1983

Review of From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology, and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages, by J. Marenbon

Joseph F. Kelly
*John Carroll University, kelly@jcu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub](http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub)

Part of the [Religion Commons](http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub)

**Recommended Citation**


[http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub/4](http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub/4)

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by Carroll Collected. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theology & Religious Studies by an authorized administrator of Carroll Collected. For more information, please contact connell@jcu.edu.
theological ones drawn from the Bible and patristic writings and also by increasingly explicit Petrine theories. Eventually papal decretals became the devices used to spell out a new vision of the world and of the place in that world of popes as *gubernatores*. Whereas in Constantine’s time certain distinctions had been drawn between *interna* (purely ecclesiastical issues, such as dogma) and *externa* (legal, administrative, and other details concerning which spiritual and secular authorities shared competence), by Gelasius’s time everything had come to be viewed as *interna* and therefore as governed by the church. Gelasius was really a conservative who formulated a precise jurisdictional scheme that was true to Chalcedon and Leo I and was fundamentally Petrinological. Gelasius was never a “dualist” because, in his calculus, “the emperor’s empire had become the pope’s church.”

As always, many will disagree with Ullmann’s general conclusions and specific interpretations. But, at the same time, everyone interested in late Christian antiquity should read, and will learn from, this book.

*University of Virginia*  
Charlottesville, Virginia

**THOMAS F. X. NOBLE**

*From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology, and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages.* By **JOHN MARENBOН.** New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981. ix + 219 pp. $49.95.

This book has a misleading subtitle; otherwise it is a superior methodological study. The subtitle implies a rather vast presentation for a book with only 132 pages of actual text; also, despite the word *theology* in the subtitle, there is no account of the ninth-century theological controversies. Marenbon’s real interest is logic, and that is treated very well. The chief attraction for the church historian, however, lies less in the content than in the approach.

Early medieval historians routinely utilize codicology and paleography and thus have increased steadily the amount of material available for research. Their philosophical brethren traditionally have jumped from Boethius to Anselm, nodding at John Scotus Eriugena along the way. Marenbon has made a thorough investigation of the manuscripts of the period, uncovering new or overlooked material, especially glosses on ancient philosophical texts. Names like E. A. Lowe and Bernhard Bischoff, which rarely appear in philosophical works, are prominent here, and early medieval philosophy takes on a new look.

Marenbon begins with Alcuin (d. 804), defends the authenticity of the *dicta Candidi*, and demonstrates the originality of Candidus on Trinitarian analogies and the preexistence of the soul. He also demonstrates the significance of glosses on the *decum categoriae* of Aristotle for Carolingian dialects. The work of John Scotus Eriugena is likewise treated in terms of the categories, especially their inapplicability to God in terms of John’s negative
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theology. Marenbon then returns to paleography to argue that two manuscripts thought to be John’s belong instead to followers of his and that his following was wider than previously supposed. He closes by discussing tenth-century glosses on the categories.

In three helpful appendixes which are half as long as the text, Marenbon has edited several texts from Alcuin’s circle as well as glosses on the *decem categoriae* and has shown the relationship among the various manuscripts. All in all, this is a fine book.

*John Carroll University*  
Cleveland, Ohio


Contrary to the practice of many scholars who are content to reissue papers with little or no revision, Caroline Bynum here presents substantially revised versions of four previously published studies along with a long new piece, “Women Mystics in the Thirteenth Century: The Case of the Nuns of Helfta.” The introduction and conclusion make claims for the inner connection of the essays which are not totally borne out in the reading, though the same sophisticated method is employed throughout: the author judiciously mixes wide reading, a balanced viewpoint, and deft textual analysis. Bynum seeks to analyze the images found in the literary products of “high-culture piety” in order to provide new insights into the broader functions of religion that proponents of “popular piety” have taken as their territory, though with mixed success for the premodern period. She is most concerned with the complex relations between individual and community and between women and clerical authority.

Although the conclusions advanced at times go beyond the evidence presented, Professor Bynum has made an important contribution to the history of medieval spirituality; indeed, several of the pieces, most notably the title article, “Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother,” are among the most thought-provoking recent additions to the literature on medieval spiritual traditions. The first two essays, “The Spirituality of the Regular Canons in the Twelfth Century” and “The Cistercian Concept of Community,” suffer the most from the gap between the generality of the conclusions advanced and the rather narrow range of evidence presented. For example, as valuable as it may be to survey the works of practical spiritual advice for the clues they offer to the distinctive spirituality of the canons, one wonders if the “abstract treatises of mystical and biblical theology” (p. 36) have not been dismissed too easily as equally valid evidence for what was—or what was not—distinctive of the canons. A similar disparity between evidence and claims also seems