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John Mair’s Trinitarian Theology: The Inheritance of Scholastic Tradition

John T. Slotemaker

In the first decades of the 16th century, trinitarian theology remained remarkably consistent with the theological trajectory of the high and late medieval period. In the Smalcald Articles (1537), Martin Luther wrote that with respect to the doctrine of the divine Trinity there is “no contention or dispute” between the Roman Church and the Reformers: both parties, according to Luther, held one faith. However, the theological consensus regarding the Trinity—developed in the creedal statements of the patristic era and worked out with increasing complexity in the Medieval Latin West—would eventually be challenged as the 16th century unfolded. A rising tide of anti-trinitarian thought presented a sustained critique of the Christian doctrine as it was classically conceived, although those events took place only after John Mair published the final volume of his massive commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. For the purposes of contextualizing Mair’s Trinitarian theology, there are two aspects of 16th-century trinitarian thought that stand out when viewed against the backdrop of the late medieval tradition.

The trinitarian theology that began to emerge in the third and fourth decades of the 16th century was different from its medieval antecedents in two respects: (1) there emerged in the 16th century a sustained critique of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; and (2) trinitarian theology began to be debated in non-scholastic treatises (i.e., in works that were not commentaries

---


on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, quodlibetal questions, etc.). The first development occurred in the early 1530s, for example, in Michael Servetus’s *De Trinitatis erroribus* published in Strasburg in 1531. Servetus’s work inspired a theological critique that expanded geographically into Transylvania with the publication of *De falsa et uera unius Dei patris, filii et spiritus sancti cognitione libri duo* by George Blandrata and Francis Dávid in Alba Iulia (modern day Gyulafehérvár, Romania) in 1568. The second development is difficult to date with precision, although a solid point of reference is the publication of the first editions of Philipp Melanchthon’s *Loci communes* in Basel in 1521 and John Calvin’s *Institutio Christianae religionis* in Basel in 1536. All of these treatises—written by Michael Servetus, George Blandrata, Francis Dávid, Philipp Melanchthon, Martin Luther, or John Calvin—share the common feature of being influenced by scholastic trinitarian theology, but also rejecting, in part, the scholastic method established in the *Sentences* commentary tradition. John Mair’s trinitarian theology—which was published in two separate commentaries on Book 1 of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* in 1530 (reprint, 1519) and 1530—is one of the last great scholastic works on the Trinity written before either of these two shifts began to influence the development of 16th-century trinitarian thought. In this respect, Mair is an intriguing reference point regarding the reception of late medieval scholasticism. Mair is the last of the great scholastic theologians whose trinitarian theology remains relatively unaltered by the shifts in theology and theological method that altered the development of Christian thought in the early modern period.

Given this historical context, the present paper will analyze the trinitarian theology of John Mair as a culmination of late medieval scholasticism. The emphasis will be on Mair’s commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard,
focusing on the influence of the great scholastic theologians on Mair’s theology. First, I consider the structure and content of Mair’s 1510 and 1530 commentaries on Book I of the Sentences—looking both at what specific distinctions and questions of Peter Lombard’s Sentences John Mair treated and at the development between the 1510 and 1530 editions. Second, I treat the sources of John Mair’s trinitarian theology, focusing on what authors are cited throughout the 1510 and 1530 editions. Finally, in the third part of the essay I treat the content of Mair’s trinitarian thought, looking in detail at the medieval scholastic influences on his theology.

1 Mair’s Trinitarian Theology in 1510 and 1530: The Textual Tradition

John Mair’s trinitarian theology is developed almost exclusively in Book I of his commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. Mair initially published Book I in 1510 and republished it in 1519. Mair returned to the content of Book I almost two decades later to rework the text and published a final version in 1530. The present discussion will first consider the structure of Book I of the Lombard’s Sentences before considering Mair’s commentaries on the Sentences and how those commentaries diverged both from the Sentences and from the 14th-century theologians who inform Mair’s thought.

Peter Lombard and the Order of Trinitarian Doctrine

John Mair’s trinitarian thought is intricately tied to the structure and form of trinitarian theology found in the Lombard’s Sentences. This is because John Mair’s commentary on the Sentences is reminiscent of early 14th-century commentaries—perhaps the best example being William of Ockham’s—which follow the general structure of the Lombard’s work, but often limit a given distinction to one of the many topics discussed by the Lombard in that distinction. Because of this intimate relationship with the Sentences itself, it is instructive to consider the order and structure of the Lombard’s trinitarian theology. Unfortunately, Peter Lombard’s trinitarian theology has not been the subject of extensive study; this is a serious lacuna in the field, given that the order of the Lombard’s Sentences had a significant influence on subsequent medieval treatments of the Trinity.6

6 See Marcia L. Colish, Peter Lombard (Leiden: 1993), vol. 1, 245–263; Philipp W. Rosemann, Peter Lombard (Great Medieval Thinkers) (Oxford: 2004), 71–92; and Johannes Schneider, Die Lehre vom dreieinigen Gott in der Schule des Petrus Lombardus (Munich: 1961). For a fine discussion of the development of trinitarian theology during the period surrounding the
In his *Sentences* Peter Lombard treats the triune nature of God in what are later demarcated as distinctions 3–33 of Book I of the *Sentences*. The prologue and the first two distinctions of Book I treat issues of method and theological epistemology, leaving the trinitarian discussion to begin with the question of the *imago Dei/imago Trinitatis* in distinction 3. The discussion of the *imago Trinitatis* is contextualized within a broader discussion of theological epistemology; specifically, what can human beings know about the triune nature of God through the created order? Following the discussion of the *imago*, the Lombard treats: (1) the generation of the Son in distinctions 4–7; the divine essence in relation to the distinction of persons in distinctions 8–9; and (3) the procession of the Holy Spirit in distinctions 10–18. In the 14th century distinction 17 became a self-contained discussion of the intension and remission of forms, and thus functioned as a break within the treatment of the divine Trinity. But, in both the Lombard and in the subsequent tradition, the remaining distinctions on the Trinity (dd. 19–33) treated questions of trinitarian language, the nature of the persons and the personal properties of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Thus, the general flow of the Lombard’s trinitarian theology in the first eighteen distinctions moves from the *imago Trinitatis* to the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit. Finally, in distinctions 18 through 33, the Lombard treated a series of questions relating to the individual properties of the three persons and how the three persons related to the divine essence.

The general structure of the Lombard’s trinitarian theology described above had a significant impact on the order of trinitarian doctrine in the subsequent medieval tradition. In the early years of the commentary tradition—e.g., in the commentaries of Alexander of Hales (†1245) and Richard Fishacre (†1248)—medieval theologians followed Lombardian order meticulously. This lasted

---


8 In the late medieval period the discussion of the *imago Trinitatis* was frequently dropped from commentaries on the *Sentences* I, d. 3. The focus of distinction 3 in these later commentaries often shifted to questions of theological epistemology. This can be evidenced (see below n. 19) in Mair’s analysis of d. 3 in his first commentary on Book I of the *Sentences*.

9 For a discussion of distinction 17 of Book I, see below fn. 26.

through the mid-to-late 13th century, as both Bonaventure (†1274) and Thomas Aquinas (†1274) follow the general order as established by the Lombard. In the early 14th century the picture becomes somewhat more complicated, as the commentaries of John Duns Scotus (†1308), William of Ockham (†1347), and their contemporaries begin to diverge from a strictly Lombardian order of doctrine. For both Scotus and Ockham, the general order of doctrine is preserved but the number of questions treated is reduced significantly; that is, both Franciscans at times collapse various distinctions into one (e.g., treating dd. 11 and 12 as a single distinction) or omit individual questions from a given distinction. Further, in the three decades following Ockham, Oxford theologians began to re-structure and re-organize trinitarian doctrine more drastically. This development can be evidenced in the commentaries of Robert Holcot (†1349), Adam Wodeham (†1358) (i.e., the *Ordinatio Oxoniensis*), Roger Roseth (fl. 1330s), and, in Paris, Peter of Ailly (†1420). However, while many medieval bachelors chose to reorganize trinitarian theology, some throughout the 14th century retained the structure of the Lombard (e.g., the Augustinian Peter Gracilis, a contemporary of Ailly). This brief overview cannot do justice

---


to the numerous types of commentaries that emerged in Paris and Oxford during the 14th century, but it does give some indication of the options available to John Mair.\footnote{On the development of the genre, see Philipp W. Rosemann, \textit{The Story of a Great Medieval Book: Peter Lombard's Sentences} (Ontario: 2007).} Given the development of printing and the numerous incunabula and early printed editions already available between 1510 and 1530, John Mair had access to a broad range of commentaries and was influenced by the structural and organizational principles informing these commentaries. As a student of the development of 13th-, 14th-, and 15th-century theology, Mair probably read commentaries that represent every stage in the development of the organization of the \textit{Sentences} commentary tradition.\footnote{The sources of Mair's commentary are discussed in, Severin V. Kitanov, John T. Slotemaker and Jeffrey C. Witt, “John Major's (Mair's) Commentary on the \textit{Sentences} of Peter Lombard: Scholastic Philosophy and Theology in the Early Sixteenth Century,” in \textit{Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard}, volume 3 (ed.) Philipp W. Rosemann (Leiden: 2015), 369–415.} Here we turn to Mair's 1510/19 and 1530 commentaries on Book I of the \textit{Sentences}.

\begin{center}
\textit{Mair's 1510/19 Commentary on Book I}
\end{center}

John Mair's first edition of his commentary on Book I of the \textit{Sentences} was published in 1510 and reprinted in 1519 (with minor typesetting changes). These two recensions are almost identical, including the questions addressed throughout the commentary and the marginal notations that indicate Mair's sources. Here, the aim is to describe the structure of Mair's 1510/19 commentary, attending to the order of distinctions as well as what questions were asked in each distinction.\footnote{For the complete table of questions for both the 1510/19 and 1530 editions see Appendix B.} For example, did Mair retain the original questions of Peter Lombard, or did he adopt an approach closer to that of William of Ockham or Peter of Ailly? Each period in the development of the \textit{Sentences} commentary tradition included and excluded particular distinctions or questions as thought necessary. The question here is: what approach did John Mair adopt given that he was looking back on the tradition and surveying the numerous possibilities?

