Heresy in Thirteenth-Century Catholic Texts

Lucy J. Sackville

Submitted for the degree of
PhD

University of York
Department of History

September, 2005

Abstract

The present study is concerned with the religious history of high medieval Lombardy and Languedoc, and with the exploration of the concepts underlying the texts concerning heresy and its repression that were produced in the Church and constitute the main body of evidence for heresy in those regions. While most studies of heresy now take for granted that the 'outsider' representation of heresy cannot be seen as unvarnished truth, not all of them deal with the problem directly. To understand that representation, however, and the layers of construction and distortion that comprise it is important not only because the scarcity of writings by the heretics themselves makes discriminating analysis of these Catholic texts essential, if one is to access the reality of heresy, but also because it provides a key to what the underlying Catholic idea of heresy might have been, and to the mechanisms that shaped and determined that idea. To investigate both of these themes, then, a wide range of sources has been consulted from a narrow chronological band across the middle of the thirteenth century. Where previous studies have concentrated only on one group, here texts representative of all the major treatments of heresy, including polemical, homiletic, canon-legal, and inquisition material were analysed first within broad generic groups and subsequently in comparison with each other. This study examines these texts and the ways in which they represent heresy in order to obtain both a clearer understanding of the Catholic idea of heresy, and a more nuanced view of the relationship of that idea with its subject.

Contents

Acknowledgments ..... - 4 -
A note on Conventions ..... - 5 -
Introduction ..... - 6 -
Chapter 1 – Polemical Sources ..... - 17 -
I - Literacy ..... - 22 -
II - Hierarchy ..... - 35 -
III - Abstraction ..... - 39 -
IV - Conclusions ..... - 42 -
Chapter 2 – Texts for Edification ..... - 43 -
I – *Summae auctoritatum* ..... - 44 -
II – *Exempla* Collections ..... - 58 -
i – *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus* ..... - 58 -
ii – *Dialogus miraculorum* ..... - 72 -
iii – Bonum universale de apibus ..... - 78 -
iv – The *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry ..... - 80 -
III – Dominican Sources ..... - 85 -
i – The representation of heresy ..... - 86 -
ii –The role of heresy in Dominican self-consciousness ..... - 91 -
IV - Conclusions ..... - 99 -
Chapter 3 – Canon-Legal texts ..... - 102 -
I – Ecumenical Councils ..... - 103 -
II – Regional Councils ..... - 109 -
III – Textbooks ..... - 117 -
i – *Concordia discordantium canonum* ..... - 117 -
ii – *Decretales Gregorii IX* ..... - 124 -
IV - Conclusions ..... - 129 -
Chapter 4 – Inquisition texts ..... - 132 -
I – Legal Consultations ..... - 134 -
II – The product of inquisition ..... - 141 -
III – Inquisitor's handbooks ..... - 157 -
IV – MS Vat Lat 3978 ..... - 174 -
Appendix to Chapter 4 ..... - 180 -
Chapter 5 – *De heresi* ..... - 182 -
I – Figurative construction ..... - 183 -
i – Foxes ..... - 184 -
ii – False appearance ..... - 190 -
iii – Corruption ..... - 200 -
II – Number ..... - 205 -
III – Heresy and the Heretic ..... - 220 -
IV - Conclusions ..... - 235 -
Conclusion ..... - 237 -
Abbreviations ..... - 247 -
Bibliography ..... - 252 -

Acknowledgments

The first and most important acknowledgement that I can make here must be to Pete Biller, for all his guidance and friendship, and for his generosity with his time, knowledge, wine, and more book loans than I care to remember.

I would like to thank the Department of History of the University of York, and the Arts and Humanities Research Council for their financial support throughout my studies. I am also grateful to the librarians of the Bodleian Library, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. To Mark Ormrod and Mary Garrison, for their insight and suggestions, and for all the help that they have given me over the past three years, I offer my heartfelt thanks, and I am also immensely grateful to Pete Biller, Caterina Bruschi and Shelagh Sneddon for allowing me to use their edition of Doat 25 before its publication.

Other debts of gratitude are owed to my Mum and Dad, for their love; to Amy, for her intellectual and emotional support; to Miggy, for salads and general loveliness; to John Arnold, for his advice and encouragement; to all my friends, who have kept me smiling, with special mention in this category for Helen Lacey, Judy Frost and Katy Gibbons, for services above and beyond the call of duty; and, without hope of repayment, to Mark.

A note on Conventions

References to the internal organization of texts have, for the most part, been given only in the case of the major textbooks. In light of the variety of texts and the difficulty that some of them present in this regard, most footnotes make reference only to the organization of the relevant edition. With regard to personal names: no attempt has been made at consistency in the choice of forms for proper names. For deponents in the inquisition registers, a modern equivalent has been used where possible, but in the majority of cases, the most commonly used form has been adopted in each case – thus Stephen of Bourbon, but Jacques de Vitry; Thomas Aquinas, but Guillaume d'Auxerre.

Introduction

I once heard, says Stephen of Bourbon, about a heretic who used the Scriptures to preach his error. He succeeded in converting a certain young man, and, when he was sure of the youth's conversion, told him that in fact he did not believe the Gospels, or any of the Scriptures that he expounded. Confused, the young man asked the heretic, why then did you preach them to me? The heretic's slightly sinister response was that as a bird catcher mimics the whistle, or the voice, of his prey in order to capture them because the sound of his own voice would frighten them away, so the heretics use the Bible in order to lure people from the Catholic faith.[1]

The story appears in the vast collection of *exempla* written by Stephen in the middle years of the thirteenth century. It is a neat story, but it has several overlapping layers, not all of which are immediately apparent. At an obvious level, it presents a first-hand account, a heretic, preaching his error to the people in an effort to win converts. His preaching, which is at the forefront of the story, would seem to depend at least initially on a use and exposition of the Catholic Scriptures for its support. That use of Scripture though is a more loaded image than it seems: it suggests first literacy on the part of the heretic, and, secondly, it effectively constructs a pretended appearance for that heretic, and the idea that the public face of heresy is not the same as the one visible to the initiated.

Both the initial picture of active heretics and their pastoral activity, and the underlying constructs of literacy and false appearance, are aspects of a Catholic picture that Stephen shares with most of his contemporaries, ideas that recur throughout the corpus of anti-heretical literature. Their use here is distinctive though – indeed the peculiar form of this story is unique to Stephen – by virtue of

---

[1] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.430; Stephen uses this same motif in book four, though in a less colourful form, p.309.

their function within Stephen's collection. Vivid similes are Stephen's own stock in trade, so even though it seems plausible as the heretic's own words, some suspicion is provoked by the placing of the simile of the pipe or whistle in the mouth of the heretic. That suspicion is in fact confirmed by a quick glance at the immediate context of the story, where the same whistle – the same imagery and the same vocabulary – has been used by Stephen to build a general theme of pastoral care and negligence throughout the rest of the chapter. Moreover, the heretic's rejection of Scripture stands in direct contrast to the accounts that Stephen gives earlier in his text of heretical doctrine, accounts received from former heretics. It is that complex layering within and among genres, and the construction of heresy that emerges from it that forms the leitmotiv of this thesis.

