

Abstract of Monia Mancinelli's work (RAMUS PhD - curriculum FITMU, XXIX cycle – XV o. s.)

Title: “The Principle of Individuation in Landulph Caracciolus's commentary on the *Sentences*. Text and study”.

This research is aimed at reconstructing and studying the sections of Landulph Caracciolus's commentary on the *Sentences* dedicated to the principle of individuation.

Landulph Caracciolus is a Franciscan friar coming from Naples who lived in the XIVth century and who lectured the *Sentences* at Paris in the academic year 1318-1319. Recently, Christopher D. Schabel has underlined that, despite its widespread popularity and the important context of its composition, however, Landulph's commentary on the *Sentences* has largely been neglected. From 1999 Christopher D. Schabel and Russell L. Friedman have been promoting a larger attention to Landulph's commentary, showing that the Franciscan friar can be an interesting mean to trace the story of the reception of Duns Scotus and Peter Auriol's doctrines at the University of Paris during the first twenty years of the XIVth century.

The question of the principle of the individuation is about the research of the existence and the identification of the element responsible for both ontological determination and knowledge of the single entity. The first chapter of this work shows that the question explodes during the XIIIth century thanks to the Aristotelian *corpus* and to Avicenna's and Averroes's works, and many thinkers try to offer a personal solution to the problem, offering six main competing theories: 1) real natures are individual as such (William of Ware); 2) double negation (Henry of Ghent); 3) actual existence (maybe Roger Bacon, Peter of Falco, Peter of Alverny or Robert Kilwardby); 4) the collection of personal accidents/properties (ascribed to Boethius), and particularly quantity (Godfrey of Fontaines and Thomas Sutton); 5) matter (Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquin and Giles of Rome); 6) respectus ad agens (unknown). In the XIVth century John Duns Scotus and Peter Auriol add their proposals. The Subtle Doctor gives a solution that is complex and rich of critical issues, due to the evolution of his theory for the principle of individuation (from *forma individualis superaddita* to the common nature to the *ultima realitas formae*, a positive entity logically similar to a difference and really identical but formally non-identical to the common nature) and to the plurality of terms and expressions with their content-related nuances (*'forma individualis'*, *'differentia individualis'*, *'proprietas individualis'*, *'gradus individualis'* or *'gradus intrinsecus'*, *'ultima realitas formae'* and *'haecceitas'*); despite this, Duns Scotus is able to reach his aim to reconsider the value of the singular, recognizing to the individual a central role both form the

ontological point of view (because common natures and individuals, originating from differences by their superiors, have the same structural shape and the same metaphysical composition) and the gnoseological point of view (because the principle of individuation is a metaphysical entity and so it is equipped with a certain degree of intellegibility), so that there are only a difference of degree and of way of being between common natures and concrete individuals. The novelty and the subtlety of this solution on the principle of individuation produces a certain interest on different thinkers, called “early Scotists”, present at Paris during Scotus’s teaching years as *lector* and *magister* and considered as the firsts responsables of the interpretation ad diffusion of Scotus’s thought. Among them, there are thinkers, as the anonymous of ms. Borgh. 346, Hugh of Novocastro, Antonius Andreae and Aufredus Gonteri Brito, who are so fascinated by the Scotistic paradigm that they start to promote and defend it, although with a different importance; other thinkers, as Henry of Harcaly and William of Anwick, despite their predominant role in the interpretation and diffusion of Scotus’s thought, are very critical against his solution on individuation based on the real existence of common natures, and prefer to reevaluate the theory of a primitive thisness, focusing the attention on the way our intellect produce universals form individuals (Henry of Harclay) or the theory of Henry of Ghent (William of Alnwick). Peter Auriol, on his hand, elaborates a theory of individuation near to Henry of Harclay’s one, but he suggests a different way for the psychological process responsible of the production of universal concepts based on the theory of *esse apparens*, and he establishes a strong distinction between singularity an individuality.

The second chapter of this work is about Landulph’s position on the principle of individuation. The reconstruction of the text of parts 3-5 of the 12th distinction of the second book of Caracciolus’s commentary on the *Sentences* and its historical-philosophical study shows that the Franciscan friar defends Scotus’s solution on this argument mainly through a strong critic of Peter Auriol’s position. In part 3 he supports the plausibility of the Scotistic theory of common natures with their less-than-numerical unity and he critics the Auriol’s idea that they are instead universals *in anima* and that their unity is simply a unity of similarity due to a psychological process; in part 4 he summarizes Scotus’s critics against individuation by matter, by actual existence and by accidents (with a special attention to the individuation by quantity, in which he adds a refer to Peter Auriol’s doctrine, which gives quantity a role in the individuation of *continua*); in part 5 he concludes his dissertation with critics against primitive thisness in Auriol’s version and against individuation by double negation, ad he offers his personal interpretation of Scotus’s solution, choosing ‘*gradus intrinsecus*’ as the proper expression for the principle of individuation, and modal distinction between *ens in quantum ens* and its modes (*finitum* and *infinitum*) as the proper interpretation of the

relationship between common nature and principle of individuation, even if this choice produces a series of difficulties in merging the plurality of terms and expressions with their content-related nuances coming from Scotus's solution (mainly the idea that common nature and principle of individuation are in a potency-act relationship and that they are really identical but formally distinct).

In conclusion, this work wants to show that it is necessary to continue to produce texts and studies about Scotistic thinkers aiming both at the reconstruction the birth and the evolution of the Subtle Doctor's doctrine on different themes and at highlighting contact points, differences and nuances between Duns Scotus and his interpreters, who are responsible of the construction of "Scotism" but also independent and eclectic thinkers.