As argued above, Peter Lombard begins his discussion of the divine Trinity in distinction 3. The third distinction begins with a question of epistemology, but transitions into an analysis of whether or not human beings can know God through the \textit{imago Trinitatis} and finally what the nature of the \textit{imago} is.\footnote{Lombardus, \textit{Sent.} i, d. 3 (1: 68–77).} In Mair's treatment of distinction 3, the focus is exclusively on questions of...
epistemology. Thus, in the 1510/19 editions of Book 1 there is no discussion of the *imago Trinitatis per se*. This is the first indication that Mair’s commentary is similar, in many ways, with a somewhat later tradition, as the question of the *imago Trinitatis* remained central to the analysis of distinction 3 up through the commentaries of William of Ockham, Walter Chatton, and Adam Wodeham’s *Lectura secunda*. In distinction 4, therefore, Mair begins his treatment of the divine Trinity, analyzing various aspects of the doctrine up through distinction 33. That said, Mair’s discussion of the Trinity remains relatively short: Book 1 (1510), distinctions 4–33 occupy 55 folios (37vb–92vb), of which 36 folios are dedicated to d. 17 (47rb–83vb) and are not focused on trinitarian theology. Thus, there are only 19 folios specifically treating the Trinity in the 1510 edition of Book 1 (approximately the same numbers hold for the 1519 edition).

John Mair’s trinitarian distinctions tend to consist of a single question, with distinctions 8 (3 questions) and 24 (2 questions) being the exceptions. Interestingly, the first distinction devoted to trinitarian theology is distinction 4/5 that analyzes the vexed question of whether logical rules hold in analyzing the triune nature of God (*Utrum regulae logicales teneant in divinis?*). Mair begins his analysis of the Trinity, therefore, with the question of the relationship between Aristotelian logic and trinitarian faith. The focus of this question, as in previous medieval authors, is the expository syllogism and the proper supposition of trinitarian terms. This means that the Lombardian emphasis—which, in distinction 5, was on the procession of the Son—is withheld until distinctions 6 and 7 regarding whether the Father necessarily or freely begot the Son and whether the divine essence is the principle of generating (*principium generandi*) the Son. Distinction 8 shifts from trinitarian questions to issues dealing with the divine attributes (d. 8, q. 1), divine immutability (d. 8, q. 2), and divine simplicity (d. 8, q. 3). Finally, distinction 9 concludes the discussion of the generation of the Son with the question of whether or not the Father is, in some way, prior to the Son. This concludes the distinctions with respect to the Son per se.

Having discussed the generation of the Son, the following four distinctions (i.e., d. 10, d. 11/12, d. 13, and d. 14/15/16) treat the procession of the Holy Spirit.

---

19 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1510), d. 3, fols. 30ra–37vb; (1519), fols. 31ra–37vb.
20 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1510), d. 4, fols. 37vb–40vb; (1519), fols. 37vb–40vb.
21 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1510), d. 5, fols. 40vb–41rb; (1519), fols. 40vb–41ra; d. 6 (1510), fols. 41rb–42ra; (1519), fols. 41ra–42ra.
22 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1510), d. 8, q. 1, fols. 42rb–42vb; (1519), fols. 42ra–42rb; (1510), d. 8, q. 2, fols. 42vb–43va; (1519), fols. 42rb–43rb; (1510), d. 8, q. 3, fols. 43va–44rb; (1519), fols. 43rb–44ra.
23 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1510), d. 9, fols. 44va–45ra; (1519), d. 9, fol. 44ra–44vb.
Distinction 10 is concerned with whether or not the procession of the Holy Spirit is free (libere) or natural (naturaliter), while distinction 11 and 12 are combined into a single question on whether or not the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The following two distinctions treat the procession of the Holy Spirit specifically, asking whether or not the procession is actually a generation (as with the Son) and whether or not there is a twofold procession (given the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son). Because Mair collapses distinctions 11 and 12 into a single distinction—as well as distinctions 14, 15, and 16—much of the material dedicated to the process of the Holy Spirit in the Lombard's Sentences is omitted. Thus, the discussion of the Holy Spirit comes to a conclusion as he begins distinction 17, which in the late medieval period was focused on the intension and remission of forms.

Following distinction 17, John Mair's commentary contains select trinitarian questions up through distinction 33/34. The distinctions of importance are: distinction 20 on the equality of the divine persons; distinction 24, question 2 on the unity of God (i.e., how unitas is predicated of God); distinction 25 (et sequitur) on whether the divine persons are constituted in and of themselves; distinction 30/31 on the nature of the divine relations; and distinction 33/34 on whether or not the divine person or personal properties are distinguished from the divine essence. These questions round out John Mair's discussion of the divine Trinity in the 1510/19 edition, although, as will be demonstrated below, he expands his trinitarian theology in the 1530 edition. However, before discussing the 1530 edition a few observations about what is included and omitted from the 1510/19 edition are in order.

24 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 10, fol. 45rb–45vb; (1519), d. 10, fol. 45rb–45vb; (1510), d. 11/12, fols. 45vb–46rb; (1519), d. 11/12, fols. 45vb–46rb.
25 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 13, fols. 46va–47ra; (1519), d. 13, fols. 45vb–46rb; (1510) d. 14/15/16, fol. 47ra–47rb; (1519) d. 14/15/16, fol. 46rb–46va.
27 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 20, fols. 83va–84va; (1519) fols. 83ra–84ra.
28 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 24, q. 2, fols. 87ra–88vb; (1519) fols. 86vb–88rb.
29 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 25, fol. 89ra–89va; (1519), fol. 88rb–88vb.
30 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 30/31, fols. 92va–92vb; (1519), fols. 88vb–91rb.
31 Mair, In primum Sent. (1510), d. 33/34, fol. 92ra–92vb; (1519), fol. 91rb–91vb.
Mair’s 1510/19 commentary on Book i of the Sentences follows the structure of the Lombard’s work. Thus, in the broadest sense Mair’s discussion of the Trinity moves from an analysis of the generation of the Son (i.e., 6–7) to the procession of the Holy Spirit (dd. 11–16) and ends with a series of questions (dd. 20–34) on the relationship between the divine persons themselves and between the divine persons and the divine essence. However, while the work follows the general structure of the Lombard, it does not treat all of the distinctions or questions considered throughout the Sentences. Mair’s commentary, in this respect, reminds one of the commentaries written at Oxford in the second or third decade of the 14th century. Like Ockham, for example, Mair retains the system of distinctions—not abandoning the distinctions, for example, as Robert Holcot and Peter of Ailly will do in subsequent decades—but is highly selective regarding what material he treats.

**Mair’s 1530 commentary on Book I**

John Mair’s 1530 commentary on Book i of the Sentences is a substantial revision of the 1510/19 edition, and with respect to his trinitarian theology there are several important developments. First, it bears mentioning that with respect to the structure and order of trinitarian doctrine, John Mair’s 1530 commentary remains structurally identical to the edition published in 1510/19 (i.e., Mair did not reorganize the material or deviate from Lombardian order throughout his revision of Book i published in 1530).

The theological expansion of John Mair’s trinitarian theology happens in two distinct ways: (1) Mair adds to distinction 3 a discussion of the *imago Dei/Trinitatis*, and (2) he develops extensively his discussion of distinctions 18–33.32 Thus, what the reader observes is that between distinction 3 and distinction 17—which, traditionally, deals with the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit—Mair’s analysis of the Trinity remains remarkably consistent between 1510/19 and 1530. First, regarding the *imago Trinitatis*, it is significant that Mair adds the following question: *An in creatura vestigium atque imago Trinitatis increatae inveniatur?*33 This question, therefore, considers whether or not one can find in creatures a vestige or image of the uncreated Trinity. This is a significant addition, as Mair never addressed this question in his 1510/1519 edition. However, it is Mair’s more substantial additions to distinctions 18–33 that are the most significant and to which we turn.

Traditionally, distinctions 18–33 of Book i treat a constellation of questions regarding the equality of the divine persons, the relationship between the persons

---

32 This discussion follows closely that in Severin Kitanov, John T. Sloteraker and Jeffrey C. Witt, “John Major’s (Mair’s) Commentary on the Sentences.”

33 Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), d. 3, q. 6, fol. 33ra–33rb.
and the divine essence, and the nature of the personal properties and the persons per se. In the 1510/19 edition, Mair limited all of this material to five distinctions:

D. 20: Utrum personae divinae sint aequales, et an Deus effectus naturaliter conservet?
D. 24, qu. 1: An quantitas discreta sit aliqua res quantis inhaerens?; qu. 2: Utrum unum de quolibet dicatur, et an unitas sit res distincta a re una?
D. 25: Utrum personae divinae ipsis proprietatibus constituantur, et ab invicem distinguantur?
D. 30/31: Utrum relatio realis distinguatur a fundamento et termino?
D. 33/34: Utrum in Deo persona vel proprietas personalis distinguatur ab essentia divina?

As this list indicates, some of the questions are not focused on the Trinity per se (e.g., d. 24). Further, of the properly trinitarian questions, Mair limits his discussion to: the equality of the divine persons (i.e., d. 20), the divine relations (d. 30/31), and the personal properties (dd. 25 and 33/34).

The 1530 edition of Book i expands this list considerably. Consider the following list of questions:

D. 18: Utrum Spiritus Sanctus sit donus ab aeterno, an in tempore tantum datum?
D. 19/20: Utrum personae divinae sint aequales?
D. 21: Utrum haec ‘solus Pater est Deus’ sit vera?
D. 22: An Deus sit nominabilis?
D. 23: An persona dicatur univoce de persona creata et increata?
D. 24: An Sancta Trinitas sit numerus?
D. 25: Utrum persona sit relativa, an absoluta?
D. 26: Utrum essentia divina et proprietas constituant personas in divinis?
D. 27: An paternitas et spiratio activa distinguantur?
D. 28: Utrum innascibilitas sit proprietas Patris in divinis?
D. 29: Utrum in divinis sit principium?
D. 30: An relatio a fundamento et termino distinguatur?
D. 30/31: Utrum Dei ad creaturas sit relatio realis?
D. 32: Utrum Pater in divinis sit sapientia sapientia genita?

The first thing to note about the questions that John Mair adds to the 1530 edition is that the majority of them are extremely short. Combined, distinctions

\[^{34}\] Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1530), dd. 18–32, fols. 60rb–65vb.
18–32 occupy only about five and a half folios. Thus, the additions that are made in the 1530 edition are relatively minimal. Second, one notes that the theological topics considered expand on the basic framework of the 1510/19 edition. The majority, as the list indicates, are focused on the personal properties and the divine relations.

