old Logic* (ed. Bos, 2016: 142): “significatum materiale sit principalis quia pro eo terminus habet suppositionem”. For *significatio formalis* see: Johannes Buridanus, *Quaestiones in duodecim libros ‘Metaphysicorum’ Aristotelis VII, qu. 15, determinatio, concl. 2*, (ed. Mansfeld, 2014: 102). For *significatum formale* and *materiale*, see: Marsilius of Inghen, *Treatises on the Properties of Terms* (ed. Bos, 1983: 130).

of the second conclusion, it follows that the relationship of the universal with individuals postulated by the Wicklefists has its logical counterpart in the relationship between the *essential significate* and the individual. However, as Paul writes, the postulates of the Wicklefists are preserved only by the universal *in causando*, or the First Intelligence, which causes and sustains the existence of the individual. In the corollaries of the third conclusion, the moderate Aristotelian position was presented and accepted as true.

Finally, he states in *corrolarium responsale* that, assuming the Aristotelian solution, there is no universal *in essendo* separated from individual things.

## 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 shelfark and folios-range.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Abbreviations:

ALD *Aristoteles Latinus Database*. Turnhout: Union Académique Internationale KUL/BRE-POLiS (online).

### Manuscript sources:

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

Anonymous. *Quaestiones Cracovienses super "Isagogen" Porphyrii*. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, cod. BJ 1941, ff. 7va/10ra-85rb.

Benedictus Hesse. *Quaestiones super "Isagogen" Porphyrii*. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, cod. BJ 2037, ff. 1r-246v; BJ 2043, ff. 2ra-304va; BJ 2455, ff. 2r-295r.

Paulus de Pyskowice. *Commentum super "Isagogen"*. Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, cod. BJ 1900, ff. 1r-155v.

### Modern editions:

Albertus Magnus. (1890a). *De intellectu et intelligibili* (=B. Alberti Magni Opera omnia, 9). (A. Borgnet, Ed.). Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives.

Albertus Magnus. (1890b). *Liber de praedicabilibus* (=B. Alberti Magni Opera omnia, 1). (A. Borgnet, Ed.). Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives.



- Albertus Magnus. (1890c). *Metaphysicorum lib. XIII* (=B. Alberti Magni Opera omnia, 6). (A. Borgnet, Ed.). Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives.
- Anonymus. (2020). Utrum universale nihil sit aut posterius suis singularibus?. (M. Stanek, Ed.). *Rocznik Tomistyczny*, 9(2), 239–247.
- Aristoteles. (1968). *Analytica posteriori*. (L. Minio-Paluello & B.G. Dod, Eds.). Bruges-Paris: Desclee de Brouwer. [Reprint edition: (1995). Leiden–New York–Köln: Brill] (=ALD IV.1–4).
- Avicenna. (1977). *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina I–IV*. (S. Van Riet & G. Verbeke, Eds.). Leiden: Brill.
- Johannes Buridanus. (2014). *Quaestiones in duodecim libros “Metaphysicorum” Aristotelis*. (M. Mansfeld, Ed.). Dissertation (Ph.D.). Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach.
- Marsilius of Inghen. (1983). *Treatises on the properties of terms*. A first critical edition of the *Suppositiones*, *Ampliationes* and *Alienationes* with introduction, translation, notes and appendices. (E.P. Bos, Ed.). Dordrecht–Boston–Lancaster: Kluwer.
- Nicholas of Amsterdam. (2016). *Commentary on the Old Logic*. (E.P. Bos, Ed.). Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Paulus de Pyskowice. (2022). *Quaestio Utrum universalia subsistant ex cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32v*. (H. Wojtczak, Ed.). *Argument. Biannual Philosophical Journal*, 1(12), 482–490.
- Porphyrius. (1966). *Isagoge* (pp. 5–31). In: L. Minio-Paluelo & B.G. Dod (Eds.). *Categoriarum supplementa. Pophyrii Isagoge translatio Boethii et Anonymi fragmentum vulgo vocatum “Liber sex principiorum”* (=Aristoteles Latinus, 6–7). Bruges: Brepols.
- Ps.-Thomas de Aquino. (1932). *De universalibus “Universale”*. (C. Ottaviano, Ed.). Romae: Reale accademia d'Italia. Retrieved from: <https://www.corpusthomicum.org/xun.html> (30.09.2022).
- Stephanus de Palecz. (2021). Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus (pp. 318–336). In: O. Pavliček. Stephen of Pálec'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.
- Thomas Aquinas. (1968). *Quaestiones de anima. A newly established edition of the Latin text with an introduction and notes*. (J.H. Robb, Ed.). Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Thomas de Aquino. (1984). *Sentencia libri “De anima”* (=Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia, 45.I). (Fratres Praedicatorum, Eds.). Roma–Paris: Commissio Leonina — Libraire Philosophique J. Vrin.
- Studies:
- De Libera, A. (1998). *La querelle des universaux. De Platon à la fin du Moyen Age*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Del Punta, F. (1998). The genre of commentaries in the Middle Ages (pp. 138–151). In: J.A. Aersten & A. Speer (Eds.). *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?* (=Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 26). Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hoenen, M.J.F.M. (2003). Via antiqua and Via moderna in the fifteenth century: Doctrinal, institutional, and Church political factors in the Wegestreit (pp. 9–36). In: R.L. Friedman & L.O. Nielsen (Eds.). *The medieval heritage in early modern metaphysics and modal theory, 1400–1700*. Dordrecht: Cluver. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-0179-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-0179-2_2) (30.09.2022).
- Markowski, M. (1967). Problem uniwersaliów w *Quaestiones super Isagogen* B. Hessego z Krakowa. *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej*, 7, 77–100.
- Markowski, M. (1968). Stanowisko polskich średniowiecznych komentatorów *Isagogi* Porfiriusza wobec wiklefowskiej teorii uniwersaliów. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 16(1), 125–132.