The historiography of medieval heresy, as thrown into relief by Arno Borst's 1953 review, and by subsequent surveys by Peter Biller, has itself revolved around a series of constructions, in which each successive era and ideology has shaped the history of this phenomenon after its own image. Among Catholic and Protestant historians of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, the heretics were regarded as the forerunners of the protestant movement; to the Catholic viewpoint, they were representatives of the continuing presence of evil, for the Protestants, early manifestations of their own doctrine, and a rival claim to the antiquity and continuity of the Catholic Church. To some later Marxist historians, the heretics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were less to do with religious dissent and more a symptom of class struggle, as manifested in the context of a religious society.[2] The history of heresy has then, to some extent, also been the history of mainstream ideas, or at least a reflection of them, its image constructed and reconstructed according to the role it has played. That is not to say that those constructions have been wrong or inaccurate, but neither have they been whole, an issue that is

[2] For the full version of this analysis, see A. Borst, *Die Katharer*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XII (Stuttgart, 1953), pp.1-58, French transl. C. Roy, *Les Cathares* (Paris, 1984), pp.9-53. For an updated version see P. Biller, 'Cathars and Material Women', in P. Biller and A.J. Minnis (eds.), *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, York Studies in Medieval Theology, I, (York, 1997), 61-81. Also in 'Texts and the Repression of Heresy: Introduction', in Bruschi and Biller, with Bruschi. On post-war historiography see also J. Nelson, 'Religion in "Histoire totale": Some Recent Work in Medieval Heresy and Popular Religion', in *Religion*, 10 (1980), 60-85, especially on Marxist perspective.

compounded by the fact that the documents on which they rely are not necessarily transparent documents of fact and event, themselves built up in various layers of construction.[3] At the same time, with little equivalent evidence from the other side, as it were, these anti-heretical texts stand as reflections of the mainstream thought of their time, with little to balance or bear out what they have to say.

It is that difficulty in reading anti-heretical texts that provides one of the starting points of this thesis, namely, the need to understand the mainstream treatment of heresy more fully precisely because it is so one-sided. If 'the need for primary evidence from "insiders" as well as "outsiders" is an important guideline for historical research', and if that insider evidence is, in the case of heresy, hard to come by, then the need to understand the complexities of a constructed and layered outsider point of view becomes imperative; some historians have tried to do just that.[4]

One of the major developments of recent heresiology has been to read the sources less as records than as texts, and to look specifically at those texts as the subject of study in their own right, as well as at the construction of heresy that they present. Apart from the terms and approaches that this introduction now takes for granted, that strand is in evidence in collections such as *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages*, which focuses on ideas of heresy through a series of largely text orientated articles.[5] More directed still have been two collections dedicated to texts and text-critical problems with regard to heresy; *Heresy and Literacy*, edited by Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, gave new impetus to this area of inquiry, while the recent *Texts and the Repression of Heresy*, edited by Caterina Bruschi and Peter Biller, follows up and develops further this approach to the subject.

To some extent, this shift has simply been part of the wider historiographical trend toward a general tendency to treat text as subject.[6] The treatment of heresy presented by Brian Stock's work, *The Implications of Literacy*, is at once indicative of this trend, as well as influential in its own right, in its re-reading of the evidence

---

[3] Bruschi and Biller, introduction, pp.6-9, 15.
[4] J. Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (New York, 1999), p.66.
[5] W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th – 13th C.)* (Louvain, 1983).
[6] In large part as a result of Michael Clanchy's *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-1307* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1993).

for heresy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries in terms of textual relations.[7] Stock's ideas focus more on the presence and use of texts than on the nature of their content, though we will return to look more at those ideas shortly. The focus on construction and on the mechanisms underlying the texts themselves stems from rather earlier scholarship, and is in large part a result of the work of Herbert Grundmann. Grundmann's work on heresy has been influential in several ways. His book *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, first published in 1935, transformed the traditional treatment of heresy and mainstream religion as two separate entities, into an approach which saw heresy as one element in a broader continuum of religious groups and ideas, an approach which has since been taken for granted by subsequent scholarship.[8]

Earlier than this though, in 1927, Grundmann had published a ground-breaking article that outlined the rhetorical topoi that were employed by medieval authors of anti-heretical texts, to describe their subject.[9] The effect of this article was to turn the spotlight on the texts themselves, and on their representation of heresy, as constructed entities that need to be understood in a more complex way than simply as records of what happened. This approach was further refined throughout Grundmann's career, by his article on the use of the term 'literate' in the middle ages, and by the appearance, almost forty years after that first breakthrough, of his study of the mechanisms of inquisition trial records and the difficulties of interpretation posed by these deceptively straightforward documents.[10] It is worth noting that, despite the significance of Grundmann's early work, its impact was not immediate, and in English speaking circles at least, its influence owes a lot to the

---

[7] B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton and Guildford, 1983).

[8] H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. u 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Berlin, 1935). English translation by S. Rowan, *Religious movements in the Middle Ages: the historical links between heresy, the Mendicant Orders, and the women's religious movement in the twelfth and thirteenth century, with the historical foundations of German mysticism* (Notre Dame and London, 1995).

[9] H. Grundmann, 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung', in *Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, Festschrift für W. Goetz* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927) 91-107; repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze,* Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXV (3 vols., 1976), vol.1, 313-27.