II The Sources of Mair’s Trinitarian Theology

In his commentary on the Sentences John Mair demonstrates a remarkable knowledge of late 13th- and 14th-century theology. A complete study of Mair’s sources is certainly not possible until a critical edition of his works is completed, but it is possible to present here an initial judgment regarding which sources influenced his trinitarian theology. As the discussion above indicates, it is only necessary to consider Mair’s sources in the 1510/19 edition because the supplements he makes to the 1530 edition do not generally include long discussions that engage with previous authors. The additions to the 1530 edition are generally limited to supplements that are close, textually and theologically, to the Lombard’s original work; as such, the 1530 supplements do not include significant engagement with 13th- or 14th-century authors. The present discussion, therefore, will focus on the 1510 and 1519 editions, as they provide helpful marginal notations that identify Mair’s sources.

Mair begins his discussion of the Trinity with distinction 4/5 of Book 1, focusing acutely on the relationship between Aristotelian logic and the Trinity. The discussion begins, as it did for many 14th-century authors, with reference to Innocent III’s clarification of the Lombard in response to Joachim of Fiore in the Extra de summa trinitate et fide, c. Damnamus (Lateran IV), which states

35 Throughout the present discussion, I am not (in general) pointing out references to Scripture, the creeds of the Christian Church, Aristotle, Augustine of Hippo (or other casual references to patristic sources), Averroes, or Peter Lombard.

36 E.g. Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), dd. 19/20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, and 29. These nine distinctions present new material that is not found in the 1510/19 edition, although none of these distinctions make reference to late medieval scholastic thought(!). Mair references Peter Lombard, Scripture, and occasionally Augustine; his method, throughout these distinctions, is to present a brief summary of the relevant distinction as he understands it to have been presented by the Lombard. See Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), dd. 19/20–29, fols. 60va–63vb. Because of this, the present section treats only the 1510/19 edition.

37 Throughout the following discussion, I have cited both the references within the text and the marginal notations from the 1519 edition.
explicitly that there is not a fourth thing in the Trinity.\textsuperscript{38} Thus, the context is set by a consideration of Joachim and Peter Lombard,\textsuperscript{39} although the discussion eventually shifts to the later scholastics. The text itself rarely mentions a specific doctor,\textsuperscript{40} although the marginal notations identify several *quidam*, such as: Thomas Aquinas, Peter of Ailly, and Adam Wodeham.\textsuperscript{41} Shifting to distinction 6, one notes that beyond the typical reference to Augustine and Peter Lombard there are no medieval authors cited or referenced in the margin. Contrarily, distinction 7 contains substantial engagement with Hilary of Poitiers,\textsuperscript{42} as well as references to Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, John Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham.\textsuperscript{43} The only marginal reference found throughout this section is to Peter of Ailly.\textsuperscript{44}

John Mair divides distinction 8 into three questions, and here it is convenient to treat them together. The first question is relatively brief, and the only significant reference is to Anselm.\textsuperscript{45} The second question is more substantial and includes citations that are both within the text and in the margins. Within the text, Mair makes reference to Anselm, while in the margins there is a reference

\textsuperscript{38} See the *De summa trinitate*, c. 2 in *Corpus iuris canonici*, 2nd ed. (ed.) Emil Friedberg (Graz: 1959), ii, 6: “Damnamus ergo et reprobamus libellum seu tractatum, quem abbac Ioachim edidit contra magistrum Petrum Lombardum de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis, appellans ipsum haereticum et insanum pro eo quod in suis dixit sententiiis: ‘quoniam quaedam summa res est Pater, et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, et illa non est generans, neque genita, neque procedens’. Unde asserit, quod ille non tam Trinitatem, quam quaternitatem abstruebat in Deo videlicet tres personas, et illam communem essentiam quasi quar tetam; manifeste protestans, quod nulla res est, quae sit Pater, et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; nec est essentia, nec substantia, nec natura; quamvis concedat, quod Pater, et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt una essentia, una substantia unaque natura.” See Mair, *In primum Sent.*, (1519), d. 4/5, fol. 37vb.

\textsuperscript{39} Circa Joachim and Peter Lombard, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 4/5, fol. 37vb–38ra. Nota bene: throughout this section I have used “circa” in the sense of “concerning,” such that the present footnote means that “concerning Joachim and Peter Lombard” one can consult the following passage in Mair. Where a reference to a medieval author is in the margin, not the text per se, I have referenced it by noting *in marg*.

\textsuperscript{40} One exception: Peter of Ailly (cited as Alliaco), Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 4/5, fol. 40va.

\textsuperscript{41} Circa Thomas, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 4/5, fol. 38ra *in marg.*; circa Ailly and A. Wodeham (1519), fol. 38rb *in marg*.

\textsuperscript{42} Circa Hilary, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 7, fol. 41va–41vb.

\textsuperscript{43} Circa Aquinas, Giles, Scotus and Ockham, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 7, fol. 41rb; circa Anselm, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 7, fol. 41va–41vb.

\textsuperscript{44} Circa Ailly, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 7, fol. 41vb *in marg*.

\textsuperscript{45} Circa Anselm, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 8, q. 1, fol. 42rb.
to both Adam Wodeham and John Buridan. The third question of distinction 8 is substantially a discussion of Aristotle and Averroes, although there is one passing reference to Anselm's *De incarnatione verbi Dei*. The ninth distinction consists of one question, and here there is a diversity of authors cited, including Boethius (i.e., *Consolatio Philosophiae*), John Duns Scotus, and John Gerson (the second lecture of the *Lectiones super Marcm*). The tenth distinction is focused on the production of the Holy Spirit and the only authorities cited are the traditional references to Augustine and Peter Lombard. That said, in distinction 11/12 on the procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio*, Mair engages substantially with the patristic and medieval traditions.

Because of the longstanding division between the Greek and Latin Churches over the *filioque* (the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son), it is not surprising that Mair engages with numerous sources in distinction 11/12. In particular, Mair references Scripture, the Nicene Creed, and the Constantinopolitan Creed. Further, in defense of the Latin position he engages with Augustine, while his defense of the Greek position mentions Athanasius, Didymus the Blind, Cyril of Alexandria, and John Chrysostom. Finally, with respect to medieval authorities, he references: Anselm, William of Auxerre (Altissiodorensis), Pope Gregory X (i.e., the second council of Lyon), Thomas Aquinas, and Gregory of Rimini. The discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit continues in distinction 13, and Mair again returns to numerous sources. With respect to an earlier tradition, he references John of Damascus and Anselm; with respect to the later scholastics he references Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Gregory of Rimini, and Peter of Ailly. In particular, Mair references Gregory of Rimini's argument that it is impossible to know the distinction between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit. He also references Peter of Ailly's strong response to this argument by

---

46 Circa Anselm, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 8, q. 2, fol. 42va; circa Wodeham, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 8, q. 2, fol. 42va in marg.; circa Buridan, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 8, q. 2, fol. 42vb in marg.

47 Circa Anselm, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 8, q. 3, fol. 43vb.

48 Circa Boethius, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 9, fol. 44ra; circa Scotus, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 9, 44va in marg.; circa Gerson, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 9, fol. 44va.

49 Circa the Creeds, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 10/11, fol. 45va.

50 Circa the Greek Fathers, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 10/11, fol. 45va.

51 Circa Anselm, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 10/11, fol. 45va; circa the council, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 10/11, fol. 45vb; circa Thomas, Gregory, and William, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 10/11, fol. 45vb.

52 Circa John of Damascus, Anselm, and Gregory, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 13, fol. 46ra; circa Thomas, Scotus, and Ailly, Mair, *In primium Sent.* (1519), d. 13, fol. 46ra.
claiming that it is scandalous (*scandalosus*). Finally, Mair concludes his discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit in distinction 14/15/16; this is a short discussion consisting of a single column of text that only references Scripture.

Mair’s presentation of trinitarian theology is interrupted textually by his massive discussion of the intension and remission of forms in distinction 17, but in the following distinctions he returns to properly trinitarian questions. Distinction 20, on the equality of the divine persons, engages with Aristotle and Averroes throughout, and there is a single reference to John Buridan. A similar pattern holds for the first question of distinction 24, where the only medieval text referenced besides Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* is Lorenzo (Laurentius) Valla’s logic. However, in the second question of distinction 24, Mair makes reference to numerous late medieval authors, including: Gregory of Rimini, Lorenzo Valla, Thomas Aquinas (*et reales*), and John Capreolus. In distinction 25, John Mair treats the personal properties of the divine persons and engages in the thought of Praepositinus of Cremona, Hugh of St. Victor, William of Auxerre, and William of Ockham.

One of John Mair’s longest distinctions on the Trinity is distinction 30/31 on the question: Whether a real relation is distinguished from its foundation and term. Mair acknowledges in setting up the question the numerous opinions, and in answering the question he references several theologians and schools of thought. First, regarding schools of thought, Mair makes reference to the *nominales, antiqui, Thomistae*, and *Scotistae*. And, while it is not unusual for Mair to reference these groups throughout his writings, he

---

53 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 13, fol. 46ra: “Frater Gregorius de Arimino dicit quod non est ei possibile intelligere hanc materiam, licet confiteatur se credere.”

54 Circa Buridan, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 20, fol. 83vb *in marg.*

55 Circa Valla, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 24, q. 1, fol. 85rb *corpus et in marg.*

56 Circa Gregory and Thomas, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 24, q. 2, fol. 87ra *in marg.*; circa Valla, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 24, q. 2, fol. 87ra, *in marg.*, fols. 87va and 88rb; circa Capreolus, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 24, q. 2, fol. 87rb *in marg.*

57 Circa Praepositinus and Ockham, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25, fol. 88vb *in marg.*; circa Hugh, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25, fol. 88vb; circa William of Auxerre, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25, fol. 88va–88vb *corpus et in marg.* It should be noted that in his 1530 edition of Book 1, Mair includes a discussion of Gilbert of Poitiers in distinction 26 (which corresponds to d. 25 in the 1510/19 edition). See Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1530), d. 26, fols. 61vb–63ra.

58 Circa nominales and antiqui, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 89ra; re Thomistae, Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519) d. 30/31, fol. 90ra–90rb; re Scotistae, Mair *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 90rb *in marg.*
has not previously employed them in his discussion of the Trinity. Second, regarding individual theologians Mair makes reference to: Gilbert of Poitiers, Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Bonaventure (Doctor Seraphicus), Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, John Duns Scotus (Doctor Subtilis), Peter Aureoli, William of Ockham, Adam Wodeham, and Gregory of Rimini. The emphasis throughout is on delineating the various positions adopted by the medieval theologians and relating individual thinkers to those broader arguments. Finally, in distinction 33/34 Mair considers the relationship between the divine persons, their respective personal properties and the divine essence. Throughout, the only reference to a medieval author is to Gregory of Rimini.

