

H-France Review Vol. 5 (April 2005), No. 41

Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom face Heresy, Judaism and Islam (1000-1500)*, translated by Graham Robert Edwards. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002. xv + 407 pp. £ 47.24 (hb); ISBN 0-8014-3708-3.

Review by Peter Biller, University of York.

The writings of Peter the Venerable, ninth abbot of Cluny (1122-1156) against heretics (*Contra Petrobrusianos*), Muslims (*Summa totius heresis Sarracenorum and Contra sectam Sarracenorum*), and Jews (*Adversus Iudeos*) have usually figured separately in three distinct areas of modern scholarship. These are the history of Catholic writing about Christian heretics, polemics against the Jews, and western knowledge of Islam. In the last of these genres, Peter has attracted a lot of attention (witness the works of M.-T. d'Alverny, and others) because of his connection with and use of the translation into Latin of the Qur'an.[1] In 1998, Dominique Iogna-Prat brought Peter's writings against heretics, Muslims and Jews together, inside the covers of a very striking book which now appears in English translation.

Part one of *Order and Exclusion* sets out the work's high ambition. Its two chapters parade the history of ideas of the "ordering" Christianity and Cluniac self-identification with the universal Church. These themes join hands with the thesis of R. I. Moore's *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (1987), that the High Middle Ages saw Christendom's emergence as a persecuting society, defining itself by the labelling and exclusion of deviant "Others." Iogna-Prat's excluded "Others" are defined by faith (Moore's included lepers and homosexuals), and his is a more narrowly focussed picture. He concentrates on Peter the Venerable and his three decades as abbot of Cluny: Peter, Cluny, and this period are set at the centre of the process whereby 'persecution and demonisation of the "Other" became a "structural necessity" for Christian society' (p. 23).

In Part two of *Order and Exclusion*, Iogna-Prat turns to Peter's writings against heresy, and in Part three to his writings against Jews and Muslims. The disproportion in the attention given to the texts--massive to the anti-heretical treatise, much less to the others-- may be an attempt to redress earlier imbalance in the attention Peter's writings have attracted in modern scholarship. At its fullest, in the case of the *Contra Petrobrusianos*, Iogna-Prat's account is exhaustive, providing pretty well everything a reader could want. There is the immediate setting of the treatise; the addressees; analysis of the rhetorical and logical techniques used by Peter and their sources; recapitulation of the arguments; short essays on those aspects of the church called into question (e.g. baptism, the cross, or church buildings); and both immediate and long-term influence--or lack of influence--of the treatise. Everywhere there is deep and fine reading of the texts and reference to a wealth of modern French and German scholarship.

The alliance of Iogna-Prat's interpretations, scholarship, and collation of the three texts brings a very substantial advance in our knowledge and understanding. The collocation itself restores a medieval clerical perspective, which is a commonplace in the texts of canon law and much theology, where Muslims, Jews, and heretics are grouped together and treated adjacently. Various polemical texts that are not often read are now made very accessible. And their discussion within one book enables the easy and clear parading of interconnections, parallels, and differences. Thus, the reader is encouraged to compare and contrast Peter's interest in and knowledge of sources from or about the opponent; for example, Peter's access to the Qur'an can be set beside his rather more nebulous access to the Talmud and the evidence he may have had about the heretic, Peter of Bruis. But there is more. Above all, there is the provision of the context of Cluny itself. Just one transparently obvious and tangible example of the riches thereby provided to the reader is this triplet: heretics attacking offerings of Masses, prayers, gifts

and alms for the dead; Cluny incarnating the system of prayers for and commemoration of its aristocratic patrons; and Cluny's abbot systematic refutation of these heretics' views.

Everything is conveyed very easily. In part, this is because the clarity of Iogna-Prat's mind and writing is nowhere lessened in the absolutely wonderful translation into English by Graham Robert Edwards. In part, it is because of the brevity of individual sections: the seventy-page chapter on Cluny, for example, is a mosaic of little essays, usually no longer than two or three pages. At a micro-level pretty well everything is solid: much is learnt, and there is much to praise. Here the reader cannot fail to be moved by the melancholy, truth, and beauty of Iogna-Prat's meditations on the intermittent or fragmented connections of modern and medieval history, in particular between medieval anti-Judaism and the modern anti-Semitism. His book is a very worthwhile continuation of the debate that was launched by R. I. Moore. In a review of Moore's book, Michael Clanchy wisely remarked that its value outweighed various errors which specialists would point out, errors that any large, bold, and quasi-sociological thesis was bound to have.[2] It is in the spirit of Clanchy's comment, then, that I raise for discussion a few of the costs of Iogna-Prat's approach.

It is striking that the business of fighting heretics, especially with words, tended to be the business of men of the most prominent religious Order of the period: from the early thirteenth century, the Dominicans, and before them, as Beverly Kienzle has recently demonstrated, the Cistercians.[3] Going yet earlier, we come up against Cluny. However, since Iogna-Prat's focus is Peter, the reader does not get a study of wider Cluniac interest in heresy. There is no systematic comparison between Peter's *Contra Petrobrusianos* and the contemporary *Contra haereticos* of the Cluniac Hugh of Amiens, which has a further, not specifically Cluniac consequence. An investigation of similarities and differences between the methods of the Peter, Hugh, and the other contemporary polemicist against heresy, the obscure "monk Henry", would have been very illuminating about the period 1130s to 1140s which Iogna-Prat sees as the moment of birth of the anti-heretical treatise. The opportunity is missed. Another opportunity missed is Ralph Glaber, writer of the famous *Historiarum libri quinque* (c. 1030-c.1046), who can be seen as belonging to the Cluniac tradition, in a rather broad sense.[4] Ralph not only noticed heresies a lot, but he also made an attempt to describe the doctrines of the heretics at Orléans and to provide a refutation (book 3, chapters 27-30). The feebleness of his efforts is not the point: this was an earlier, arguably "semi-Cluniac" effort.