- Markowski, M. (1970). Problematyka uniwersaliów w polskich piętnastowiecznych pismach nominalistycznych. *Studia Mediewistyczne*, 12, 73–166.
- Markowski, M. (1971). *Burydanizm w Polsce w okresie przedkopernikańskim*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Markowski, M. (1989–1990). Próba reaktywowania burydanizmu na uniwersytecie praskim w drugim ćwierćwieczu XV wieku. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 1(37–38), 91–105.
- Markowski, M. (1996). *Dzieje Wydziału Teologii Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego w latach 1397–1525*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAT.
- Markowski, M. & Włodek, S. (1972). *Repertorium commentariorum medii aevi in Aristotelem Latinorum quae in Bibliotheca Iagellonica Cracoviae asservantur*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich — Wydawnictwo PAN.
- Mielcarek, P. (2008). *Od istoty do istnienia*. Warszawa: Fundacja Świętego Benedykta.
- Pavliček, O. (2021). Stephen of Pálec'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 âge*, 88, 287–336.
- Stanek, M. (2013). Najstarsze zachowane krakowskie kompendium logiczne (rkp. BJ 1941). *Studia Antyczne i Mediewistyczne*, 11(46), 203–218.
- Stanek, M. (2014). Zachowane w rękopisie BJ 1900 komentarze logiczne Pawła z Pyskowic. *Ibidem*, 1, 38–55.
- Stanek, M. (2020). Kwestia *Utrum universale nihil sit aut posterius suis singularibus* z zachowanych w rękopisie BJ 2118 *Collectanea de anima*. *Rocznik Tomistyczny*, 9(2), 229–238.
- Tarnowska, I. (1961). Krakowskie rękopisy logiczne XIII, XIV i XV w. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 20(4), 249–259.
- Wielgus, S. (1992). *Średniowieczna łacińskojęzyczna bibliistyka polska*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Włodek, Z. (1965). Paweł z Pyskowic. *Materiały i Studia Zakładu Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej*, 5, 142–168.
- Wojtczak, H. (1997). *Quaestiones de quantitate et de qualitate ex Benedicti Hesse commento super 'Praedicamenta' Aristotelis cum quaestionibus et additionibus eius successorum. Editio critica (=Acta Mediaevalia, 10)*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL.
- Wojtczak, H. (2018a). Komentarze Benedykta Hessego do *ars vetus* w świetle nowych ustaleń. *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, 24, 115–120.
- Wojtczak, H. (2018b). *Paul of Pyskowitz's commentary on Aristotle's Categories. Part I*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Wojtczak, H. (2019). *Benedykta Hessego Komentarz do Kategorii Arystotelesa. Część 1*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Zwiercan, M. (1980). Paweł z Pyskowic (pp. 394–395). In: *Polski słownik biograficzny*. (Vol. 25). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Narodowe im. Ossolińskich — Wydawnictwo PAN.