John Mair’s trinitarian theology is unique because of his historical perspective given that he was writing at the beginning of the 16th century. Like Gabriel Biel, John Mair surveyed an enormous amount of scholastic literature. And, working from Paris, he had exceptional access to the numerous scholastic works available in the Parisian libraries. Even more so than Biel, Mair is concerned with the numerous opinions held for each theological position and attempts to demarcate the various lines of argumentation. Biel, as one will recall, was essentially writing a massive commentary on the Lombard secundum Ockham (in Book 1 on the Trinity); thus, he was not as free as Mair to consider the full range of medieval thinkers. This brief overview is only a point of departure; with respect to Mair, and his use of sources, there are at present more questions than answers. First, it remains unclear what Mair’s actual sources were for many of his references and citations: did he have access to Biel’s Collectorium? Is he quoting the authors he mentions directly, or is he generally paraphrasing them? What is the source of the marginal ‘footnotes’ in the 1510 and 1519 editions of Book 1 (i.e., are they original to Mair, or the work of an editor)? Second, until one completes the laborious process of editing John Mair’s massive commentary (with a complete apparatus fontium), his extensive use of medieval scholastic authors will remain largely unknown. This is unfortunate, as Mair is an outstanding resource for understanding what authors in the early 16th century knew about the development of theology in the late medieval period.

59 Circa Gilbert, Alexander, Albert, Bonaventure, Henry, Scotus, and Aureoli, Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 89ra corpus et in marg.; circa Thomas, Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 90rb in marg.; circa Ockham, Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 90va–90vb in marg.; circa Gregory and Adam, Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 30/31, fol. 91ra in marg.

60 Circa Gregory, Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 33/34, fol. 91va.
Mair's Theology of the Divine Trinity

John Mair's trinitarian theology borrows heavily from the scholastic tradition of medieval thought that developed between the 12th and 15th centuries. In particular, his commentary on the Sentences substantively engages the great scholastic doctors of the 14th century. Thus, as has been argued for other late medieval or early modern theologians (e.g., Gabriel Biel, John Calvin, Martin Luther, and Huldrych Zwingli), it is perhaps best to understand John Mair's trinitarian thought as decisively influenced by one of the 14th-century traditions of medieval trinitarian theology.61 To gain a better perspective on Mair, it is useful to briefly review three distinct traditions of medieval trinitarian theology that developed during the 14th century.

Three Medieval Theories

The work of Théodore de Régnon, Michael Schmaus, Russell Friedman and others has recognized two dominant approaches to trinitarian theology in the late 13th and early 14th century. First, in a radically simplified way, the French Jesuit Théodore de Régnon argued that Saint Bonaventure defended a dynamic approach to the Trinity (through an account of the divine processions), while, by way of contrast, Thomas Aquinas defended a rather static approach to the Trinity (focused, as he was, on the doctrine of relations).62 In his magisterial


62 Théodore de Régnon, Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité, 4 vols. (Paris: 1892–1898). In particular, see the second part (deuxième série) as found in volume 2. This volume
study Michael Schmaus—a German priest and professor of dogmatic theology in Munich—considered a much greater diversity of late 13th- and early 14th-century sources, but similarly developed an account of late medieval trinitarian theology that recognized two central models that found their clearest expression in the thought of Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus. Following Schmaus, the recent work of Russell Friedman has argued for the presence of two distinct traditions: a Franciscan tradition (e.g., John Duns Scotus) and a Dominican tradition (e.g., Thomas Aquinas). However, in Friedman’s recent work he also focuses on a third tradition (i.e., that of 14th-century Praepositinianism) that, I would argue, begins the necessary process of reconsidering the implications of over-emphasizing the two-model approach.

First, it is instructive to begin with the two theories. According to the research of Schmaus and Friedman, the two basic theories emphasize either the priority of the divine relations or the divine processions in accounting for the distinction between the three persons of the Trinity. These theories are best exemplified in the works of Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus, who hold a relational model and processional model respectively. To these two

---

treats the “théories latines des processions divines” beginning with a discussion of the 12th-century masters before considering in detail: (1) Thomas Aquinas, (2) Richard of St. Victor, (3) Alexander of Hales, and (4) Bonaventure.


65 Friedman has argued that the two theories can be referred to as the Dominican and Franciscan approaches to the divine Trinity. This argument is perhaps most succinctly defended in Friedman, “Divergent Traditions,” but see also, id., Intellectual Traditions 1, 1–43. Linking the relational and processional models with the Dominican and Franciscan orders—through the language of a distinctly “Dominican Tradition” and “Franciscan Tradition”—is perhaps to overstate the case. See my review of Friedman’s Intellectual Traditions, in Archa Verbi 2013, 183–185.

66 See Thomas Aquinas, Scriptum i, dd. 11–12 (Mandonnet 1: 273–296); and Scotus, Ordinatio i, dd. 11–12 (Bálic V: 1–64). For numerous other primary texts relevant to the two traditions, see: Russell L. Friedman, “Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues: Trinitarian Texts from the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries,” Cahiers de l’institut du Moyen-Âge Grec
theories, another theory can be added which was developed in the late 12th century by the Dominican Praepositinus of Cremona (†1210) and was reasserted in the third and fourth decades of the 14th century. This third approach—found in the writings of Walter Chatton, Robert Holcot, and Gregory of Rimini—emphasizes the absolute simplicity of the divine nature and argues that the persons are distinct in and of themselves (se ipsis). The 14th-century scholastic theologians generally associated this third theory with Praepositinus and William of Auxerre. Thus, following Friedman, this view is perhaps best referred to as Praepositinianism.

These three types of late medieval trinitarian theology are best understood as distinct conceptual models that include a broad range of sub-points on which the three models either agree or disagree. That is, while broad strokes will be employed to paint a picture of these three types of medieval trinitarian theology, it must continually be insisted that in their details—in the individual brush strokes that comprise the broader portraits—these authors agree and disagree about numerous aspects of trinitarian theology.

Before considering the points of disagreement between Thomas and Scotus, it is necessary to explicate the generally accepted picture in the late 13th

---


century. Medieval Latin/Western theologians working at the end of the 13th century agree that within the one divine nature: (1) the Father eternally emanates (specifically, generates) the Son; and (2) the Father and Son eternally emanate (specifically, spirates) the Holy Spirit. These two eternal emanations within the divine nature are the two processions within God. Further, the two processions engender distinct relationships between the three divine persons, such that: (1) the Father’s relation to the Son is one of *paternity* and his relation to the Holy Spirit is one of *active spiration*; (2) the Son’s relation to the Father is one of *filiation* and his relation to the Holy Spirit is (also) *active spiration*; (3) finally, the Holy Spirit’s relation to the Father and Son is one of *passive spiration*. Accordingly, there are four relations that constitute the two emanations within God; paternity and filiation are the relations that constitute the generation of the Son, while active and passive spiration constitute the spiration of the Holy Spirit. Thomas and Scotus agree, one can note, with this general picture.

Further, and more technically, Thomas and Scotus also agree: (1) that there is some kind of distinction between the individual divine attributes (e.g. God’s wisdom and power) and between the divine attributes and the divine essence; (2) that there are distinct personal and constitutive properties of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by which they are distinct from one another (i.e., *paternitas*, *filiatio*, *spiratio activa*, and *spiratio passiva*); and (3) that the individual personal properties of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are relational properties that are, in some way, distinct from the persons themselves. Having established these points of agreement, we can now turn to the points of disagreement between Thomas and Scotus.

Thomas argues that in order for the divine persons to be distinct, one cannot simply appeal to the two divine processions within God. First, one must note that the four divine relations described above can be grouped into two sets of two in which the relations in question are opposed to each other. Speaking of the generation of the Son, one can note that paternity and filiation

---

70 For a discussion of the divine relations, see Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 28 in *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis, doctoris angelici Opera Omnia iussu Leonis xiii. O. M. edita., cura et studio fratrum praedictorum* (Rome: 1882–1996), vols. 4–11. Thomas Aquinas primarily develops his trinitarian theology in his commentary on the *Sentences*, the *Summa contra Gentiles, De potentia*, and the *Summa theologiae*. I will be referencing the *Summa theologiae* (as it is his most accessible and mature work), although the reader may choose to consult the work of Gilles Emery for references to other sources. In particular, see Gilles Emery, *La Trinité créatrice, Trinité et création dans les commentaires aux Sentences de Thomas d’Aquin et de ses précurseurs Albert le Grand et Bonaventure* (Paris: 1995); id., *La théologie trinitaire de saint Thomas d’Aquin* (Paris: 2004).
are opposed—that is, paternity and filiation describe the same act of emanation, but from an active (paternity) and passive (filiation) perspective. Similarly, speaking of the spiration of the Holy Spirit, one can note that active and passive spiration are opposed—as above, active and passive spiration describe the same act of emanation (emanation of the Holy Spirit), but from an active (active spiration) and passive (passive spiration) perspective. However, the distinction that arises as a result of the correlative opposites is not merely a mental distinction understood by the observer. As Friedman argues, the distinction “has ontological and metaphysical significance.” The relations, therefore, are really distinct from each other (i.e., paternity and filiation are really distinct), while only minimally distinct from the divine essence. This allows the relations to pass into the one divine essence when compared with it, and yet establish the necessary distinction between the individual divine persons. This opposition, Thomas argues, is necessary to give an account of the distinction of the divine persons because, following Aristotle, the distinction of non-material things can only be on account of a relation, and the only relational distinction applicable to the divine nature is a relation of opposition.