[10] H. Grundmann, '*Litteratus-illiteratus*. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XL (1958), 1-65. H. Grundmann, 'Ketzerverhöre des Spätmittelalters als quellenkritisches Problem', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 21 (1965), 519-75, repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXV (3 vols., 1976), vol.1, 364-416.

initiative of Robert Lerner, who pushed for a translation of *Religiöse Bewegungen*, and also to his use of Grundmann's theories in his own work, at which we will look shortly. As Bruschi and Biller point out in their introduction, the other place that we must look to find the roots of the emphasis on texts is the accumulation of what Nelson calls the 'formidable dossier of primary evidence', built up by the work of scholars such as Antoine Dondaine, through whose editions the texts themselves were made available, where previously they had often been poorly known, or not known at all.[11]

Within the context of the focus on heresy and text generated by the work described above, we can look at examples of scholarship that have, within that vein, been concentrated on particular texts, or on specific aspects of the repression of heresy. One of the most wide-ranging examples of scholarship in this area must be that of Peter Biller; the work that Biller has carried out on heresy has done as much to contribute to this strand of historiography as it has to explain and elucidate its scope and intricacies for the benefit of others.[12] Several of his articles have identified strands of construction in anti-heretical sources, or refined the way in which we understand their use, as with, for example, the use of the topos of heretical illiteracy, and the variations in its application over space and time.[13] In other places, he has looked at the mechanisms of this construction, those devices that define the picture of heresy that we receive from our sources; this work has been focussed particularly on inquisition records and treatises, and more recently also on legal texts.[14]

A large part of all the work in this area has in fact been based on the texts emanating from the milieu of inquisition, perhaps because of the nature of their content and structure, but also surely in part as a result of Grundmann's insight. The famous example of a textual approach to inquisition records in recent scholarship is of course Robert Lerner's deconstruction of the sect of the Free Spirit. Following Grundmann's methodology, as laid out in 'Ketzerverhöre',

---

[11] Nelson, 'Religion in "Histoire totale"', pp.61-62.
[12] See for example the summaries mentioned above, p.6, n.2.
[13] P. Biller, 'The *topos* and Reality of the Heretic as *illiteratus*', in Biller, *Waldenses*, 169-90.
[14] P. Biller, 'Through a Glass Darkly. Seeing Medieval Heresy', in P. Linehan and J. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001) 308-26; '"Deep Is the Heart of Man, and Inscrutable": Signs of Heresy in Medieval Languedoc', in H. Barr and A.M. Hutchison (eds.), *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, Medieval Church Studies 4 (Turnhout, 2005), 267-80.

Lerner applied these principles to the inquisition records that appeared to deal with this sect of libertine heretics, and was able to show that the sect as we perceive it in these documents was in fact a fabricated one, an appearance of reality constructed from leading questions.[15] Grado Merlo, the other leading light in the study of inquisition mechanisms, has also done much to further and refine this approach to the documents of inquisition using the Italian sources.[16] From a different angle of textual analysis, John Arnold has analysed closely the inquisition records for the south of France within a framework of literary theory, using, amongst others, Foucauldian ideas to explore and illuminate the problems of these texts, as well as to understand the developments of this genre over time, and to relate these to the development in attitudes amongst inquisitors toward their subject, as part of wider societal changes.[17]

Not all this textual work has been on the records of inquisition however; Dominique Iogna-Prat, Lorenzo Paolini, and earlier, Marie-Humbert Vicaire, have all examined the polemicists' treatment of heresy.[18] Iogna-Prat's book, *Ordonner et Exclure*, deals with Cluny's response to the enemies of the church, not only heretics but also Jews and Muslims, in the days of Peter the Venerable's reign as abbot. His analysis of the anti-heretical tradition at Cluny turns on Peter's *Contra Petrobrusianos*; he places the text within its contemporary context, as an early example of the newly re-emergent polemic genre, and examines the influences which led to its writing, and the ways in which it deals with heresy.[19] Paolini's approach, though similarly text-critical is directed the other way; he uses polemical material in order to answer questions about lay literacy and its relationship to heresy. His careful analysis of these texts demonstrates, amongst other things, the

---

[15] R.E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1972).

[16] G.G. Merlo, *Eretici e inquisitori nella società piemontese del Trecento: con l'edizione dei processi tenuti a Giaveno dall'inquisitore Alberto De Castellario (1335) e nelle Valli di Lanzo dall'inquisitore Tommaso Di Casasco (1373)* (Turin, 1977), pp.9-15. Carol Lansing has used these Italian sources, in particular the inquisition records of Orvieto, to undertake a microcosmic study of Italian Catharism, and the ways in which it was defined by its Catholic opponents, C. Lansing, *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (Oxford, 1998).

[17] J. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001).

[18] M.-H. Vicaire, 'Les Cathares albigeois vus par les polemistes', *CF*, 3 (1968), 107-28.

[19] D. Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion. Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)*, transl. G.R. Edwards (Ithaca and London, 2002), originally published in French as *Ordonner et Exclure. Cluny et la société Chrétienne face à l'hérésie, au Judaïsme, et à l'Islam 1000-1150* (Paris, 1998).

presence of pre-existing heretical texts underlying the polemicists' response.[20] Other work, not on polemic, but, like Iogna-Prat's book, focussed on traditions of anti-heretical writing within specific religious orders has been carried out by Beverly Kienzle, for the Cistercians and Bernard of Clairvaux, and by Luigi Canetti and Anne Reltgen-Tallon for the Dominicans.[21]

Out of this text based approach, a tendency emerges to view these texts in a deconstructive way, which has in turn led in several directions and with varying degrees of epistemological scepticism, in some instances to a view of heresy as entirely constructed from or by its sources. That view is in evidence in earlier work on eleventh- and twelfth-century heresy by Guy Lobrichon, Jean-Louis Biget and particularly Robert Moore. As Carol Lansing points out, Moore's approach extended the idea that heresy must exist relatively, to a view of heresy as created by a Catholic bureaucracy as a justification for the entrenchment of their power and authority.[22] More recently, this approach has been current especially in French scholarship, particularly that of Biget and Monique Zerner, and is perhaps most easily accessible through a collection of articles, with the deliberately ambiguous title *Inventer l'hérésie?*, which looks at evidence for heresy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, that is, heresy pre-inquisition. As the title suggests, it explores the idea of heresy as a construct contained more or less entirely in the texts; a good example is Biget's article on the literary creation by the northern French and Cistercian writers of both the idea of the Albigeois as a centre for heresy, and of the general application of the name to various heretical groups.[23]

---

[20] L. Paolini, 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in Biller and Hudson, 83-103.

[21] B.M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229. Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (York, 2001); L. Canetti, *L'invenzione della memoria; il culto e l'immagine di Domenico nella storia dei primi frati Predicatori* (Spoleto, 1996); A. Reltgen-Tallon, 'L'historiographie des Dominicains du Midi: une mémoire originale?', *CF*, 36 (2001), 395-414, p.398.

[22] G. Lobrichon, 'Le clair-obscur de l'hérésie au début du XIe siècle en Aquitaine: une lettre d'Auxerre', in T. Head and R. Landes (eds.), *Essays on the Peace of God: The Church and the People in Eleventh-Century France. Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques*, 14 (3) (1987), 422-44, summarized in *Inventer*, 'Arras, 1025, ou le vrai procès d'une fausse accusation', 67-85; against Lobrichon's reading, see C. Taylor, 'The Letter of Heribert of Périgord as a Source for Dualist Heresy in the Society of Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine', *Journal of Modern History*, 26 (2001), 313-49; J.-L. Biget, 'Un proces d'inquisition à Albi en 1300', *CF*, 6 (1971), 273-341. Lansing, *Power and Purity*, pp.12-13; R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Oxford, 1987); R.I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent* (Toronto; London, 1977).