The preoccupation with the notion that Peter's decades were pivotal brings *costs* elsewhere. "Things had started out well" introduces a section on Jews, where the contrast is with what happens later: twelfth-century deterioration. On this theme, Iogna-Prat relegates Glaber to a passing allusion (p. 278). But Glaber's account of Jews is quite extraordinary and very full: their high numbers in Orléans and the notoriety of their arrogance, envy, and insolence; Christians deciding to drive Jews out of their lands and cities, Jews becoming the objects of universal hatred, some being driven from cities, some put to the sword, and so on (book 3, chapters 24-25). This was in the very early eleventh century: it suggests that more reflection is needed about the chronology of "things started well but they got worse." Most expensive is the view of Peter's *Contra Petrobrusianos* as pivotal, new in itself but—as a text discussing heretical propositions—short-lived because of the persecution it helped to usher in. "It had no future. Within fifty years of the writing of *Contra Petrobrusianos*, heresy had ceased to be a matter for discussion. It had become a crime of lese-majesty and a matter for the Inquisition. Peter's treatise ... had no literary progeny" (p. 255)—a verdict delivered in different words earlier in the book (pp. 146-147). The trouble is that the thirteenth-century saw a quite phenomenal production of polemical treatises describing and attacking heretical doctrines, especially in Italy. The most impressive of them, Moneta of Cremona's treatise against Cathars and Waldensians, runs to 560 pages in its eighteenth-century edition.[5]

Towards the end of his chapters on the Jews, Iogna-Prat summarises an *Arts quodlibet* from Paris in the early 1300s, which dealt with Jews bleeding, which "asked whether there was a natural difference

between Christians and Jews, similar to that between men and women. The question hinged on whether Jewish men were subject to periodic bleeding like the menstrual flows of women. The answer was in the affirmative ... The corollary was that all women were, at least, periodically Jewish" (pp. 321-322). This is virtually all incorrect. The *quodlibet* makes no reference to a parallel between Christians: Jews and men: women; it makes no mention at all of menstruation or women; and the flow of blood is due to haemorrhoids.[6]

I introduce this point in order to raise some questions, first about the relationship between stimulating general theses, accuracy in details, and understanding. Which promotes understanding more – being curious about something whose details are rather unexpected, or assembling and reflecting upon widely received commonplaces? In this particular instance the former is haemorrhoids (people finding haemorrhoids abhorrent, funny, and grotesque), and haemorrhoids becoming a medical topic of the moment through translation work in the 1290s), while the latter is the combination of two topics, the “feminisation” of the Jew and the low estimation of women in medieval culture. Secondly, a brief and trenchant attack on “religious history” early on in his book (p. 4) is based on its modernity: “[r]eligion” is an eighteenth-century creation and its application to the study of the middle ages wholly inappropriate” (p. 4). If so, how does one justify applying to the Middle Ages a whole raft of *other* modern categories, as Iogna-Prat does very freely, as, for example, the sociological categories produced in the decades around 1900 of German sociologists, such as Ernst Troeltsch and Max Weber? Beyond the inconsistency lies an interesting and debatable point. And the gap between modern and medieval terminology suggests a final question to be put to Iogna-Prat’s book. Is anything lost when (in medieval terms) the *faith*-identities of heretics, Jews, and the followers of Mahomet are described as “social” identities?

NOTES

[1] M.-T. d’Alverny’s articles on the subject were collected and reprinted in her *La connaissance de l’Islam dans l’occident medieval*, ed. C. Burnett, Variorum Collected Studies Series 445 (Ashgate: Aldershot, 1994); R.W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1962); J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, 1964).

[2] *Times Literary Supplement*, September 11, 1987, 990.

[3] *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229* (York Medieval Press: Woodbridge and Rochester N.Y., 2001)

[4] See the nuanced discussion of this in Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, ed. N. Bulst, J. France and P. Reynolds, Oxford Medieval Texts (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1989), pp. lviii-lxiii.

[5] Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque*, ed. T. Ricchini (Ex Typographia Palladis, Excudebant Nicolaus et Marcus Palearini: Rome, 1743). Two important recent editions are *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum hereticum*, ed. C. Hoécker, Edizione Nazionale dei Testi Mediolatini (SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo: Florence, 2001), and Salvo Burci, *Liber suprastella*, ed. C. Bruschi, Fonto per la Storia dell’Italia Medievale, Antiquitates 15 (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 2002); these provide efficient access to the abundant literature on these polemical treatises.

[6] Together with antecedent and succeeding texts, it can be read in P. Biller, 'A "Scientific" View of Jews from Paris around 1300', *The Jews and the Sciences, Micrologus* 9 (2001): 137-68 (pp. 160-8).

Peter Biller
University of York
ppab1@york.ac.uk

Copyright © 2005 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and its location on the H-France website. No republication or distribution by print media will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France.

ISSN 1553-9172