John Duns Scotus disagrees with Thomas Aquinas’s claim that the divine persons are distinct by opposed relations of origin. For Scotus, it is not necessary that there be an opposition between the two sets of relations within God. This means that there need not be an opposition between paternity and filiation or between active and passive spiration in order to account for the distinction of the divine persons. But, why would Scotus argue for such a position when he admits that the argument is purely counterfactual because as a matter of Church doctrine he does concede that the four relations in question are opposed? Is there anything actually at stake in this argument? Scotus argues that on Thomas’s model (opposed relations of origin), in order for the Holy Spirit to be distinct from the Son the Holy Spirit must necessarily spirate from the Father and Son. This means that the doctrine of the *filioque* (as held by the Latin Western Church) must necessarily be true; and, further, that the Orthodox position which denies the *filioque* must be heterodox. The theological implication of Thomas’s doctrine

---

72 Scotus, *Ordinatio* III, d. 11–12 (Balić v1–64). Scotus’s trinitarian theology is developed in numerous works, including his three commentaries on the *Sentences* (i.e., the Lectura, *Ordinatio* and *Reportatio*) and his *Quodlibetal* questions. For a discussion of Scotus’s trinitarian theology, see Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus on God* (Aldershot: 2005); and Friedrich Wetter, *Die Trinitätslehre des Johannes Duns Scotus* (Münster: 1967). For a discussion of Scotus’s alternative theory (i.e., the theory of the absolute divine persons), see Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions* 1, 341–416.
of opposed relations of origin, according to Scotus, is that the Holy Spirit must necessarily proceed from the Father and Son (filioque).\footnote{See John T. Slotemaker, "John Duns Scotus and Henry of Harclay on the Non-Necessity of Opposed Relations," \textit{The Thomist} 77 (2013): 419–451.}

Despite the differences between the two positions, when compared to the third model the Thomistic and Scotistic approaches to trinitarian theology hold much in common. The third position (i.e., Praepositinianism) rejects: (1b) any distinction between the individual divine attributes (e.g. God’s wisdom and power) and between the divine attributes and the divine essence; and (2b) any distinction between the divine persons and their respective personal properties. The persons, it is argued, are distinct in and of themselves (\textit{se ipsis}). That is, there is no need to appeal to some individuating personal property by which one divine person is distinct from another divine person—the persons are simply distinct as persons, in and of themselves.\footnote{For a useful discussion of the origins of Praepositianism, see Friedman, \textit{Intellectual Traditions} ii, 678–683.} This model is defended in the 14th century by Robert Holcot, Walter Chatton, and Gregory of Rimini.\footnote{See Holcot, \textit{In quatuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones}, q. 5; Gualterus de Chatton, \textit{Lectura super Sententias} (eds.) J.C. Wey and G. Etzkorn, 3 vols. (Toronto: 2007–2009); and id., \textit{Reportatio super Sententias} (eds.) J.C. Wey and G. Etzkorn, 5 vols. (Toronto: 1989–2005). Gregory’s commentary on the \textit{Sentences} is found in, Gregorius Ariminensis, \textit{Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum} (eds.) D. Trapp et al. (Spätmittelalterund Reformation Texte und Untersuchungen 6–11) (Berlin: 1979–1984). For a discussion of the personal properties, see \textit{Lectura i}, d. 26–27 (Trapp iii, 59–78).}

Medieval trinitarian theology in the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries was characterized by three distinct models: a relational model, a processional model, and the Praepositinian model. In what follows, it will be clear that Mair rejected the heated 13th-century debate between those who defended the relational and processional models. In short, Mair is somewhat disparaging in his remarks about this 13th-century debate. In this regard, he is similar to some of the 14th-century theologians such as Holcot, Chatton, and Rimini. Further, it will be argued that Mair is sympathetic with the Praepositinian model as defended in the mid 14th century.

\textit{John Mair, the Filioque, and the Relational and Processional Models}

The best point of entry into John Mair’s trinitarian theology is the heated debate regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit \textit{a filio}.\footnote{Throughout the present discussion I have relied upon Mair’s arguments as developed in the 1519 edition of Book i. I am using this text so as to maintain continuity with the discussion of Mair’s sources in the previous discussion—but it is important to observe that}
Peter Lombard analyzed this topic in distinctions 11 and 12 of the first book of the *Sentences*, and the great scholastic doctors of the 13th and 14th century followed suit. As Friedman has demonstrated throughout numerous publications, the debate between the relational and processional theories (in Friedman’s language, the Dominican and Franciscan traditions respectively) was acutely focused on distinctions 11 and 12 of Book 1. Thus, it is instructive to begin with John Mair’s discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

Mair introduces distinctions 11 and 12 by noting that in these distinctions the Lombard speaks about the procession of the Holy Spirit: in particular, Mair notes, the focus is on the point where the discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit touches upon the dispute (*disceptatio*) between the Greeks and the Latins. Given this context, Mair formulates the *quaestio* as: “Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son?”77 Mair responds affirmatively that the Holy Spirit does proceed from the Father and the Son. To demonstrate this claim, Mair begins methodologically by defending the claim that all truths that can be deduced from the content of Sacred Scripture and are held as articles of faith are true (*simpliciter vera*).78 Thus, since the procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio* can be deduced from Scripture and is an article of the faith, it follows that it is true. This argument is strengthened by two passages from Book 15 of Augustine’s *De Trinitate* (i.e., 15.17 and 15.27); these passages of Augustine, however, are not intended to stand alone as an authority, but to serve as witness to the fact that the truth of the *filioque* is attested in Holy Scripture.79 This is expressly evident, Mair argues, in Book 4 of Augustine’s *De Trinitate* where the Bishop of Hippo demonstrates the scriptural truth of the doctrine in

---

77 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “Magister loquitur de processione Spiritus Sanctus: ubi tangitur disceptatio inter Graecos et Latinos. Queritur: an Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio.”

78 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “omnis conclusio ex contentis in sacra scriptura per se deducta est simpliciter vera: et ut articulus fidei tenenda: haec est huiusmodi...”

79 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “igitur, maior est manifesta, minor est beati Augustini, 15 *De Trinitate*, c. 17 ubi dicit expresse, ‘quod de Filio Spiritus Sanctus procedere reperitur’; et c. 27, dicit ‘difficillimum est generationem a processione distinguere, sufficiat interim eis qui extendi non amplius valent id quod de hac re in sermone quodam proferendo ad aures populi diximus, dictum quae conscripsimus.’ See Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15.17.29 (ed.) W.J. Mountain in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* 50–50A (Turnhout: 1968) (Mountain 503, ll. 58) and 15.27.48 (Mountain 529, ll. 1–6).
question. Augustine’s repeated citations of Matthew 10:20, John 14:26, John 15:26, John 20:22, and Galations 4:6, provide biblical warrant for the claim that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Thus, Mair states that these passages demonstrate not only that Augustine holds that the Holy Spirit proceeds a Filio, but that the truth of this claim is easily deduced from Scripture. Finally, in support of this conclusion, Mair argues that the position of Augustine and Scripture is supported by Gregory X’s statement at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274:

We profess firmly and devotedly that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one principle; not by two spirations, but by one single spiration. This the holy Roman Church, mother and teacher of all the faithful, has until now professed, preached, and taught; this she firmly holds, preaches, professes, and teaches; this is the unchangeable and true belief of the orthodox fathers and doctors, Latin and Greek alike...

---

80 Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “Et subdit ad propositum immediate, inter cetera enim per sanctarum scripturarum testimonia docui de utroque procedere Spiritum Sanctum. Et libro 4, c. 53, hoc deducit per auctoritatem sacre scripture dicens: ‘nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus a Filio non procedat, non enim frustra et Patris et Filii Spiritus [Mt. 10:20; Gal. 4:6] dicetur, nec video quid aliud voluit significare Filius, cum sufflans [in faciem discipulorum] ait: accipite Spiritum Sanctum [Io. 20:22], neque enim flatus ille corporeus cum sensu corporaliter tangendi procedens ex corpore substantia Spiritus Sancti fuit; sed demonstratio per congrua significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed etiam a Filio [Io. 15:26] procedere Spiritum Sanctum.’ (See Augustine, De Trinitate 4.20.29 (Mountain 199, ll. 102–110)). Et subdit: ‘quid ergo ait dicens quem ego mittam vobis a Patre [Io. 15:26], ostendit Spiritum Sanctum et Patris et Filii [Mt. 10:20; Gal. 4:6], quia etiam cum dixisset quem mittet addidit in nomine meo [Io. 14:26]. Et que forte diceret aliquis si Filius dixisset: quem mittet Pater a me, sicut dixit quem ego mittam vobis a Patre: ubicunque ostenderet quod totius divinitatis vel (si melius dicitur) totius deitatis Pater est principium.”


82 Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “Istas rationes facit ibidem Augustinus [De Trinitate], libro 15, c. 26, patet igitur ex intentione Augustini quod Spiritum Sanctum procedere a Filio potest ex contentis in sacra scriptura per se deduci.”

83 Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “Testimonium efficarum huius conclusionis colligitur ex Concilio Lugdunensi sub Gregorio X, De summa trinitate et fide catholica, lib.
Following this lengthy quotation from the second council of Lyon, Mair turns to the counter arguments.

The argument against the *filioque* begins with the uncomfortable realization that if one is obliged to hold the procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio*, the Greeks (who deny this claim) are heretics and consequently damned; however, it is unfitting (*inconveniens*), Mair states, to assert this of so many celebrated and famous men.84 In particular, Mair observes that John of Damascus argues that the Holy Spirit comes forth from the Father by means of procession not filiation.85 But, it is not only the theology of John of Damascus that presents a challenge; Mair observes that neither the Constantinopolitan Creed nor the Nicene Creed sung in the Mass (*cantatur in Missa*) contain the statement that the Holy Spirit proceeds *a Filio*.86 It seems, therefore, that there is good evidence—both among theologians and in the creeds themselves—that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. It is interesting that nowhere in the

---

84 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45rb: “Si ita esset sicut ipsa asserit ipsa esset articulus fidei et per consequens Graeci tenentes oppositum sunt haeretici et damnandi. Hoc est inconveniens asserere de tot celebribus viris.”


86 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45va: “Item in symbolo Constantinopolitanae Synodi sic legitur ‘credimus in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum, et vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum et glorificandum.’ Et in Symbolo quod cantatur in Missa, quod fuit editum in Nicaeno Concilio, non continetur quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Filio.”
defense of this opposing position does Mair address the question of whether or not this argument is consistent (or inconsistent) with the Scriptures.

