

Pierre Chambert-Protat, Jérémy Delmulle, Warren Pez , Jeremy C. Thompson (eds.), *La controverse carolingienne sur la pr determination. Histoire, textes, manuscrits*, Haut Moyen  ge 32, Turnhout, Brepols, 2018, 322 pp., ISBN: 9782503577951. Cloth  75

Rese ado por RODRIGO BALLON VILLANUEVA
 Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, ES
 ballonv.r@gmail.com

This is the first collective volume devoted entirely to the Carolingian controversy on predestination. The book is the result of an international conference that took place in Paris on October 11 – 12, 2013. From the 840s to the 860s, the Carolingian Empire (800 – 888) was involved in a major polemic regarding the nature of salvation and condemnation of the human soul in relation to God’s eternal will and knowledge. The origins of the debate – the most heated during this time – are found in the preaching of a Benedictine monk named Gottschalk of Orbais (ca. 808 – 868). The doctrine spread by Gottschalk stated that there is a double, or twofold, predestination (*gemina praedestinatio*), that is, that God, from his eternity, destines the elect to paradise and the reprobates to damnation. This teaching produced the die-hard animosity of archbishops Rabanus Maurus (ca. 780 – 856) and Hincmar of Reims (806 – 882), although it also found many supporters, which divided the intellectual landscape of the 9th century.

Over nine councils and three generations, the brightest minds of the Carolingian Empire were confronted by a polemic that was not restricted to the clergy. Certainly, all types of actors from all of the Frankish kingdoms took part in the debate: simple clerics and monks, bishops and archbishops, schoolmasters, aristocratic groups, the Pope, and the Emperor himself. This particular feature allows the editors to state that «the controversy sheds light, better than any other crisis, on the functioning of the Carolingian *ecclesia*, in which the royalty, the aristocracy, and the episcopate collaborate to lead the Frank people to salvation. The theological discourse is at the same time a discourse on the ends and means of the political community» (p. 11). The controversy, therefore, is interesting not only from a theological point of view but is also valuable as an object of social history. The latter perspective is the main conductive thread in this book.

The approach adopted by the nine authors that participate in this work is marked by close attention to the texts and their materiality. More than a focus on philosophical or theological ideas behind the debate on predestination, the contributions of this volume constitute an exercise of mediatic history, where sciences like codicology, paleography, textual criticism, and so on, acquire a principal role. In this context, topics such as the historiography of the controversy, the production, and circulation of its manuscripts, and the conservation of its texts are studied throughout the book.

After the introduction, Warren Pez ’s chapter, entitled «Historiographie de la controverse sur la double predestination, des origines   la seconde guerre mondiale», is

the perfect opening for this book. Here, Pezé shows us how the academic discourse regarding the debate was shaped throughout the centuries. As it is proven by many Carolingian annals, the predestinarian polemic was a historiographic object from the very beginning. However, it is in the 17th century, during the Reformation, when an authentic revival of the question was witnessed. In this context, Pezé distinguishes three interpretative lines on the historiography of the controversy, marked «by an original bias» (p.28): Mauguin (in defense of Gottschalk), Cellot (against Gottschalk), and Mabillon and his conciliatory attempt. After covering further developments in the 19th century, there is a reference to the misappropriation of Gottschalk by German nationalism during the 20th century. The chapter ends with a declaration of the possibilities of new interpretations due to recent discoveries and advancements of philological and historical disciplines. Pezé has the opportunity later on in this book to apply these new tools, in his chapter «Une confession inédite d'Hincmar sur la prédestination», which includes an edition of the confession of the archbishop of Reims.

