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Introduction

As is well known, Radulphus Brito, after a brilliant career as a master of arts in Paris in the 1290s, started a new career as a theologian around the beginning of the new century.\(^1\) He commented on the *Sentences* during the years 1308–9 (as indicated by the only manuscript witness), discussed some quodlibetal questions,\(^2\) and finally some questions on the *Psalms* (ascribed to him by Stegmüller) that, together with the questions on the *Sentences*, are preserved in a Pavia manuscript.\(^3\)

The questions on book 1, 2 and 3 of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, surviving only in MS Pavia Biblioteca Universitaria Aldini 244, ff. 15–54 (copied by a Parisian scribe), are in greater part unpublished. As far as I know, only three questions have been edited: qq. 66–67 on book 1 in an article by Marco Rossini and Chris Schabel published in 2005,\(^4\) and q. 31 on book 3 in the introduction to Iacopo Costa’s edition of Brito’s questions on the

---


\(^2\) Some *Questiones in vesperris* and a series of *Questiones de quolibet* are witnessed by Prosper of Reggio Emilia and preserved in MS Vatican lat. 1086 (see I. Costa, *Le questiones di Radulfo Brito sull’Etica Nicomachea* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), p. 103, n. 17). In my transcriptions, I always keep the orthography of the manuscripts.


Ethics. In addition, a long quotation from q. 28 on book 2 can be found in Sten Ebbesen’s article on Brito’s questions on the Metaphysics.

The manuscript is not in good condition and consequently it is often hard to read. The very first folio of the commentary (f. 15 in the modern numbering) is partly damaged by time and misuse. Furthermore, an entire folio appears to be missing: in the original numbering of the work there is a gap between f. 12 and f. 14 (corresponding to f. 26 and f. 27 in the modern numbering), so that the commentary jumps from q. 39 to q. 44 on book 1. All in all, I counted 76 questions on book 1 (ff. 15ra–36ra), 43 on book 2 (ff. 36rb–45vb), and 34 on book 3 (ff. 46ra–54va).

In this paper, I will look at Brito’s theory of relations as discussed in various questions on the three books of the Sentences.

Natural and Divine Relations

Nine questions in Brito’s commentary (five on the first book, two on the second, and one on the third) are devoted to relations, since, according to a traditional account that stems from Augustine and Boethius, they have the function of distinguishing the persons of the Trinity. I will focus especially on five questions here: q. 50: utrum relatio habeat constituere et distinguere personas (ff. 28vb–29rb) and q. 51: utrum circumscriptis relationibus remaneant tres persone (f. 29rb–vb) on book 1; q. 3: utrum relatio creaturarum ad creatoris sit de essentia creature (f. 37ra–b) and q. 4: utrum relatio creaturae {creatoris ms.} ad creaturam differat a fundamento suo (f. 37rb–va) on book 2; and finally, q. 8: utrum filiatio qua Christus est filius dei et filiatio qua est filius virginis sint due relationes reales (f. 47rb–47va) on book 3. Throughout, Scotus’ Reportata Parisiensia will serve as a useful point of comparison.

---

7 Comparing Brito’s questions on book 2 to Scotus’, I think this is a better reading of the title (for more on this, see below).
8 As Rossini and Schabel underline in their article (‘Time and Eternity’, 279), Brito probably knew Scotus’ ideas ‘from a Parisian Reportatio, if not directly from Scotus’ Parisian lectures on the Sentences’.