

4-1-1990

# Review of Agni-Immaculati, Research on Hagiographic Sources Related to Maieul (Maiolus) of Cluny, 954-994, French, by D. Iognaprat

Joseph F. Kelly

*John Carroll University*, [kelly@jcu.edu](mailto: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](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Kelly, Joseph F., "Review of Agni-Immaculati, Research on Hagiographic Sources Related to Maieul (Maiolus) of Cluny, 954-994, French, by D. Iognaprat" (1990). *Theology & Religious Studies*. 39.  
[http://collected.jcu.edu/theo\\_rels-facpub/39](http://collected.jcu.edu/theo_rels-facpub/39)

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](mailto:connell@jcu.edu).

Tale, or with associated legal questions, for instance, Arcite's obligations at different stages of the Knight's Tale. Hornsby concludes by discussing the "hue and cry" (it is hard to agree that there is such at the end of the Miller's Tale, p. 143), appeal of felony, presentment jury, compurgation, and ordeal, illustrated by reference to the Man of Law's Tale and Wife of Bath's Tale (pp. 144–49), and procedure by bill in the Physician's Tale (pp. 149–58). He calls the trial in the Physician's Tale, for all the fraud and collusion behind the scenes, "a model of procedural propriety" (p. 157), quickly noting, however, that Appius violated procedure by not requiring Claudius to prove his allegation by witnesses and by not allowing Virginius to bring witnesses against it.

Hornsby's enterprise is a very worthy one; and although his concrete applications of law to Chaucer's works are occasionally questionable, he succeeds in bringing together a great deal of information and insight. He is much stronger on secular law than on ecclesiastical law. He alludes very sparingly to the *Corpus juris canonici*, citing only Gratian and the Ordinary Gloss of "Johannes Teutonicus" (pp. 39–40, 48). He draws on only two minor glosses of William Lyndwood's *Provinciale*; but almost every page of this vast work, compiled in the generation after Chaucer's death, can throw important new light on the *Canterbury Tales*, and the same is true of John Acton's legatine glosses, composed in the 1340s (published as an appendix to Lyndwood). There is still much more to be done on the subject of Chaucer and the law, and I encourage Hornsby to keep at it. I hope that any reservations that I have expressed above will be taken not as strictures but rather as an effort to move the discussions forward.

H. A. KELLY, University of California, Los Angeles

DOMINIQUE IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati: Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à Saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988. Paper. Pp. vii, 478. F 235.

This long work documents the wide significance of hagiography at Cluny. Iogna-Prat demonstrates that the particular work under consideration, the *Vita Sancti Maioli*, played a significant role in the self-understanding and development of the Cluniac order and was additionally a background text for the Gregorian Reform.

The subject of the work is Maiolus or Maieul, the fourth abbot of Cluny (954–94), a man usually eclipsed by his predecessors and successors. His *Vita* appears in two main versions (5179, 5180) in the *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina* of the Bollandists. Iogna-Prat has concluded that 5179 is the more important version and that the BHL edition is insufficient for the task of studying St. Maieul, and not just because of new editorial techniques. The Bollandist edition lacks the necessary source analysis, especially of the *Sermo de beato Maiolo* composed by the abbot Odilo, Cluny's fifth abbot and Maieul's successor (994–1049). Iogna-Prat has thus decided to reedit the *Vita* as well as the *Sermo* and the brief (one and a half pages) *Electio Domini Odilonis*.

Much of the book is given over to an edition of BHL 5179. (Other variations — 5177, 5178, and 5180 — are discussed as well.) The edition contains all the requisite elements, including an annotated list of manuscripts, a stemma, a discussion of previous editions, a description of the editorial method used, and a longish account of the sources. The importance of all this cannot be gainsaid, but interest in it is limited to those as interested in St. Maieul as is the editor, a category into which this reviewer was regrettably unable to place himself.

On the other hand, this new source analysis has produced results of larger interest,

for example, the influence of late-antique Neoplatonism on Cluniac hagiography, traced from Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite through John Scottus Eriugena and Hieric of Auxerre to the Cluniac hagiographers. Of equal interest is Iogna-Prat's tracing of the persistent influence of primitive Indo-European mythological motifs on early-medieval literature, specifically "le schéma des trois ordres fonctionnels," although, surprisingly, there is no reference to Georges Dumézil. This section is itself a part of a long, useful discussion of monastic self-understanding.

Iogna-Prat's analysis of the *Vita* concludes that under Odilo the Cluny scriptorium produced a wide variety of literature and that this *Vita* was a deliberate, careful production intended to portray Maieul as the ideal monk. This body of literature continued the tradition of Abbot Odo (927–42) and thus of the Carolingian reform of Benedict of Aniane, but it was informed by the biblical study of the ninth and tenth centuries. The Cluniacs desired the independence of their reformed house, a radical notion for the day, but one which appealed two generations later to Peter Damian and Hildebrand, a point the author proves by demonstrating inter alia the importance of Maieul's cult in northern Italy. Iogna-Prat has thus added another element to the Cluniac background of the Gregorian Reform.

This is clearly a work for the specialist, but one which will repay careful study. Students of Cluny will find it of great interest; those of the Gregorian Reform of lesser interest.

JOSEPH F. KELLY, John Carroll University

MARK D. JOHNSTON, *The Spiritual Logic of Ramon Llull*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 1987. Pp. xii, 336; 4 tables, 7 black-and-white illustrations. \$65.

The central scene in the famous *Breviculum* miniatures depicting episodes from the life and teaching of Ramon Llull shows three chariots besieging the tower of Falsity, in which Truth is held imprisoned. The chariots are drawn by horses named *Ratiocinatio*, *Imaginatio*, and *Recta Intentio*. The horses are ridden by Aristotle, Averroes, and Llull respectively.

The *Breviculum* manuscript (now in the Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe) was a gift to the queen of France by one of Llull's closest disciples. Because it was meant to make Llull's teaching known in the French court, the miniatures and their texts were carefully chosen and throw light not only on Llull's own teaching but also on the context in which it developed. The central scene (miniatures 6 and 7) reflects clearly the late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century debates in the University of Paris concerning the doctrine of Aristotle, especially as it was interpreted by Averroes.

The Commentator is shown reined in by a cardinal and his teaching as limited to the phantasms of the imagination. Aristotle's army seeks to liberate Truth, using his discursive logic. His chariot carries the five predicables and the ten categories; his lance bears the inscription "Instrumenta abundandi in syllogismis."

On the opposite page (miniature 7) Llull's chariot carries the eighteen principles of his *Ars*, while the inscription of his lance reads "Intelligentem spiritualia oportet sensus et imaginationem transcendere et multotiens seipsum." The banner for the principles of the *Ars* makes a distinction between three types of knowledge, sensible knowledge of sensible things, intellectual knowledge of sensible things, and intellectual knowledge of intellectual things.

This distinction gives us the key to the *Breviculum's* names for the horses leading the liberating armies. Averroes' *imaginatio* does not transcend sense knowledge. Ar-