

attempting to reconstruct past thought, debate whether such a thing existed. Between St Augustine and Guibert of Nogent, autobiography was a neglected genre. In Richard's day, the self was a confusion of impulses involving the will, the spirit, God, the devil and the flesh. Any discussion of his 'self-representation' needs to take account of this, although none of the above detracts from the fact that Vanderputten's portrayal of a flawed virtuoso is both appealing and convincing. His deep understanding of eleventh-century thought is often apparent, despite the trendy theory (a sweetener to some).

Like many notable religious figures of the eleventh century, Richard dispensed with the idea of vocation in search of God. At different times he was a secular cleric, an abbot, a freelance administrator, a hermit, a pilgrim, a preacher and an instructor in morality. His anonymity obtains in the fact that the many spiritual currents of the age bore him along. Chronologically he bridges the divide between the monastic reformers of the late tenth century and the 'new hermits' identified by Henrietta Leyser who were emerging in the 1040s. Future studies must incorporate Richard into this wider picture, now that Vanderputten has published a discussion worthy of the complexity of his career. The model that he constructs will cause us to question our assumptions about 'reformers' such as Dunstan of Canterbury and William of Volpiano; and in an age which still fetishises greatness, it will appeal to historians who wish to recover real human beings from the past.

UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA

TOM LICENCE

Cluny and the Muslims of La Garade-Freinet. Hagiography and the problem of Islam in medieval Europe. By Scott G. Bruce. Pp. xii + 160 incl. 1 map. Ithaca–London: Cornell University Press, 2015. \$49.95. 978 0 8014 5299 4
JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046916000774

In this brief and clearly written monograph, Scott G. Bruce connects Cluniac hagiography with the polemics of Peter the Venerable against Islam. Peter is best known for commissioning the so-called Toledan *corpus* of texts about Islam translated into Latin. This *corpus* included the first Latin version of the Qur'an. Bruce argues that Abbot Peter looked back to a preceding head of the monastery at Cluny, Maiolus, when writing his final polemical work. This approach also requires reevaluating hagiographic texts, crediting them with a formative intellectual impact on young monks exceeding the bounds of their spiritual development.

The first part of the book focuses on Abbot Maiolus. During the summer of 972 Maiolus and his companions were abducted while crossing the Alps on a return trip from Rome. His captors were Muslim bandits based at La Garde-Freinet or Fraxinetum in Provence. (This colony specialised in collecting ransoms and selling captives not thus redeemed into slavery.) The monks of Cluny ransomed their abbot and his companions. This attack on a revered spiritual leader also mobilised Christian resentment of the Christian leadership in Provence, and led to the elimination of this Muslim enclave. The captivity of Maiolus was commemorated in two versions of his note requesting ransom, which said that he had fallen into the hands of 'the hordes of Belial', a name which had become identified with the Devil.

This comparatively modest text became embodied in the hagiography of Cluny's abbots. An anonymous *vita* of Maiolus soon began to embroider this tale of captivity and ransom. The captivity of the holy abbot became a providential event. This narrative emphasised the cruelty of the captors and the wonders worked by Maiolus to protect his companions. The 'Saracen' captors were treated by the author more as barbarians than as followers of a rival religion. The author was affiliated to an Italian monastery affiliated with Cluny. The narrative treats the city of Pavia, the location of these monasteries, as a holy city blessed with the abbot's miracles.

The monks of Cluny soon took control of their abbot's holy reputation. Abbot Odilo commissioned a biography of his predecessor which referred to wonders worked near Pavia. Syrus, the author, emphasised Maiolus' prowess in preaching, as well as in working wonders. This included preaching the Gospel to his captors in Fraxinetum. The captors' belief in the prophet Mohammed received an emphasis not seen before in the narrative. Abbot Odilo provided a condensed version of this narrative for a monastic house dependent on Cluny. By the 1040s Rodolphus Glaber provided a version of Syrus' *vita* in his history. This version added detail about the refutation of Islam's prophet to the captivity narratives previously composed.

