

Clarification

TURNING POINTS

James Greenaway: *The Differentiation of Authority: The Medieval Turn toward Existence*. (Washington, DC: University of America Press, 2012. Pp. vii, 309.)

doi:10.1017/S0034670513000132

James Greenaway has complained of Takashi Shogimen's review of his book *The Differentiation of Authority*, in *The Review of Politics* 75, no. 2 (Spring 2013): 289–92, asserting that Shogimen has misinterpreted the thesis he was attempting to develop, and that he has also made several factual errors. We are sorry that Professor Greenaway thinks that Shogimen's review of his book was dismissive. Professor Shogimen responds that was not his intention. The impression may, unfortunately, be a result of what was necessarily a very brief account of Greenaway's book. Scholars who agree to write book reviews do so out of a sense of professional obligation and interest, and their reviews express their opinions, not those of the journal or its editors. We do not and cannot censor reviews. We can and have tried to correct factual errors.

Factual errors alleged by Professor Greenaway include (1) an assertion by Shogimen that Greenaway used "secondary sources" including a "college textbook" by Warren Hollister, whereas Greenaway actually used a companion volume, a collection of documents to accompany the textbook, edited by Hollister and others; and (2) Shogimen's claim that "references to and analysis of the texts by Marsilius of Padua are simply absent," whereas Greenaway has several references to the work of Marsilius.

Professor Shogimen explains: (1) The collection edited by Hollister and others is produced primarily for purposes of undergraduate education, not for use by experts in medieval history or philosophy for serious scholarly research without reference to original sources—and so he characterized it as a "college textbook." Shogimen acknowledges, however, that he should not have called it a "secondary" source. (2) On the matter of Marsilius, Shogimen says he would have been more clear had he specified an absence of references to the "original" texts—that is, Professor Greenaway's argument required reference to the original Latin, rather than reliance on an English translation that many specialists find to be problematic. Professor Shogimen regrets any misunderstanding occasioned by his wording.