

the establishment of the Empire; like the Donatists, the Monophysites came to reject the authority of an emperor who sought to enforce the official orthodoxy on them.

But here the resemblance ends. In *The Donatist Church* Frend painted what has become, despite a fair share of criticism that it has come in for, a classic picture of a dissident group. The schism, on Frend's reading, provided an outlet for pre-existing tensions. Donatism was a protest: the religion of the underprivileged, economically backward and culturally un-assimilated countryside, the religion of the relatively un-Romanised Berber rejecting the religion of the cultured townsmen upheld by the emperor and his law-enforcing agencies. A tempting image; and tempting to generalise and apply it to other dissenting groups. Whatever its validity for North-Africa—and whatever nuances qualify its great simplicities—the contrast with the image which emerges from the present study could scarcely be sharper. The Monophysite movement, too, came to reject the official 'Melkite' Christianity of the court and capital; but the great merit of Frend's study of its origins is the deep seriousness of its attention to the theological roots and the care with which he traces the slow and relatively late emergence of the elements of political opposition in the movement. In the debates

from Ephesus onwards (431) we are not for a moment allowed to forget that what all these theologians were grappling with was the mystery of 'the salvation of man through the suffering of the Christ-God' (p. 279). The doctrinal controversies are traced with meticulous care and sympathy. In a particularly fine chapter Severus, the great Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (c.465-538) is shown as a theologian at least as far removed from the Monophysitism of Euteces as from his neo-Chalcedonian opponents. Severan Monophysitism remained within the mainstream of Byzantine theology and Byzantine spirituality, even when Severus embarked on the decisive phase in the history of the movement of creating a rival episcopate. And with the crystallization of Monophysite areas which, finally, lost their links with the Empire, areas such as Egypt and the Nubian kingdoms, culturally, as Frend shows in his final chapters, the Monophysite Church always remained within the Byzantine orbit.

This book is not only a splendid study of the history of the movement and of the theological controversies among which it was born; it is also a discerning analysis of a set of political, cultural and religious relationships which add up to something very different from those Frend saw at work in North African Christianity.

R. A. MARKUS

RAMON LULL AND LULLISM IN FOURTEENTH CENTURY FRANCE, by J. N. Hillgarth. OUP (at the Clarendon Press) Oxford, 1971. xxvii + 504 pp. & XVI plates. £10.00 net.

This lavishly produced volume is presented as 'an attempt to trace the history of that part of the Lullian movement which was centred on Paris . . . the most important Lullist centre in the 14th century' and claims to examine 'the synthesis of Lullian teaching devised by a direct disciple of Lull, a Parisian Master, Thomas Le Myésier'(v). What the volume in fact contains is a number of more or less loosely connected studies differing in importance and success, giving useful *précisions* on the movements of Lull and of Le Myésier, and on the dissemination of their mss. Yet the book fails to contribute substantially to an understanding of 'lullism'; fails even to explain in what 'lullism' would consist or how it would be recognised; fails to show that there was a 'Lullian movement', in any serious sense, in Paris or elsewhere in the 14th century; and offers no stronger case for 'Lullism' in 14th century Paris than is provided by the work of Le Myésier, which owed as much to Henry of Ghent as to Lull, if Dr. Hillgarth himself is correct. Le Myésier would appear in no scholar's top twenty of Paris philosophers of the 14th century, and if his name means nothing to you, you may console yourself by looking (in vain) in the indexes to the standard works of Gilson

(1955), De Wulf (1947) and Ueberweg-Geyer, and in the *tables générales* of the DTC. Nothing in the present volume suggests that the neglect of Le Myésier is unmerited and, on the strength of his work, there is no better case to be put for talking about a Lullian movement in 14th cent. Paris than there is for talking about an Ouspenskyist movement in Oxford in the first half of the 20th century.

The first two chapters, 'Ramon Lull' and 'Ramon Lull and the politics of his age', make passably compelling reading, and offer scholars not a few useful corrections on Lull's *curriculum vitae*. The second chapter especially makes it clear that the still widespread picture of Lull as a blundering naif, wholly innocent of the wiles of politics, is not borne out from the evidence.