In response to the counter position, Mair presents an interesting analysis of the development of Christian thought and doctrine. He argues that for those who historically preceded the express determination of the Church (*praecesserunt expressam determinationem ecclesiae*) on a particular doctrinal matter, it was permitted for them to hold an opinion that, subsequently, was determined to be illicit.87 However, after a determination of the Church, one (particularly one who is educated) is bound to follow the teaching as presently established by the councils of the Church. The implication, therefore, is that while it was licit to hold the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone prior to the second Council of Lyon, it is no longer licit for one to hold that position following the council. The qualifier—especially the learned (*potissimum de literatis*)—indicates, it seems, that the situation could be somewhat different if a particular person or church persisted in a region not informed of the decision of the Church.88

Having interjected this methodological argument regarding the historical development of doctrine, Mair turns to a famous passage where Peter Lombard argues that the Greeks agree with the Latins in meaning but disagree in words

---

87 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45va: “Respondetur negando consequentiam: maxime de his qui praecesserunt expressam determinationem ecclesiae, licuit enim interdum aliquid opinative tenere et tamen post determinationem ecclesiae non licet, si sit sermo de posterioribus qui secuti sunt determinationem ecclesiae, non habetur consequens inconveniens, potissimum de literatis.”

88 Theologians in the early 16th century were increasingly aware of the historical development of Christian doctrine and teaching. This general awareness built on the Renaissance emphasis on the historical nature of texts, and is evident, for example, in the heated debates between Michael Servetus (for Servetus, see n. 2 above) and John Calvin. For Calvin’s view of the historical nature of the Church, see *Responsio ad Sadoleti epistolam* (eds.) G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, in *Corpus Reformatorum, Ioannis Calvini opera, quae supersunt omnia* (Braunschweig: 1886), 385–416. For Calvin’s understanding of the development (or lack thereof) of trinitarian theology, see *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra Trinitate contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serueti Hispani* (ed.) J. Kleinstuber, in *Ioannis Calvini Opera Omnia* (Geneva: 2009). Calvin’s response to Servetus was first published in 1554. During his trial, Servetus had argued that pre-Nicene Christians (e.g., Irenaeus of Lyons) did not have an “orthodox” understanding of the Trinity. Calvin’s response in the *Defensio* was to argue that the theology of the pre-Nicene Fathers was consistent with the theological consensus of the 4th-century Church. This understanding of the development of Christian thought (in particular the doctrine of the Trinity) was increasingly nuanced in the 16th century, and John Mair inherits this attention to historical development.
He observes that the Lombard had argued that the disagreement is only verbal (solo verbo) and examines in some detail the patristic evidence provided for this claim. This evidence notwithstanding, Mair concludes the question by arguing that it is simply incorrect to argue that the dispute is merely verbal and not real. His evidence, again returning to tradition, is found in St. Anselm of Canterbury’s *De processione Spiritus Sancti*. Saint Anselm, one must recall, attended the council of Bari, called by Urban II, in 1098; at the council Anselm engaged in substantive debate about the filioque and the relationship between the Eastern and Western Churches. While historically it is unclear whether many Greek Bishops or theologians attended the council, the Latin sources often give the impression that a substantive theological discussion took place between Eastern and Western Bishops. This is precisely what the text of Anselm provides: evidence that the Latin Church teaches the filioque and, more importantly, that the Latin Church attempted to ‘inform’ the Greek Church about this theological truth.

---

89 Lombardus, *Sent.* i, d. 11, c. 2 (1: 116, ll. 22–24): “Sed cum non sit aliud Spiritum Sanctum esse Patris vel Filii, quam esse a Patre et Filio, etiam in hoc in eandem nobiscum fidei sententiam convenire videntur, licet verbis dissentiant.”


92 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45va: “Sed non est verisimile de Graecis post determinationem ecclesiae quod haberent disputationem vocalem cum Latinis, sed potius realem. Ut patet per Anselmum *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, c. 4, in principio capituli, ubi loquens de quibusdam quae premiserat in principio. Sic inquit hoc suplere
assumption, it is not surprising that Mair—building on his argument above concerning the nature of tradition and doctrine—argues in response to the Lombard’s position that Greek theologians cannot appeal to ignorance regarding the decision of the Latin Church. In short, Mair rejects the claim that this is simply a verbal dispute and not a real dispute. Returning to the situation discussed by Anselm, Mair notes somewhat unceremoniously that the Greeks who attended the Council of Bari refused the teaching of the Church and “returned to their own country by another route and to their former vomit (ad priorem vomitum).” Mair, therefore, holds the position of the Latin Church that the Holy Spirit proceeds a Filio.93

What is striking about Mair’s treatment of distinctions 11 and 12 in the 1510/19 and 1530 editions of Book 1 of his commentary is that he never engages in the lengthy dispute that dominated the late 13th and early 14th centuries (i.e., regarding disparate vs. opposed relations). Not unlike Peter of Ailly and other late 14th-century theologians, Mair was not engaged in the dispute that was the focus of attention for over half a century. This gives us our first indication of Mair’s theological position with respect to the three models of trinitarian theology discussed above. In short, Mair does not discuss the distinction between the relational and processional models of trinitarian theology that dominated the late 13th century and is not particularly interested in the debate concerning opposed or disparate relations. His focus, in distinctions 11 and 12, is on the theological question at hand: whether or not the filioque is true according to Christian teaching. However, before any definitive judgment can be reached, it is necessary to also consider Mair’s treatment of personal distinction.

93 The remainder of d. 11/12 contains the dubium: “Utrum Pater et Filius sunt unum principium spirans Spiritum Sanctum?” Mair notes the position of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and Gregory of Rimini, before finally concluding with a summary of the teaching of William of Auxerre. See Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 11/12, fol. 45va–45vb. The theological question presented in this dubium is retained in the 1530 edition as an independent distinction. See Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), d. 12, fol. 44ra–44va.
John Mair and Praepositanism

In distinction 25 of the first book of the *Sentences* the Master treats the properties of the divine persons. With respect to this material, the question that Mair examines in some detail is “whether the divine persons are constituted by means of their personal properties and are personally distinguished from one another?”94 This is the standard question of the day in the *Sentences* commentaries of the 14th century.95 However, what is striking about Mair’s analysis is that he frames the question by quoting a passage from William of Auxerre who argued that the position of Praepositanus of Cremona was *multum probabilis*.96

The passage by William—which itself quotes a passage by Praepositanus—argues that the sentence *paternitas est Pater* should be interpreted to mean that fatherhood (*paternitas*) simply is the Father. As discussed above, according to this view the persons of the Trinity are distinct *se ipsis* (in and of themselves). That is, the only distinction between the persons and their respective personal prosperities is (as the quotation from Praepositanus insists) in the *modo loquendi* or in the *modo significandi*.97 Mair defends this basic position.

---

94 Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88rb: “Circa distinctionem vigesimaquintam et aliquas sequentes in quibus Magister tractat de proprietatibus divinarum personarum, quaerimus: an personae divinae ipsis proprietatibus constituantur, et ab invicem personaliter distinguantur?”


96 Guillelmus, *Summa aurea* i, tr. 7, c. 6 (Ribaillier 125–126, ll. 4–7). In the 1530 edition Mair complicates the picture by considering the positions of both Gilbert of Poitiers and Praepositanus of Cremona. The position of Gilbert, Mair notes, is briefly addressed and rebuffed by Peter Lombard. See Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1530), d. 25, fols. 61vb–62ra; and Lombardus, *Sent.* i, d. 33, c. 1 (i: 242, ll. 7–11): “Hoc autem aliqui negant, dicentes quidem proprietates in personis esse, sed non esse personas ipsas, quia ita dicunt esse in personis vel in essentia divina, ut non sint interius, sicut ea sunt, quae secundum substantiam de Deo dicuntur, ut bonitas, iustitia, sed extrinsecus affixa sunt. Atque ita esse, rationibus probare contendunt.” For Gilbert, see Nikolaus Häring (ed.), *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Studies and Texts 13) (Toronto: 1966). As the Lombard understood Gilbert, he was arguing that the personal properties are in the persons (*in personis esse*) but are not the persons themselves (*non esse personas ipsas*). Mair rejects the latter claim.

by arguing that it is consistent with the absolute simplicity of the divine nature: God is omnimodo simplex. According to Praepositinus, God is perfectly simple such that any distinction posited between the persons and their personal properties is a violation of this perfect simplicity. “For this reason,” Mair states, “this conclusion is put forth: the person of the Father is not constituted in esse Patris by means of the essence and the [personal] property.”

However, as Mair notes, the personal properties are understood in many (multifariam) ways. First, there is the claim that the personal properties refer to the persons themselves (pro personis ipsis) such that “the property of the Father is the Father himself.” Mair explicates this understanding of the personal properties by referencing Peter Lombard’s citation of Jerome, who wrote that “we do not only confess the names [of the persons], but also the properties of the names, that is, the persons, and as the Greeks express it, hypostases, that is subsistences.” Here, Mair seemingly breaks with a strictly scholastic approach, attending to the Lombard’s use of the term (more Virgiliano) ecce—behold, look, or see—and arguing (implicitly) that through this language the Lombard is drawing our attention to this particular theological conclusion.
Twice, Mair observes, the Lombard emphasizes this understanding of the personal properties through the use of the term *ecce*.

Second, the personal properties can be understood as second intentions. An intention is a concept of the mind that is naturally the sign of something else. Following Ockham, there are two basic types of intentions: (1) *first intentions* which are signs of something that is not itself a sign; and (2) *second intentions* which are signs of first intentions.\(^{103}\) For example, the term ‘father’ is a first intention that signifies all males who have offspring; while the term ‘fatherhood’ is a second intention that refers to a first intention (i.e., ‘father’). Following this basic terminology, Mair will argue that a second interpretation is that the personal properties (e.g., *paternitas*, *filiatio*, etc.) are second intentions.\(^{104}\) Further, he claims that in this way one can know that one thing differs from another. The example he gives is that through ‘Scottishness’ one can distinguish Alexander of Hales from John Duns Scotus, but not Henry of Ghent—for, as he notes, Alexander is distinct from Scotus in that Scotus is from Scotland and Alexander (and Henry) are not.\(^{105}\) Thus, through the second intention ‘Scotus’ (i.e., Scotsman) one can predicate a distinction between Alexander and John Duns (i.e., Alexander is not from Scotland, while John Duns is).

---

\(^{103}\) Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va: “Alio modo capitur proprietas secundae intentionaliter: ut sit passio termini incomplexi vel complexi. Sic Aristoteles de proprietatibus substantiae et aliorum praedicamentorum loquitur. Proprietas hoc modo nihil aliud est quam aliquid per quod cognoscimus unam rem differre ab alia.”