[23] M. Zerner (ed.), *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition* (Nice, 1998). J.-L. Biget, '"Les Albigeois": remarques sur une dénomination', in *Inventer*, 219-55. See on this Kienzle, p.21.

For post-inquisition heresy records, Mark Pegg's recent work on an inquisition register held in the library of Toulouse, well-known amongst heresy scholars as a rich source of inquisition materials, attempts, in a twist on this theme, to show how the process of inquisition, rather than merely constructing a textual heresy, created a coherent entity from what had until that point been simply local custom.[24] Problems in the application of this approach to the thirteenth century have been amply highlighted by recent reviews by Biller and by Hamilton.[25]

A deconstructive approach can also work in the opposite direction. Kienzle, for example, who rejects the view of texts as so distanced from heretical reality that they hold no value for the reconstruction of heresy, instead breaks down the Cistercian anti-heretical writing in order to then reconstruct Catholic discourse, in a similar way to the article by Lauwers in *Inventer?*, but with an opposite conclusion. While it can be, as Stock observes, difficult to disentangle fact from interpretation, scholars such as Biller and Hamilton, and, for later English heresy, Anne Hudson, have attempted to do just that.[26] This other line of approach, and the one that will be followed in this thesis, assumes an underlying reality, and tries to unravel the problems of these constructs, in order to better understand the relationship that they have to the reality they ultimately describe.

In fact the principal aim here will not be to look for what the sources can say about heresy, so much as what they can tell us about Catholic ideas of heresy that lie behind them, to look at the ways in which the texts of the high medieval period construct their subject, the way in which heresy is represented by the written evidence. While most of the studies discussed above use 'heresy' as a construction, not all of them deal with it directly. To understand this representation, however, and the layers of construction and distortion that previous studies have shown us to be there, is important not only because of the dearth of balancing evidence emanating from the heretical half of this argument, but also as a key to what the reality of the Catholic idea of heresy might have been, and to the mechanisms that shaped and determined that idea. So, the other starting point of this thesis is to

---

[24] M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels. The Great Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, 2001).
[25] B. Hamilton, review of M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*, in *American Historical Review*, 107 (2002), 925-26; P. Biller, review of M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*, in *Speculum*, 78 (4) (2003), 1366-70. See also S. McSheffrey, 'Heresy, Orthodoxy and English Vernacular Religion 1480-1525', in *Past and Present*, 186 (2005), 47-80, p.47 and n.2.
[26] Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, p.107. A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988, repr.2001).

attempt an examination of the material and the construction in its own right that will allow a more nuanced view of its relationship to its subject.

While the idea of heresy has been examined in many of the studies that we have looked at, the findings have been for the most part concentrated on particular fields of anti-heretical writing, often, but not always, inquisition materials. One of the main difficulties with the analysis of the Toulouse manuscript put forward by Pegg, as Bernard Hamilton rightly points out, is that the analysis can only stand in isolation from other texts (and indeed from other inquisition registers). These texts were not, however, isolated from each other's influence, or from that of the wider contemporary environment, and several of their authors were involved in more than one area of anti-heretical activity. The author of one our polemical treatises, Moneta of Cremona, and another, the author of that vast *exempla* collection for fellow preachers, Stephen of Bourbon, were both also inquisitors in their spare time. The different topoi identified by Grundmann are indeed common to texts of many different types, in varying degrees. The best way, then, to access the contemporary idea of what heresy was, and the patterns and rhythms in which authors wrote about it, seems to be to look across the whole range of what was written, through a comparison of texts. This is to say, essentially, that there is something useful to be known about the way people thought about heresy that can be accessed through a comparison of different types of text.

Given that the aim here is to encompass as wide a range of material as possible, it is necessary to narrow the chronological scope from which it is drawn accordingly. The existence of anti-heretical material for the most part remains irregular until the middle of the twelfth century, either through accidents of survival, or gaps in either the occurrence of heresy or the commentary upon it. The origins of western heresy in the murky depths of the eleventh century are hard to divine, largely as a result of the slight survival of evidence from that period. Twelfth- and thirteenth-century heresy was in any case very different from what had gone before, and after the mid-twelfth century, there is a continuous production of material, in a greater variety of source types. By the mid-thirteenth century, both of the major movements in high medieval heresy were well-established and widely known. A contemporary tradition of anti-heretical writing had been established, and writers in this tradition

were now able to draw more on recent experience of, and had a greater familiarity with the heretics of their time, where previously writers had tended to look to the Fathers, in particular the works of Augustine, for information and guidance.[27] Anti-heretical action had also expanded to its widest range, and with the establishment and growth of the papal inquisition producing records and treatises alongside those more traditional areas of legislative action and polemical and homiletic writing, this was one of the highest and most diverse periods of Catholic activity toward and interaction with heresy; it is for that richness of textual evidence that the middle of the thirteenth century will form the focus of our study.

While the ultimate aim of this thesis is to achieve an understanding of contemporary ideas of heresy through comparison of different genres of texts, it is first necessary to have a clear idea of each genre in its own right. To understand a body of texts as a genre is identified by Bruschi and Biller as one of the main starting points of work in this area.[28] Consequently, this study will comprise two parts, the first of which will be made up of four chapters, each of which will concentrate on one specific generic group of texts. The aim in these chapters will be to try to establish a broad pattern for each group, and to analyse those groups in a way that gives common grounds for comparison. The analyses produced will then allow a basis for the wider comparison that constitutes the second part: an approach similar to Stock's methodology, which is to first establish basic meaning and point of view of a text, and then to address the broader interpretative implications. The term 'text' is not being used here in the broad sense that Stock employs, of text as a set of ideas, but rather according to the more restricted sense in which it is used by John Arnold, as both a repository of fact and as a rhetorically constructed thing.[29]

The principal textual treatments of heresy in this period can be divided, roughly, into four generic categories: polemical texts, texts designed for edification, canon-legal texts, and inquisition literature. For the sake of reference, the specific texts chosen in each group will be described in detail at the beginning of their chapter. Broadly however, canon-legal texts will cover general text-books, as well as specific anti-heretical legislation, while inquisition literature is made up of texts specific to inquisition, rather than heresy in general, and includes inquisitor's

---

[27] P. Biller, 'Cathars and Material Women', pp.64-65.
[28] Bruschi and Biller, 'Introduction', in Bruschi and Biller, p.14.
[29] Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, p.89; Arnold, 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', p.63.

manuals, together with procedural documents such as depositions and sentences; the group that is called here 'texts for edification' is perhaps the most diverse of the four, containing, principally, preachers' tools, *exempla* collections, and hagiographical material. The contents of the chapter on polemic do not need much further description than their title affords. It is within these categories that we will consider the material initially, though, as will become increasingly clear, there is a great deal of overlap between these genres at their outer edges. Most of the texts that we will be considering here derive not surprisingly from a southern French or northern Italian context, though some of those could be seen to have a sort of supra-national existence, which will be further explored in due course.