The second part of this volume focuses on Abbot Peter. His reputation as an advocate of religious dialogue has been diminished of late. Certainly it is based on the translation project and a treatise on Islam written late in the abbot's life. Bruce looks more widely, showing that Peter was a critic of heretics, Jews and Muslims in his early writings. He also hoped to inspire Bernard of Clairvaux to write the definitive refutation of Islam. However, the failure of the Second Crusade (1147–9) is credited by Bruce, quite rightly, with inspiring a new approach to Islam. Previous polemics against heretics and Jews had been either diatribes or supposed exchanges between Christian apologists and their foes. Peter's last writing on Islam takes the form of a direct address to the followers of the Prophet. This text is intended to win the souls of Muslims by soft words and reasoned arguments.

It is here that Bruce makes his creative use of Cluniac hagiography. Peter commissioned a new life of Abbot Maiolus, written in a better Latin than that used by Syrus and compiled in strict chronological order. This may have reminded the abbot of the depictions of his predecessor trying to save souls even while held in captivity. This makes good sense. Abbot Peter, as a young monk, must have learned something about Maiolus, including his misadventures in the Alps. Thus Maiolus could serve as a model for an abbot of Cluny reaching out to Muslims to persuade them to convert. This approach was not successful. More typical, as Bruce notes, is the invective against the Qur'an written by Martin of Lausanne condemning the text to being branded with a hot coal. Bruce provides an addition in a brief appendix to the book. Ironically, the condemnation by Martin appears in a fifteenth-century manuscript of the works by Peter the Venerable focused on Islam. Another irony that Bruce notes is the possibility that dialogue with Islam was considered later not just by a few Catholic writers like Nicholas of Cusa (1401–64) but by the Protestant theologian Theodore Bibliander (1504–64), who had seen the Ottoman Turks reach the gate of Vienna in his own lifetime.

Scott Bruce has provided us with a useful insight into Cluny and Abbot Peter's writing career. It does not go into depth about Western views of Islam, but the larger picture can be obtained by consulting the works listed in the bibliography.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

THOMAS M. IZBICKI

The Historia Iherosolimitani of Robert the Monk. By D. Kempf and M. G. Bull. Pp. lxxiv + 121 incl. frontispiece. Woodbridge–Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2013. £50. 98 1 84383 808 1

JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046916001032

The book edited by D. Kempf and M. G. Bull represents the first modern critical edition of the chronicle of Robert the Monk (after the edition in the *Recueil des historiens des croisades*, 1866), which is preserved in eighty-four manuscripts: that is, many more than in the case of any other chronicle of the First Crusade. However, as the editors rightly remark, this source has not received much attention from historians. This chronicle, dated to about 1110, is one of those which are based on the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* written a few years after the First Crusade. Attention in the introduction is concentrated on the identification of the author and assessing the date of the chronicle, as well as considering the manuscript tradition. Much attention is given to determining whether it is correct to identify Robert as archbishop of Reims, as is usually done (this assumption was contested recently by C. Sweetenham in the translation of Robert's chronicle). We actually do not possess the autograph of Robert's text, and the oldest manuscript can allegedly be dated to the 1140s/1150s. This (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, lat. 5129) was chosen as the base manuscript for this edition (p. lviii), the same as in the case of the *Recueil*. At the same time, while the *Recueil* edition has an *apparatus criticus* based mostly on the manuscripts preserved in France, this edition has no *apparatus criticus*, and only some clearly mistaken readings in the Latin text are amended by reference to other manuscripts (I calculated seventy-one amendments, mostly non-orthographical) (pp. lvi–lvii). The editors justify this way of editing by referring to the 'noteworthy stability of the propositional content of the text' (p. li). That is to say, the present edition contains the same text as the previous one. It should be noted however that this is the first to include a full list of manuscripts, and thus we can see their geographical distribution. There is an interesting suggestion (pp. xliv–xlvi) that fast and widespread dissemination of the text in Germany in the middle and second half of the twelfth century was favoured by German participation in the second and third crusades. In this case it is to be regretted that the edition does not contain a *stemma* analysis, since, among other things, it could help us to have a clearer idea about how many manuscripts were in imperial lands at that time. The editors note that the number of copies of the chronicle decreases considerably after the twelfth century, but that it regains favour in the fifteenth, almost exclusively in Germany. That, it is suggested, is probably a consequence of interest generated by the Ottoman threat to central Europe (pp. xlvi); that could be true. Furthermore, there were several translations of the chronicle into High German at that time. Actually, the list of manuscripts demonstrates that thirty-two manuscripts are clearly of the twelfth century, only nine of the thirteenth, five of the fourteenth and twenty-