CC BY NC SA

ARGUMENT
BIANNUAL PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNAL

e-ISSN 2084–1043 p-ISSN 2083–6635
Published online: 31.03.2023

Vol. 12 (2/2022) pp. 473–490
www.argument-journal.eu

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 Paul of Pyskowice († ca. 1467), an eminent Krakovian 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, [s]he 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.

DOI: 10.24917/20841043.12.2.08

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The subject of the present edition is the autonomous question *Utrum universalia subsistant* by Paul of Pyskowice († ca. 1467),[1] an eminent Krakovian scholar of the first half of the fifteenth century.[2] 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[3] 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 21st 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

[1] 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.

[2] For more information, see: Wojtczak, 2018: 15–22; see also: Wojtczak & Krauze-Błachowicz, 2022: 311–328.

[3] 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.[4] Only two fragments incorporated by him 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'*,[5] transcribed with minor changes from Albert the Great's work *De intellectu et inteligibili*,[6] whom, incidentally, Ps.-Thomas Aquinas quotes in this context.[7] The second one has its source in Albert the Great's commentary on *Isagoge*.[8] 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[9] and in *Utrum tantum quattuor sunt quaestiones...* by Mauritius de Benessow.[10]

PRINCIPLES OF EDITION

The edition is based on the only surviving manuscript, cod. BJ 1900. In the text presented here, the spelling is standardised to Classical Latin. The punctuation is not taken from any national language, and all the marks are put according to logical sense. There are two kinds of quotation marks in the text. Double

[4] 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* (below, p. 484).

[5] Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, *De universalibus 'Universale'*, n. 12 (ed. Ottaviano, 1932).

[6] Albertus Magnus, *De intellectu et intelligibili* (ed. Borgnet, 1890a: 493a–b).

[7] Ps.-Thomas de Aquino, n. 12.

[8] Albertus Magnus, *Liber de praedicabilibus*, tract. 2, cap. 3 (ed. Borgnet, 1890b: 24a–b).

[9] For the critical edition of the question, see: Stephanus de Palecz, *Utrum universale sit aliquid extra animam praeter operationem intellectus* (Pavliček, 2021: 318–336).

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

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 are 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 intelectum 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 consideres *formae in re* as second in order, and the ones abstracted by the intellect (*post rem*) as third.[11] 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 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

[11] See: Paulus de Pyskowice, *Quaestio 'Utrum universalia subsistant' ex cod. BJ 1900, f. 31r–32* (below, pp. 485–487).

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[12]

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 manu 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 Sabbaot*; 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 introductoriae in logicam in generali et in Porphyrio in speciali) *Utrum logica sit scientia?*

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

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

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

---

[12] Magis particularis descriptio ms. BJ 1900 cf. Wojtczak, 2018: 57–59.

[13] 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.

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 introductoria in "Praedicamenta") *Iste est liber 'Praedicamentorum' Aristotelis, cuius subiectum est praedicamentum…*

(f. 161r–310r:[14] 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 virgini Mariae Sanctissimae et dilectae(?) virgini beatae Katherinae et sancto patri Stanislao necnon gloriosae dominae Mariae Magdalenae. 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
ann.	annotatio
c.s.	cum signo
cap.	caput

[14] 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.

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.	homoioteleuton
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.	repetivit
sc.	scilicet
scr.	scripsit

Sent.	Sententiae
sin.	sinister
spec.	specialiter
supr.	suprascripsit
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 shelfark 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 Brouver. [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 forilège 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 (Romae): 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.

19 5

200

20 5

Edidit Hanna WOJTCZAK