The construction of heresy will be the main focus here, and the term 'construction' is used principally to mean how and from what parts the picture of heresy is put together, whether as part of a rhetorical programme, or at a more structural level. However, part of what is being explored here is also whether or not construction is necessarily the best way to understand the processes behind our material, and where the boundaries between construction and representation might lie. For that reason, the title of the thesis deliberately avoids any attempt to describe the precise nature either of its focus or its subject. The 'heresy' to which it is addressed will comprise, essentially, that which the contemporary church labelled as heresy, and, for the majority of the thesis, will remain undefined in order to explore the ideas and patterns from which it is constituted, and which surround its use, and ultimately to try and understand what is meant or signified by the term. The one qualification to this principle is that, though several of our texts make reference to it, academic heresy will not be considered here in a serious way, and the focus will be on movements with a broad following.

Chapter 1 – Polemical Sources

Malum non vitatur nisi cognitum [1]

The polemical treatise against heresy emerged as a genre of anti-heretical literature with the re-appearance of heresy and the growth of the schools in the mid-twelfth century.[2] Texts against the Petrobrusians and Henricians marked a starting point, but the new trend in polemic began in earnest with Eckbert of Schönau's *Sermones tredecim contra haereticos* of 1163-67, and found its first known full-scale expression in Alan de Lille's *De fide catholica contra haereticos sui temporis,* in 1199-1202. Several, mostly French works on heresy survive from the early years of the thirteenth century, perhaps most importantly the works of Durand of Huesca, a former follower of Waldes, against the Cathars.[3] After these first decades however, nearly all the polemical writing that appears against heretics emerges from northern Italy, and it is in this context that we find the texts that will form the basis of this chapter, all of which were written in that region, between about 1230 and 1250.[4] Before we turn to examine their treatment of heresy, a brief overview will be given of the texts, their authors, and some idea of how they stand in relation to each other.

---

[1] Douais *La Somme*, V, p.114.

[2] Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, p.120. For a useful overview of anti-heretical polemic, see Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.47-91. See also the 'list of polemical sources' appended to Wakefield and Evans, pp.633-38.

[3] The *Liber antiheresis*, written c.1191-3, and the *Liber contra manicheos* of 1222-23. On Durand, see M.A. and R.H. Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians: a New Work by Durand of Huesca', in S.L. Waugh and P.D. Diehl (eds.), *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution and Rebellion, 1000-1500* (Cambridge, 1996), 86-111, esp. pp.87, 100-101.

[4] There is one unpublished French work that could be considered among the polemics, but which has not been looked at here: Benedict of Alignan's *Tractatus fidei contra diversos errores super titulum de summa trinitate et fide catholica in decretalibus*, of c.1261. See M. Grabmann, 'Der Franziskanerbischof Benedictus de Alignano († 1268) und seine Summa zum Caput Firmiter des vierten Laterankonzils', in P.I.-M. Freudenreich (ed.), *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien P.Michael Bihl, O.F.M., als Ehrengabe dargeboten* (Strasburg, 1941), 50-64, and Wakefield and Evans p.636, no.xxvi; the text remains unedited, though some of the appendices to the *summa* were published by Douais, 'Les hérétiques du Midi au XIIIe siècle: Cinq pièces inédits', in *Annales du Midi*, III (1891), 367-80.

Summa adversus catharos et valdenses [5]

Moneta of Cremona (d. c.1250) was a master of arts at the university of Bologna, who, according to the *Vitae fratrum*, was on this account 'in tota Lombardia famosus' at the time of his entry into the Dominican order in 1218 or 1219.[6] He was reputedly a close friend of St. Dominic, and also served as an inquisitor.[7] Moneta's *Summa adversus catharos et valdenses*, extant in sixteen manuscripts, and known in six more now lost is a long and very scholarly work, written in or around 1241, and edited only once, by Thomas Ricchini in 1743.[8] It is divided into five books: book one deals with the arguments of absolute dualists, and Catholic replies, on God and the Devil, Creation, Angels and Men, Prophecies and Miracles. Book two addresses the same areas, this time with mitigated dualists. Three and four argue against both groups on Christ, John the Baptist, the Virgin, the Holy Spirit, the Sacraments, and Apocalyptic doctrine, and finally book five defends Catholic teaching, and covers teaching on oaths, secular justice, usury, and free will; this is where we find material on the Waldenses, who are much less represented here than the Cathars, and there is also some treatment here of philosophers.

---

[5] Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus catharos et valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. Ricchini (Rome, 1743, repr.1964). Biographical and bibliographical information from *SOPMA*, vol.3, pp.137-38, *DTC*, vol.10, cols.2211-15, and introduction in Wakefield and Evans, pp.307-08. See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.59-63

[6] *Vitae fratrum*, p.169.

[7] *DTC* mentions dedication of 1243, 'master Moneta, OP, doctor of Theology, residing in Bologna', vol.10, col. 2211.

[8] For a list of MSS see *SOPMA* vol.3, pp.138-39, and vol.4, p.201. Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 3656 and Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, MS Reg. Lat. 428 were consulted for this study. On the date of the text: a passage in Ricchini's edition, based on BAV MS Reg. Lat. 428, p.245, indicates date c.1244, though in two MSS the same passage indicates 1241: the BnF MS Lat. 3656 (fol.137^{vb} 'non enim sunt plusquam m cc xl et unus annus quod ipse [Christus] factus est homo'), and one of the Palma MSS, Bibl. Episcopal or Bibl. Pública 565, see *DTC*, vol.10, col.2211. Wakefield and Evans point out that there is also mention of 'eighty years and some since' the preaching of Valdes (c.1170), Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.402, but suggest that though this would make 1241 too early, this reference is too vague to contradict the first, Wakefield and Evans, p.744, n.1; *SOPMA* also dates the text to 1241.