The remaining four chapters, on 'Fourteenth-Century Lullism in Paris' are meant to carry the meat of the work. In fact they do not so much as establish that there was Lullism in Paris then (in the way that one can say that there was Albertism in Paris during part of the early 15th century). Hillgarth is aware of the difference between the presence in some place of a few people interested in the work of some thinker and the currency of the corres-

ponding 'ism' in that place: 'I do not think we should speak of a 'Lullian school' at all in Majorca in the fourteenth century, but only of a few disciples' (147n). Why then speak of 'Lullism in fourteenth century Paris'? The strongest evidence for its currency is, it would seem, the work of Le Myésier. Yet not only was the latter untypical of Paris academics of the time, and no intellectual giant. He was, on Dr. Hillgarth's own admission, not even clearly and uniquely Lullian: 'Le Mysésier [was] originally a disciple of Henry of Ghent, who combines Henry's views with those of Lull' (ix). Now since Henry—a not unworthy adversary of Aquinas on a number of points—was much more of an intellectual heavyweight than Lull, it might seem less unreasonable to label him, if he has to be labelled, an eclectic disciple of Henry. If Lullism was only dubiously present in Le Myésier, it was even less surely present in others: 'it is not clear how large was the circle of Lullists surrounding Le Myésier, or, indeed, whether, in his later years, he was not virtually alone in Paris in his adherence to Lull' (vii).

Ten appendices are headed: 'Description of the existing mss which certainly or probably formed part of Le Myésier's library' and 'Mss belonging to Henri de Lewis which there is no reason to believe belonged to Le Myésier' (this reviewer's favourite heading); 'The catalogues of Works of Lull in the *Electorium* of Le Myésier; The *Electorium Magnum* . . . an analysis of its contents, sources and copies'; 'Thomas Le Myésier, *Introductio in artem Remundi*'; 'Pars septima magna. Incipit pars prime intentionis'; 'Le Myésier, *Parabola gentilis ad disponendum chisticolas*'; 'The Breviculum of Karlsruhe'; 'The Artist of the *Breviculum* of Karlsruhe'; 'Examples of the influence of Le Myésier's compilations' [more precisely, a list of copies of these compilations]. A chronological table of Lull's life (xxiii-xxvii), a full table of contents, lists of abbreviations and plates, a bibliographical note, a general index and one of manuscripts, and sixteen plates complete the work. The plates are not just pretty pictures; they do genuinely illustrate passages in the body of the work, or are explained by such passages.

Despite the prodigious industry to which the book bears witness, it contributes surprisingly little—pace an incredibly fulsome review in the T.L.S.—to an understanding of Lull's thought or of 'lullism' generally and this through a fundamental defect in method. It is from a study in context of the cognitive content of the text of such works as those of Lull or Le Myésier that substantive claims about doctrines can be made or refuted and not (at least importantly) from the kind of information provided in colophons or obtained from commentaries on miniatures (no matter how well such commentaries may be made). And this

sort of study requires not only a knowledge of who sat at whose feet when or who copied what but also and more importantly an appreciation of precisely what was being put forward or argued against, in a given text. And that in turn requires a much greater acquaintance with the philosophical (and theological) texts and tools of the time than is evinced in the volume under review. (Why, for instance, was more use not made of Platzeck's work, available from 1964?) To see what can be done—and without any pretentiousness—by someone abundantly qualified in the way required, the reader may compare a review by Professor Van Steenberghe of a volume of Lull's works in *Estudios Lulianos* 13 (1969) 91-103.

There are smaller defects too. Too many references to obsolete studies, good in their day but built on and in many cases supplanted by more recent scholarship, remain in the excessively lush footnotes: it is as though the author has gathered twelve baskets of file-cards, and is determined that not one shall be lost. Is it necessary to put something as banal as 'the other great power of the time, the monarchy' (124) in quotation marks, and support it solemnly with a reference to Carreras Artau? Cross referencing is usually welcome but in this volume it is too often used to no great purpose. Page 3, for example, says very little about the historicity of the woman with the cancerous breast, saying 'I will return later to the question of the possible foundation for this legend' and referring one to p.3 and n.181. There we learn nothing more than that 'The legend of the woman with a cankered breast may well not be devoid of some foundation in fact', and are referred to p.3, for another skip round the mulberry bush. (Like Joyce, I thought that canker was a disease of plants, anyway.) Less trivially, one would like to know what precisely is so terribly wrong with the stemma in the Stohr volume (139). Dom Bascour's reservations about them are much more restricted in scope than is suggested, and in no way support Dr. Hillgarth's belief that 'Unfortunately almost all *stemma* *codicum* are open to objection', assuming that it is non-trivial objection that he has in mind.

At its best, this book has gathered valuable information which the appropriate specialists will appreciate, particularly on the mss of Lull and Le Myésier, and on the dissemination of their works. (This is not, contrary to a tacit assumption running through much of the present volume, the same as the spread of their ideas.) At its worst, it reminds one of the List of Huntingdonshire Cabmen, and is far, far too long for what it has to say in its 'attempt to trace the history of that part of the Lullian movement which was centred on Paris'. The volume is beautifully produced, in a manner worthy of a much better book. L. MOONAN