\(^{104}\) Compare with Ockham, *Summa Logicae* 1, c. 4 in *Opera philosophica* 1 (eds.) Gedeon Gál et al. (St Bonaventure, NY: 1974) (155–156, ll. 44–55): “Et quamvis secundum usum theologorum oporteat concedere quod aliqua res extra animam, quae non est signum incomplexium alterius ex quo nata est componi propositio, sit relatio, tamen puto quod Aristoteles nihil posuit relativum nec ‘ad aliquum’ nec relationem nisi solum nomen ex quo nata est propositio mentalis, vocalis vel scripta componi. Et ideo secundum opinioinem Aristotelis, ut aestimo, ‘relatio’ sive ‘ad aliquum’ sive etiam ‘relativum’ erat nomen secundae impositionis vel nomen secundae intentionis et non nomen primae intentionis. Et ideo secundum suam opinioinem non debet concedi quod homo est relatio vel albedo est relatio, sed debet concedi quod hoc nomen ‘pater’ est relativum, et non debet concedi quod iste homo qui est pater est relativum.”

\(^{105}\) Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va: “Per Scotum distinguimus Alexandrum ab Henrico non Scoto [sic]: per hoc quod unus est natus in tali patria et non alius conclusimus talem differentiam.” Clearly there is either a mistake in the edition (i.e., it should read *ab Scooto, non Henrico*) or John Mair thought that Alexander was from England and not Scotland. Either way, his central point is clear.
Given this background, Mair states that *paternitas* and *essentia* do not constitute the person of the Father *in esse Patris*. That is, fatherhood and essence do not combine or conjoin as two distinct things to constitute the person of the Father; similarly, he argues, this holds for all of the divine persons and their respective personal properties.\(^\text{106}\) This basic understanding of the personal properties is evident, Mair argues, because the personal properties (e.g., *paternitas*) are either a being in the soul (*ens in anima*) or outside of the soul (*extra animam*). If the personal properties are something *in anima*, it follows that they do not constitute the eternal divine essence and simplicity. Contrarily, if the personal properties are something *extra animam*, it must be asked whether the property in question is in the divine essence or something distinct from it.\(^\text{107}\)

Some opponents, Mair observes, agree that the property of the Father (i.e., *paternitas*) really is the Father; however, they argue that while this is a true theological statement, it is also the case that the term *constituere* (when applied to the *Pater* and *paternitas*) is appropriate or fitting. According to this position, the term *compositio* is not appropriate to a discussion of the persons and the personal properties, but the term *constituere* should be accepted. Mair argues that theologians who defend such a position—even though they correctly identify *paternitas* with *Pater*—seem to misapply or misuse (*videntur abuti*) the term *constituere*.\(^\text{108}\) Further, Mair defends this argument by observing that this is the position of Augustine and the Fathers. Mair again references Peter Lombard’s citation of Jerome, according to which *substantia unum sunt Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus; sed personis ac nominibus distinguuntur*.\(^\text{109}\)

\(^\text{106}\) Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va: “Hoc praemisso, probabatur conclusio quod paternitas et essentia non constituant personam Patris in esse Patris, et eodem modo de aliis proprietatibus in divinis. Paternitas primo modo nihil aliud est quam Pater, sed Pater et essentia divina non constituant Patrem.”

\(^\text{107}\) Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va: “Quod patet, quia vel talis paternitas est ens in anima vel extra animam. Si primum, non constituit essentiam aeternam et simplicem in esse. Si secundum, quaeritur utrum est essentia divina an aliquid distinctum ab ea.”

\(^\text{108}\) Mair, *In primum Sent.* (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va–88vb: “Respondebunt adversarii quod proprietas Patris puta paternitas realiter est Pater, nec inconvenit aliquod identificatum cum aliquo realiter ipsum constitutum. Secus est de compositione in qua requiritur partium distinctio, omnis enim compositio est neganda a personis divinis, non autem constituio. Hic non erit magnum discriminem reale cum dicunt (et necesse est) paternitatem esse Patrem, sed videntur abuti vocabulo ‘constituere’, et cum hoc attribuere vo-[88vb]-colum indecens personis divinis.”

\(^\text{109}\) Lombardus, *Sent.* 1, d. 25, c. 3 (1296, l. 15–17): “... 'Itaque substantia unum sunt, sed personis ac nominibus distinguuntur.'
Interestingly, next to the quotation by Jerome in the margin of the 1519 edition is inserted the ‘footnote’ Praepositinus. Whether this marginal note can be attributed directly to Mair is uncertain, although given the lack of contrary evidence it is perhaps best to tentatively accept these marginal notations as belonging to Mair. Either way, it is clear that Mair or the editor of the 1519 edition understood this traditional position—i.e., that of Augustine, Jerome, and other Fathers of the Church—to be the position attributed to Praepositinus of Cremona.

Following this basic explication of Praepositinus, Mair presents in the *sed contra* a variation of the traditional argument that had been leveled against Praepositianism for almost two centuries. Basically, the claim is that with respect to the Father and his relational properties (i.e., fatherhood and active generation) there must be a distinction between the way in which He is related to the Son and the Holy Spirit, i.e., by means of *paternitas* the Father is related to the Son, and by means of *generatio activa* He is related to the Holy Spirit. If this is not the case—and a single relation relates the Father to the Son and the Holy Spirit—the Father would fail to be distinct from both the Son and the Holy Spirit.

After completing the *sed contra*, Mair turns to Augustine's discussion of the Father as unbegotten (*ingenitus*) in Book 5 of *De Trinitate*. This discussion, it seems, is meant to explicate more fully the intuition or argument developed in the *sed contra*. The Bishop of Hippo had argued that with respect to the Father,
it would be appropriate to refer to the Father as unbegotten even if the Father had not begotten a Son. The Father, Mair notes, has certain properties that belong to Him per se as Father, independent of any relation He happens to have. As Mair reads Augustine here, this implies that if the Father was not unbegotten, there could still be a Son. This argument, he observes, posits a particularly odd scenario in which, per impossibile, if one of the personal properties is not able to distinguish the Father from the Son (e.g., if the Father is not ingenitus, innascibilitas, etc.), another property can distinguish them (e.g., generatio activa). This unsavory implication leads Mair to ask, “how is the Father distinguished from the Son?”

Mair responds by claiming that William of Auxerre sufficiently addresses this particular problem. Imagine that both Socrates and Plato are white and Cicero is black. In such a scenario, it is proper to say that Socrates is similar to Plato (by means of Socrates and Plato both being white) and dissimilar to Cicero (by means of Socrates being white and Cicero being black). But, while it is proper to use the language of similarity and dissimilarity, one would not say that ‘similarity’ (similitudo) and ‘dissimilarity’ (dissimilitudo) are things added to a quality. According to Mair, the two white things (i.e., Plato and Socrates) do not need ‘similarity’ added to them as a super-added quality to be similar, they are similar simply as a result of the inhering whiteness. As applied to the question at hand, Mair follows William of Auxerre in arguing that with respect

112 Augustine, De Trinitate 5.6.7 (Mountain 211, ll. 1–10): “Si autem huic sic putant resistendum esse sermoni quod pater quidem ad filium dicitur et filius ad patrem, ingenitus tamen et genus ad se ipsos dicuntur non ad alterutrum; non enim hoc est dicere ingenitum quod est patrem dicere quia et si filium non genisset nihil prohiberet dicere eum ingenitum, et si gignant quique filium non ex eo ipse est ingenitus quia geniti homines ex aliis hominis gignunt et ipsi altos—inquipunt ergo: ‘Pater ad filium dicitur et filius ad patrem; ingenitus autem ad se ipsum et genus ad se ipsum dicitur”’ (emphasis mine).

113 Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88va: “Praeterea in Patre sunt plures proprietates, ut sunt innascibilitas, generatio activa, et haec distinguuntur secundum Augustinum quinto De Trinitate, c. 6, ubi vult quod si Pater non esset ingenitus posset esse Filius, et e contrario; ergo si per impossibile unum non distinguenter Patrem a Filio posset alia distinguere; ergo est quaerere quomodo Pater distinguetur a Filio.”

114 Mair, In primum Sent. (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88vb: “Huic argumento Altissiodorensis loco superius allegato sufficienter respondet, ut patet in similis: Sortes eadem ratione est similis Platoni albo et dissimilis Ciceroni negro, nam eadem abed Sortis est similitudo Sortis ad Platonem et dissimilitudo Sortis ad Ciceronem, non enim putamus quod similitudo et dissimilitudo sint res superadditae qualitati.” See Guillelmus, Summa aurea 1, tr. 8, c. 1 (Ribailler 128–129, ll. 24–39). Compare this with William of Ockham’s argument in the Summa logicae 1, c. 54 (Gál 178, ll. 26–29).
to the Father and the Son they are distinct (i.e. dissimilar) because they are Father and Son respectively, not because of an added quality or property.\textsuperscript{115}

Mair concludes his discussion of the personal properties of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by arguing that with respect to the Father—\textit{de virtute sermonis}—the personal properties of the Father are not in the Father but are the Father (i.e., the Father and his personal properties are not distinguished one from another (\textit{ab invicem})). His argument, at this point, is particularly telling: Mair concludes by insisting that it is fitting (\textit{conveniens}) to claim that the persons are distinct \textit{se ipsis}.\textsuperscript{116} It is fitting, he argues, that the same characteristic accounts for both the unity and diversity of the divine persons.\textsuperscript{117} It is similar, in many ways, to claiming that Socrates and Plato are identical with respect to species and yet individuals of that species. While this claim appears \textit{prima facie} nonsensical, presumably what Mair means is that for any person, human or divine, to be a person is to be an individuated member of the species (again, 

\begin{thebibliography}
\bibitem{115}A variant of this argument (regarding Plato, Socrates, and whiteness/blackness) can also be found at, Mair, \textit{In primum Sent.} (1530), d. 26, fol. 62va. Further, following this argument on folio 62va is a similar argument with respect to multiple paternal relationships. Mair notes that according to the book of Genesis the patriarch Jacob had twelve sons and a daughter named Dina. Thus, as Mair states, Jacob had thirteen \textit{habitudines}: i.e., Jacob had thirteen fatherhoods (\textit{hoc est tredecim patermitates}), which are the same thing as Jacob (\textit{quae sunt eadem res scilicet Jacob}). But, as Mair implies, it makes no sense to say that Jacob has thirteen distinct “fatherhoods” corresponding to his thirteen children.