Summa contra haereticos [9]

This is a reasonably long text, around 60,000 words, that deals solely with the Cathar heresy, refuting points of Cathar doctrine, and affirming the corresponding Catholic teaching in alternating sections. An ascription to James Capelli was made by Molinier, who first described the treatise in 1888, working from the Milan manuscript that bears James' name. James was lector at the Franciscan convent at Milan in the mid-thirteenth century; Ilarino da Milano suggests that he may also have been an inquisitor, and certainly there are hints that the author of this work may have been connected to the process of inquisition. The ascription is not secure however, and the treatise was published as an anonymous work in excerpts, and then in its entirety, by Döllinger and Bazzocchi respectively, from the Cesena manuscript, which has no ascription. The text survives in four manuscripts, while a fifth, now lost, is documented in the 1381 catalogue of the Franciscan convent at Assisi.[10] Molinier and Ilarino da Milano both place this text somewhere between 1240 and 1260, though Wakefield and Evans suggest that, due to several passages comparable with the c.1241 *Summa* of Moneta of Cremona, it was 'prepared' by about 1240: the possibility of a common source for the shared material would, however, reduce the significance of the comparison.[11] Wakefield also demonstrates the dependence of the author on earlier preachers' manuals for much of the material that comprises the chapters on orthodox belief.[12]

Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum [13]

This text is an exposition and refutation of Cathar doctrine, framed within the form of a *disputatio*, or debate between a catholic and a heretic. The *Disputatio* seems to

---

[9] *L'eresia catara. Appendice:* Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos. *Codice inedito Malatestiano del sec. XIII.*, ed. Dino Bazzocchi (Bologna, 1920). Biographical and historiographical information taken from Wakefield and Evans, pp. 301-02. See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.57-59. There is a more recent critical edition, by P. Romagnoli in her 1991-2 Bologna doctoral thesis (*Pseudo-Giacomo de Capellis, "Summa Contra hereticos"*); request for interlibrary loan was refused.

[10] A. Dondaine, 'Durand de Huesca et la polémique anti-cathare', *AFP*, XXIV (1959), 228-76, repr. in *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition, XIIe-XIIIe siècles. Documents et études*, ed. Y. Dossat (Aldershot, 1990), p.266.

[11] Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.285-321; pp.309-15. See also below, p.20, n.18.

[12] Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.299-304.

[13] *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum. Die Auseinandersetzung der katholischen Kirche mit den italienischen Katharern im Spiegel einer kontroverstheologischen Streitschrift des 13. Jahrhunderts*, ed. C. Hoécker (Florence, 2001). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.66-67.

have had a very wide circulation; Hoécker puts the number of extant manuscripts at fifty-three. These fall into two families, a shorter Italian version, the version that will be used here, and a longer, later French redaction, with added material on the Eucharist. The author refers to himself as a layman, in the eighth chapter: 'michi etiam, qui laicus sum, et in lege dei parum peritus', but apart from this there is very little else to be known about him, and there has been some debate over his identity.[14] Martène and Durand in their edition of this text marked it as anonymous, but from a pun that he makes on the etymology of the name George, we can at least assume that this was his name.[15] Partly on this basis, Schmidt and Ilarino da Milano attributed it to the Dominican inquisitor Gregory of Florence, later Bishop of Fano,[16] but Dondaine, and with him Hoécker have rejected this attribution, and believe the author to be an unknown layman by the name of George, though the issue of different redactions may complicate this further.[17] There are several parts of the *Disputatio* that can be related to other texts contemporary with it. One passage on the transmigration of souls is found in both the *Disputatio* and the *Summa* attributed to Peter Martyr, for which Kaeppeli suggests a common source. There are also places in which a close resemblance can be demonstrated between George's work and that of Moneta, and though Borst rejects any relationship between the two, the similarities would seem to suggest at least some level of dependence or relationship between the two.[18] Ilarino da Milano dates the *Disputatio* to shortly before 1250; Wessley suggests that an earlier date can perhaps be inferred from references to the death penalty within the text. Hoécker places this text in the first third of the thirteenth century, at some point between 1209 and 1234.[19]

---

[14] *Disputatio*, p.46.x.
[15] *Disputatio*, p.47.i: 'falso enim ero GEORGIUS, si terras domini mei non excolam'.
[16] C. Schmidt, *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois*, (2 vols., Paris, 1848-49), vol.II, p.230; Ilarino da Milano, 'Fr. Gregorio O.P., vevosco di Fano e la "*Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*"', *Aevum*, XIV (1940), 85-140.
[17] Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.174ff; *Disputatio*, p.xxixff.
[18] T. Kaeppeli, 'Une somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?)', *AFP*, XVII (1947), 295-335, edn. of text on pp.320-335, p.325, n.38; S. Wessley, 'The Composition of Georgius' *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum hereticum*', *AFP*, XLVIII (1978), 55-61; Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.297-99; A. Borst, *Les Cathares*, tr. C. Roy (Paris, 1974, orig. Stuttgart, 1953), p.21, n.1, see *Disputatio*, pp.lxix-lxx.
[19] Wessley, 'The Composition of Georgius' *Disputatio*', p.55, and n.3; *Disputatio*, p.xi, p.xxxv ff., p.xl; see also Wakefield and Evans, p.290. See also on *Disputatio* S. Hamilton, 'The Virgin Mary in Cathar Thought', *JEH*, vol.56.i (2005), 24-49.

Liber suprastella [20]

The author of the *Liber suprastella*, Salvo Burci was a native of Piacenza, a member of notarial family 'Burcius', and, according to Bruschi, probably either connected to episcopal inquisitions, or in some contact with the heretical fringe. Like the author of the *Disputatio,* Salvo was a layman, and though he was not a scholar, he was certainly schooled. The *Liber Suprastella*, dated very precisely to Sunday 6th May, 1235, was commissioned by Monachus de Cario. Bruschi points out that the de Cario family had close links with the Speroni family, whose name had been compromised by associations with heresy, and suggests that this commission was the de Carios' attempt to assert their orthodoxy. The book is apparently a response to a heretical work by the name of *The Star*, hence the title, and is a rather rambling and incoherent work, nominally dealing with all heresies, but really with the Cathars and the Waldensians. Its prologue is written by a separate author, who was apparently trying to impose some kind of generic identity on a text which the editor characterizes as a variable and above all hurried composition, written 'di getto'. The text is extant in one MS only, recovered by Döllinger in 1890.[21]

These texts, though all emerging within the same twenty or thirty year period, and all from the Lombardy region, present a wide spectrum of quality and style. Moneta's *Summa* is clearly the work of an accomplished and well-read academic: it is a complex theological and scholastic treatise. The work of the Pseudo-James is also a learned work, especially in those parts that refute Cathar doctrine. The two lay texts are not without learning, though Salvo's work is perhaps a little more without than the *Disputatio*, which is a relatively complex theological work; however, both seem to reflect a less formal arena of discussion. For the most part all these works deal with Catharism, the Pseudo-James and George exclusively so.