The second chapter of the book, authored by Michel-Yves Perrin, is entitled «Du rôle de l'écrit dans l'historiographie et l'histoire des controverses doctrinales au cours de l'antiquité tardive» and provides a wider picture of the development of controversies, specifically during the Late Antiquity period. Here, Perrin focuses on some doctrinal debates that took place between the 3rd and 5th centuries, and urges historians to avoid assigning an epistemological priority to written texts, even though it is mainly through them that specialists have access to those disputes. Certainly, to produce an authentic intellectual history of ancient controversies, one must consider their social dimensions. Unlike what happened during the High Middle Ages, orality occupied a core place within the dynamics of controversies. After all, the origin and dissemination of a heresy involved, through predication, the entire community. At the time, there were three principal means to fight against controversies, namely, preaching, disputes, and written texts. Books or treatises were almost always linked to orality; therefore, preaching and public dispute must be studied in order to properly place written texts within the historiography of controversies. However, Perrin recognizes the difficulties that arise from it, since the historian does not have access to the word in the moment of its emission, but in turn, he recommends to pay attention to the sermons that have survived and that help to apprehend the role of preaching in ancient doctrinal controversies and its relation with the written text.

Jérémy Delmule introduces the figure of Prosper of Aquitaine (390 – 455) in his work «Les polemistes carolingiens et les œuvres sur la grâce de Prosper d'Aquitaine. Production, utilisation et circulation des manuscrits». After Augustine, and because of him, Prosper was the author most quoted during the Carolingian debate on predestination (approximately two hundred quotations). His works were used by both sides of the controversy, after having been brought up by Hincmar, because they offered a summarized version of Augustine's theology of grace. Delmule's study pays attention to the circumstances where Prosper's works were used and copied in the Carolingian era. As a result, he provides a valuable cartography and history of the reception of Prosper

during the 9th century, identifying not individual users but networks, providing, thus, a better idea regarding the circulation of the work of Prosper, something complemented with the useful annexed material at the end of the essay.

The fourth chapter of the book, «L'entremêlement des motifs préchrétiens et chrétiens dans les textes de Gottschalk: à la recherche de son repertoire», is brought by Bojana Radovanović. The work draws the attention, with special emphasis, to Gottschalk's poetry. The poetic work of the Benedictine monk is composed of letters, hymns, and poems, and it has survived in several manuscripts. Curiously, the doctrine of double predestination associated with Gottschalk does not often appear in his poems but in his prose. Radovanović develops a philological analysis of Gottschalk's poems paying attention to the ideas employed, as well as the groups of words (see Annex B, pp. 143 – 145), their repetitions, the phraseology, and so on. Having in mind the scope and use of classical motifs (see Annex A, pp. 138 – 142) in Carolingian works, the author's intention is to distinguish those pre-Christian elements present in Gottschalk's poems to examine to what extent they were linked to his Christian doctrine, especially, with his predestinarian ideas.

During the controversy, Gottschalk found support from many respectable scholars, but the brilliant Florus of Lyon (ca. 800 – ca. 860) occupies a special place among them and is the protagonist of the next chapter, «The Reception of Saint Augustine in Florus of Lyons's *Expositio epistolarum beati Pauli apostoli*. The Section on Romans 7», written by Shari Boodts. In this very comprehensive essay, Boodts analyzes the influence of the *Doctor gratiae* on Florus' reading of «For the good which I will, I do not: but the evil which I will not, that I do» (Rom, 7, 19). The *Expositio epistolarum beati Pauli apostoli* is «a commentary on the Epistles of Saint Paul consisting exclusively of fragments from the works of Saint Augustine» (p. 147), more specifically, 2218 fragments were taken from the bishop of Hippo. A similar anthology written by Bede the Venerable (672 – 735), the *Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*, will be used by Boodts to shed some light on the *Expositio* by comparison. After some notes about the identification of Florus' handwriting, his method as a compiler, and the transmission of the *Expositio*, the chapter concludes by stating that while Florus recognized the multiple deficiencies of the *Collectio*, which made him look after other sources, through it Bede provided the structure followed by Florus in his *Expositio*. The research on Florus is continued immediately by Pierre Chambert-Protat in his chapter called «Le travail de Florus de Lyon sur la predestination: un état de la documentation conserve. Avec un dossier d'extraits patristiques resté inédit». This massive codicological exercise goes beyond the traditional five Florus' works on predestination (*Libellus aduersus cuiusdam uanissimi hominis, qui cognominatur Iohannes, ineptias et errores de praedestinatione et praescientia diuina et de uera humani arbitrii libertate; Responsio ad interrogationem cuiusdam de praescientia uel praedestinatione diuina, et de libero hominis arbitrio; Libellus de tribus quibusdam epistolis uenerabilium episcoporum, quid de earum sensu et assertionibus iuxta catholicae ueritatis regulam sentiendum sit; Absolutio cuiusdam quaestionis de generali per Adam damnatione omnium, et speciali per Christum ex eadem ereptione electorum; Libellus de tenenda immobiliter Scripturae ueritate, et sanctorum orthodoxorum Patrum auctoritate fideliter sectanda*) and traces at least a dozen works in total (texts, treatises, and collections of patristic testimonies) related to the