\bibitem{116}Mair, \textit{In primum Sent.} (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88vb: “\textit{Ad alius dico quod de virtute sermonis proprietates non sunt in Patre, sed capiendo illum loco unius intransitivae, hoc est proprietates quae sunt Pater, non distinguuntur ab invicem. Haec consequentia est nulla: si Pater non esset genitus esset Pater, ergo inascibilitas in Patre et Pater distinguuntur. Exemplum in simili non sequitur: si Deus non esset dominus adhuc potest esse Deus, ergo deitas et Dei dominium distinguuntur. Personae enim divinae se ipsis distinguuntur inter se dato quod se ipsis conveniant, quia non est inconveniens idem eodem convenire cum alio et distinguire ab alio. Immo convenire cum aliquo et differre realiter. Sortes enim convenit cum Platone in specie cum sua humanitate, et per eandem distinguitor ab eo}.”

\bibitem{117}Nota bene: in the last paragraph Mair offers a final citation (from pseudo-Augustine, i.e., Fulgentius of Ruspe). Mair, \textit{In primum Sent.} (1519), d. 25/26, fol. 88vb: “\textit{Personae distinguuntur per aliqua quae notificant eam proprietates probatur per Augustinum in \textit{De fide ad Petrum}, capitulo secundo, ubi ait, ‘in illa sancto Trinitate unus est Pater, qui solus essentialiter ex se ipso unum Filium genuit, et unus Filius qui de uno Patre solus est essentialiter natus, et unus Spiritus Sanctus, qui essentialiter solus a Patre filioque procedit. Hoc autem totum una persona non posset, scilicet gignere, nasci de se, procedere. Quia alius est genuisse quam natum esse, alidueque procedere quam genuisse vel natum esse, ut manifestum est.’}” See Fulgentius Ruspensis, \textit{De fide ad Petrum} i, 6. (ed.) J. Fraipont, in \textit{Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina} 91A (Turnhout: 1968), 715–716.
human or divine). That is, there are no non-individuated persons; to be a person is simply to be individuated.

Moving from the 1519 edition to the 1530 edition, the reader notes that in the latter Mair defends Praepositinianism at greater length. This is accomplished through eight objections and responses, in which Mair anticipates many of the potential theological arguments against the theory. It is not necessary here to recount them all in detail, but a brief consideration of one of the objections and responses is instructive. The second objection claims that in the normal way of understanding things, that which is attributed to a personal property of a divine person is not attributed to the person. Therefore, it follows that the personal property and the person are not formally identical (formaliter idem) in the way claimed by the defenders of Praepositinianism. Mair responds to this objection by stating, first, that he concedes that the persons are distinguished by means of their personal properties. But, he notes, it does not follow that the personal properties are necessarily distinct from the persons. Mair recites the opinion of Jerome (i.e., proprietate esse in personis identice) followed by his own declaration that the Son is distinct in and of himself (se ipso) from everything that is distinguished from Him. Remarkably, Mair retains the late 13th- and early 14th-century language (i.e., concedo quod personae suis proprietatibus distinguuntur) while also arguing that the persons and the personal properties are not distinct.

The upshot is that John Mair’s trinitarian theology is significantly influenced by the development of Praepositinianism in the 14th century. For students of 14th-century Praepositinianism, it is worth observing that Mair does not employ at great length the arguments developed by Robert Holcot, Walter Chatton, or Gregory of Rimini. That said, Mair does follow the broader methodology of Gregory by insisting that this particular interpretation of the persons and the personal properties is consistent with the patristic and earlier medieval tradition. Gregory of Rimini is particularly concerned with defending the historical continuity of this interpretation, and John Mair follows this basic approach. Following Gregory’s methodology (i.e., a return to the patristic

118 Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), d. 25, fol. 62ra: “Secundo: aliquid attribuitur proprietati quod non attribuitur personae; ergo non sunt formaliter idem.”
119 Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), d. 25, fol. 62ra: “Ad secundum concedo quod personae suis proprietatibus distinguuntur.”
120 Mair, In primum Sent. (1530), d. 25, fol. 62ra: “Concedo quod Filius seipso distinguitur ab omni illo a quo distinguitur...”
121 See Slotemaker, “Pierre d’Ailly and the Development of Late Medieval Trinitarian Theology,” 369–389. Oddly, John Mair does not follow Gregory of Rimini in explicating at
sources), Mair explicated at length the opinion of Jerome recorded in Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*.

**IV Concluding Remarks**

John Mair’s trinitarian theology is an interesting barometer for measuring the influence and reception of 14th-century theology. The great scholastic authors of the 13th and 14th century clearly shaped the discussion of early 16th-century theology, although often in ways that remain unpredictable. Here I offer two brief concluding remarks focused on John Mair and the historiography of late medieval and early modern trinitarian theology.

(1) It is interesting to observe that John Mair had little to no interest in the heated debate regarding the primacy of the divine processions or divine relations (i.e., disparate relations vs. opposed relations) in articulating the distinction between the divine persons. This is significant because earlier scholarship has been quick to observe two distinct models of medieval trinitarian theology: (1) a processional model that was developed and defended by theologians such as Bonaventure and John Duns Scotus; and (2) a relational model that was developed and defended by theologians such as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. This basic picture, as noted above, is variously developed in the work of Michael Schmaus, Russell Friedman, and others.

The trinitarian theology of John Mair—and, one could add, a plethora of understudied 15th-century theologians—challenges the traditional scholarly approaches to late medieval trinitarian theology. While it is clear that between 1250 and 1310 there were two rivaling traditions of medieval trinitarian theology, a narrow focus on these two traditions obscures both the preceding tradition of medieval trinitarian thought (i.e., the period from c. 1000 to 1250) and the complexity of the period between 1350 and 1500. Regarding the former, it is important that the development of trinitarian theology between Anselm of Canterbury (c. 1100) and Thomas Aquinas (c. 1250) be discussed on its own terms. For example, it is hardly instructive or helpful to argue that Anselm’s account of the divine relations is a prior instantiation of (or anticipates) either a Thomistic or Scotistic account (much less, that Augustine of Hippo anticipates

---

122 See Friedman, “Divergent Traditions”; id., *Intellectual Traditions*; id., *Medieval Trinitarian Thought*. 

length the position of Saint Augustine. Mair is more focused on particular arguments of Jerome found in Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*. 
either a Thomistic or Scotistic account).\textsuperscript{123} Perhaps more problematically, the trinitarian theology that began to emerge in the third and fourth decades of the 14th century is radically distinct from what preceded it between 1250 and 1325. A two models approach simply will not suffice, as theologians such as John Mair demonstrate almost no interest in the theological approach to trinitarian theology that one finds at the end of the 13th century.

(2) John Mair’s trinitarian theology is strongly influenced by the development of 14th-century Praepositinianism: a tradition that has its roots in Ockham’s \textit{Summa logicae}. Consider, by way of conclusion, this passage from the Venerable Inceptor:

According to one opinion which holds that the divine persons are totally indistinct from the divine essence and from \[\text{the divine}\] relations, these propositions need to be distinguished: ‘The Father has paternity,’ ‘Paternity is constitutive of the Father,’ ‘Filiation is a property of the Son,’ ‘Essence and passive spiration constitute the Holy Spirit,’ and innumerable similar propositions, insofar as they can be taken properly, they are false according to this opinion, insofar as it is denoted from this first meaning that the Father is distinct from paternity and from the divine essence and the Son is distinct from filiation. This is the case, since if this were not denoted, then it could be properly said that the Father has paternity and that the Father is constitutive of the Father just as paternity is constitutive of the Father. Strictly speaking, such propositions seem false to many who think this way.\textsuperscript{124}

What Ockham introduces by means of the \textit{Summa logicae} is a renewed emphasis on the use of theological language. And, one of Ockham’s arguments in the

\textsuperscript{123} That said, it is an altogether different matter to inquire into how Thomas and Scotus understood Anselm’s trinitarian theology. On this, see John T. Slotemaker, “The Development of Anselm’s Trinitarian Theology: The Origins of a Late Medieval Debate,” in \textit{Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy} (eds.) Giles E.M. Gasper and Ian Logan (Toronto: 2012), 203–221.

\textsuperscript{124} Ockham, \textit{Summa logicae} iii–4, c. 6 (Gál 778, ll. 188–199): “Et similiter, secundum unam opinionem quae ponit quod personae divinae sunt penitus indistinctae ab essentia et a relationibus, istae sunt distinguendae ‘Pater habet paternitatem,’ ‘paternitas est constituativa Patris,’ ‘filiatio est proprietas Filii,’ ‘essentia et spiratio passiva constituunt Spiritum Sanctum,’ et innumerabiles tales, eo quod possunt accipi proprie, et tunc sunt falsae secundum illam opinionem, eo quod denotatur ex prima significatione earum Patrem distinguere a paternitate et ab essentia et Filium distinguere a filiatione. Quia sic hoc non denotaretur, ita proprie posset dici quod Pater habet paternitatem et quod Pater est constitutivus Patris sicut quod paternitas est constitutiva Patris. De virtute igitur sermonis tales propositiones videntur falsae multis sic opinantibus.”
Summa logicae is that the modern way of speaking—e.g., propositions like 'Pater habet paternitatem' or 'paternitas est constitutiva Patris'—is actually foreign to the trinitarian theology of the patristic and early medieval tradition (even if one occasionally finds such phrases sprinkled about in their writings).\textsuperscript{125} Ockham stands just prior to the development of 14th-century Praepositinianism, but in the Venerable Inceptor one finds an emphasis on theological language coupled with a strong doctrine of the unity and simplicity of the divine essence that is attractive to later thinkers.

As demonstrated above, John Mair was clearly influenced by William of Ockham's methodology and the subsequent development of 14th-century Praepositinianism. And, following Gregory of Rimini, Mair was convinced that the radically simplified theology of Praepositinus and others was consistent with the early Christian tradition.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{125} Ockham, Summa logicae III–IV, c. 6 (Gál 778–779, ll. 207–231).

\textsuperscript{126} It is interesting to note by way of conclusion that despite retaining a scholastic methodology, the trinitarian theology of John Mair is consistent with the somewhat simplified approaches to the Trinity that one finds in other 16th-century theologians such as John Calvin. I am not here implying or advocating a return to the thesis of Karl Reuter as found in, Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins. Unter Einbeziehung ihrer geschichtlichen Abhängigkeiten (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche 15) (Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1963); and id., Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformatör. Studien zum Werdegang Johannes Calvins (Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1981). For a modified version of the thesis, Alister McGrath, The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation (Oxford 2004); id., Reformation Thought: An Introduction (Oxford: 1999); and id., "John Calvin and Late Medieval Thought. A Study in Late Medieval Influences upon Calvin’s Theological Thought," Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte 77 (1986): 58–78. In short, I would argue that much more work remains to be done on John Mair before such a thesis would be defendable.