---

[20] Salvo Burci, *Liber Suprastella*, ed. Caterina Bruschi, Instituto storico italiano per il medio evo, fonti per la storia dell'italia medievale (Rome, 2002); biographical and bibliographical information taken from introduction pp.vii-xxxvii. Excerpts have also been edited by Ilarino da Milano, *Il "Liber supra Stella" del piacentino Salvo Burci contro I catari e altri correnti ereticali*, in Eresie medievali. Scritti minori (Rimini, 1983), 205-367, orig. publ. in *Aevum*, XVI (1942) 272-319; XVII (1943) 90-146;XIX (1945) 218-341.

[21] In Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS *Mugellanus (de nemore)* 12.

Though Moneta and Salvo both claim to address Catharism and Waldensianism, they both give far greater space to the heresy of the Cathars. Despite their differences, though, there are such similarities in the structure of these texts, and in the ways that they represent their subject, that we can look at the patterns of that representation across the group as a whole, beginning with their construction of heresy as a learned, that is an educated and intellectual phenomenon.

I

In his *Summa contra gentiles*, Aquinas says that it is possible to argue against heretics because they recognize a common text, that of the New Testament, and indeed the few brief glimpses that these polemical texts allow us of heretics in action, as it were, show them owning, using and revering the text of the Gospels or of the New Testament in their rituals.[22] In fact, a more complex impression of heretical book use emerges from these texts than that afforded by the rare descriptions of custom that they include, and in the main substance of their content the polemics construct a picture of heretical literacy and education that goes beyond the ritual use of Scripture. The heresy that is represented here not only reflects the same methods of academic, or more precisely scholastic education as the authors of the Catholic texts display, but further, can be seen to create and exist within a written tradition all of its own.

Instantly accessible in these texts is the fact that heresy is presented without exception as a set of doctrines expounded according to scholastic principles. George tells us he will proceed 'more hereticorum', which Hoécker understands to mean a scholastic method.[23] Both George and his Patarine conduct their argument in that fashion, and though it reaches its fullest expression in Moneta's work, the same pattern runs through each of our texts. In the first place, each heretical argument presented by the polemicists is shown to be supported by Scriptural

---

[22] Aquinas, *SCG*.1.ii, p.2. Heretics using Gospel/Testament in ritual: Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.cxxxviii: 'textum evangeliorum super caput eius imponit'. Pseudo-James Capelli also makes reference to apocrypha, Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.xciii.

[23] *Disputatio*, p.4 and n.6. A possible parallel to this usage occurs in the *Vitae fratrum* account of the Peter Martyr story, where the young Saint argues with his uncle: 'patruus nisus est ei probare per auctoritates, more hereticorum, quod dyabolus ista creaverat', *Vitae fratrum*, p.236.

authorities. Occasionally, our texts also show the heretics making reference to patristic writers such as Augustine and even Chrysostom, but such occasions are not common and usually appear because the heretic cites those writers not in support of his own point, but as a proof used by his Catholic opponent.[24] For the most part, the principal source of authority for the heretics is Scripture, and in almost every case that authority is drawn from the New Testament; the only substantial use of Old Testament material by heretics appears in Moneta's *Summa*. In the second place, those heretical articles presented are then developed through the exegesis of their supporting authorities, and in some places are further elaborated by the use of logical arguments. Moneta, the Pseudo-James, and Salvo, all describe the Cathars as using *rationes*, and in Moneta's text, that use is extended again by a Cathar argument based on a *dictum* of Aristotle.[25] One of the few remaining Cathar texts, the *Liber de duobus principiis*, which uses both Aristotle (or a text that its author believed to be by Aristotle) and Roman Law as source material, would seem to support these representations.[26]

The *Liber de duobus principiis* brings us neatly to our second point, namely that the other and perhaps more significant way in which these texts present heresy as learned lies not only in Cathars' arguments and use of Scripture, but in their creation of their own texts. For each of these polemical works it is possible, to varying degrees, to point to the presence of one or more heretical works, a book produced by Cathars, that is, a creative as well as a physical or technical production. In places, that presence is a deliberate part of the construction. Moneta's access to and use of such texts is made explicit at the very beginning of his work, when he tells us that his information comes either from their own mouths, 'vel ex scripturis suis illa habui'. Moneta several times refers to different anonymous heretical texts,

---

[24] References to other authorities: Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.clxxxii, ccvii; *Disputatio*, references by heretic and by George, to Chrysostom, and your Augustine, etc. pp.18.ix; 29;45;47;63;58.

[25] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.23.i, also perhaps p.83.i. On Cathar use of this *dictum*, see Biller, 'Northern Cathars', pp.36-7.

[26] Though this reference is in fact misattributed, the author clearly believed it to be from Aristotle. A. Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen de XIIIe siècle: Le Liber de duobus principiis, suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare* (Rome, 1939), pp.141, 143, 82. Paolini shows Italian Cathars using patristic authorities, as well as material from theologians and philosophers, and possibly the Ordinary Gloss. Paolini also cites George as referring to a heretical *glossa*, but Hoécker gives this as 'bursa', Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', pp.97-98, and p.100, n.76; *Disputatio*, p.46.ii (c), and n.111. Hamilton demonstrates that the Cathar version of New Testament derived from Vulgate, see B. Hamilton, 'Wisdom from the East: the Reception by the Cathars of Eastern Dualist Texts', in Biller and Hudson, 38-60. Raniero Sacconi describes John of Lugio using not only the whole bible, but also natural philosophy and Roman Law, Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, pp.53, 56, 54.

but he also uses two texts by named Cathars: Tetricus, an absolute dualist, and Desiderius, a mitigated dualist attested in other sources, whose work was also owned and used by Aquinas.[27] The very title of Salvo's work would seem to point to origins in another text; the prologue to the *Liber suprastella*, written by a different author, explains the title of this work as referring to a heretical treatise named *The Star*, to which Salvo's book is a reply: the higher star. Salvo himself makes no mention of this text, but the book's modern editor still sees the book as being in some part reliant on a heterodox text, importing elements from it, which stand out in tone and language.[28]

The presence of these books can also be seen to underlie the structure of the polemics, however, and that presence is not incidental: they constitute, or are presented as constituting a source of the heretical material contained in these Catholic works. Again, that presence can be seen most clearly in the work of Moneta, who employs heretical texts as a template for his response, working systematically from the text being refuted. That use is explicit where Moneta uses proofs found in the writings of Tetricus to construct a refutation, but many of the heretical doctrines and expositions that Moneta refutes are presented in such detail as to also suggest the presence of a text. To use an opponent's text in such a way would be standard scholastic practice; Aquinas in the same context tells us that 'we may use what they say as the basis of proceeding to a refutation of their errors'.[29]

---

[27] Anonymous texts: Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, pp.2, 42, 94, 398; Desiderius: Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, pp.248, 347, 357; his text was also used by Aquinas, in his *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum*, cap.6, ref. in Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie II, III', p.292, n.36; he also appears in several other accounts, including the *Vitae fratrum*, 5.iii, p.239, and Anselm of Alessandria's account of the Concorrezenses, Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, p.310; Tetricus: Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, pp.61, 71, 79. Raniero Sacconi tells us that the book written by John of Lugio is a 'volumen magnum X quaternorum, cuius exemplarium habeo et perlegi et ex illos errores supradictos extraxi', Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.57. Note that Wakefield points to other possibly identifiable heretical sources used by Moneta, Cathar writings, one in Provençal, one that was used by Durand de Huesca, though this is not secure, and perhaps also some Waldensian writing, Wakefield, 'Notes', p.305 and nn.74-77.