controversy. Chamber-Protat finishes his excellent paper by adding a set of tables and two unpublished Florus' Patristic dossiers.

For the eighth chapter, «The Annotated Gottschalk: Critical Signs and Control of Heterodoxy in the Carolingian Age», Irene Van Renswoude and Evina Steinová join forces. Although the essay does not refer strictly to the predestinarian polemic, it focuses on some of its protagonists and shows the use of critical signs in texts as a strategy to exert control over an adversary. In the middle of the predestinarian controversy (the early 50s of the 9th century), once again Gottschalk and Hincmar are confronted, this time due to the use of the formula *trina deitas* to address the Trinity. According to the archbishop of Reims, those terms implied polytheism since they made reference to three gods, while Gottschalk supported the use of the formula because, in his mind, it exemplified the unity of three different parts, something that was in line with the orthodox position regarding the Trinity. By this time, the monk of Orbais was already condemned to *perpetuum silentium*, however, Hincmar allows him to keep writing, but not without exerting control over his texts. Hincmar in his *De una et non trina deitate* included Gottschalk's own words and employed a pair of critical signs (*obelus* and *chresimon*) to present himself as the winner of the debate. Van Renswoude and Steinová analyze this practice in the Carolingian theological debates of the 9th century and trace back its origin, with similar use, at least until Origen of Alexandria himself.

The final chapter of the book is made by Jeremy C. Thompson and receives the title of «The Circulation of the Predestinarian Works of Lupus of Ferrières in Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 293». Lupus of Ferrières or Lupus Servatus (ca. 805 – ca. 862) was also involved in the Carolingian debate on predestination, invited by Hincmar in 849. In fact, his predestinarian writings, which survived in five medieval manuscripts, did not receive much attention in his time but have enjoyed impressive dissemination, compared to his contemporaries, ever since. The four works of Lupus on predestination were: *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*, *Epistola ad Hincmarum*, *Epistola ad Carolum*, and *Collectaneum de tribus quaestionibus*. In this chapter, Thompson reconstructs the itinerary of one main manuscript, namely, the 293 of the Bibliothèque Municipale de Valenciennes, because it contains all of the aforementioned works and is the only one that has the letter dedicated to Hincmar.

The problem of divine predestination occupies a special place, and a recurrent one, in the Western history of ideas. In this sense, this book will undoubtedly become an essential tool to anyone that wishes to understand the intricacies, especially with regard to the social context and textual tradition, of the predestinarian debate that took place during the 9th century. The erudite volume does not pay much attention to theological or philosophical discussions – because it was not the aim – turning its gaze instead to the textual tradition produced during the polemic, their origins, and ways of transmission. Precisely because of that, it provides an invaluable perspective for theologians and philosophers, who very often lack the required training to undertake this historical and codicological research. The book ends with a completed bibliography of the controversy, and useful indices of names and manuscripts.