[28] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.3. The explanation of the title of the *Liber Suprastella* would seem to presuppose the existence of a heretical text, but Bruschi suggests that perhaps the prologuer was trying here, as with other aspects of this text, to make some sense out of the rather strange title; some alternative suggestions for the source of the title are made, Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.xxii; Those elements that seem to derive from a heretical tract are collected by Bruschi into an appendix, pp.449-72. Perhaps there is also a hint of a written source in the line: 'primo videamus quid dicant Concorricii super capitulum matrimonii', p.8.13. Ilarino da Milano also argues for Salvo's direct knowledge, reference in Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.100, n.77.

[29] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.71; Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.101. Aquinas, *SGC* I.ii, p.2; transl. from Eng. tr. v.1, p.62.

Further proof of Moneta's use of written heretical material, and of the general principal at work here, can be found in another text, titled *Quaedam obiectiones hereticorum et responsiones Christianorum*; it is a much smaller text than Moneta's *Summa*, but one which has close connections with it. The *Quaedam obiectiones* was copied by the Doat scribes from a small manuscript in the Carcassonne archive. Wakefield considers it to be in fact two texts, the second part of which is a fuller version of Douais IV, part of the same family of *Summae auctoritatum* to which that latter text belongs, and which we will look at in the next chapter. The first part however, he regards as an extract from what might have once been a longer text, and he demonstrates its close relationship with the sixth chapter of the second book of Moneta's *Summa*. The prologue is almost identical with the beginning of Moneta's chapter, although the use of the terms 'Albigenses' or 'Bugari', where Moneta's version uses Cathars leads Wakefield to suggest that the Doat text is more likely to be of French origin. The main similarities, however, lie neither in the group names used for the heretics, nor in the refutations, but rather in the statements of heretical argument, and it is Wakefield's opinion that both authors had access to the same written source of heretical doctrine.[30] The use by both authors of the same material to create different arguments again highlights the use of an external source by Moneta. Elsewhere in the *Quaedam obiectiones*, we can see other suggestions of the same process. A large part of the latter text is taken up with an extended refutation of the Cathar objection to the God of the Old Testament. The refutation begins with the statement that 'obiectiones hereticorum in hoc capitulo ex quatuor radicibus procedunt', and the author then follows that four-fold framework systematically, quoting and refuting the heretical articles with the same method and the same level of detail as the other texts. A slight hint, but one that could point in the same direction.[31]

The pattern that we see in the *Summa adversus catharos et valdenses* and in the *Quaedam obiectiones* supports the idea of similar sources for the Cathar doctrines and arguments found in the other texts, which also present their opponents' views in great detail. It would certainly substantiate the importation of a Cathar text into Salvo's book, as outlined by Bruschi, as well as Paolini's view that

---

[30] Wakefield, 'Notes', p.300 n.65 and pp.307-308. The text can be found in Doat 36 on ff. 91^{v}-203^{r}; see also below, cap.2, p.53, n.38. See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.63-64.
[31] Doat 36, fol.92^{r}.

UNIVERSITY OF YORK LIBRARY

the author of the *Summa contra hereticos* was also in some part dependent on heretical texts, though breaking them down to fit his own scheme, and never citing them.[32] We cannot be sure whether the author of the *Disputatio* had a heretical text. Certainly in places he relies on other, orthodox textbooks to provide material for his refutations, but he is not concerned to present himself as using or owning a heretical book for the accounts of Cathar error that he gives.[33] However, there are passages which see him moving through precisely referenced Cathar doctrine point by point, in much the same way that Moneta does.

Heresy appears in these sources as something expressed through, and encountered in a textual form, though this may be truer or more explicit for some than for others. However, all the polemics share the conviction that heresy is something that can also be answered via a textual medium. Indeed, the prologues to both the *Disputatio* and the *Liber suprastella*, as well as the introduction of the *Quaedam obiectiones* present heresy as the stimulus to their production; both books are characterized as weapons to fight the errors of the heretics. George develops this metaphor further to include the Scriptural authorities, which he will cast as 'lapides vivos' against the heretics, and hints, rather ominously, at greater weapons to be wielded by those more powerful than himself.[34] The author of the *Quaedam obiectiones* goes one better to say that he will set out their objections 'velut proprios gladios eorum intret in corda ipsorum'.[35] Moneta too, in his prologue, hints in a rather more understated way that he is responding to the heretics that are attacking the church, heretics who are 'prepared to fight'.[36]

The text as weapon is in fact the final layer in these texts' construct of a learned heresy, which is further developed through the manner of the orthodox engagement with it. The exegetical, academic nature of the heretical arguments is answered in kind by the polemicists, and if we once more take Moneta's text, the clearest and most ordered of the four as an example, we can see that the refutation of heresy is treated as, and framed within a dialectical exercise. Each of Moneta's chapters is devoted to one point of heretical error and systematically addresses all

---

[32] Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', pp.100-01.
[33] Hoécker points to the possibility of George using Peter Lombard's Sentences as a source for his quotation of Augustine, p.63, n.144.
[34] *Disputatio*, p.4: This could be inquisition, or perhaps he means academics wielding fierce *ratios*. Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.3.
[35] Doat 36, fol.92[r].
[36] Moneta, *Adversos catharos, parati*, p.2.i; also p.6.i.

the authorities and arguments that are used to support that error by setting up the heretical argument as the thesis, and then presenting the Catholic position in terms of counter argument and solution, *contra* and *solutio*. The same structure is also adopted by the Pseudo-James and by George, though presented in the latter two within a framework of oral, rather than written debate.[37] Salvo uses some of the terms that can be found here, and his work certainly has a studied texture of academic method, but though he does try to respond to each point in turn and refute from authority, that method is less reflected in the structure of his treatise than in those of the other writers.

Stephen of Bourbon, a contemporary of our polemicists who, like Moneta, Salvo and the Pseudo-James was also involved in inquisition, relates a story in which a southern French noble, Robert of Montferrand, who died in 1234, had 'per quadraginta annos posuerat curam et diligenciam congregare libros omnium sectarum'.[38] The polemics are presenting us with a picture of heresy, and of Catharism specifically, that is very similar to that visible in Stephen's vignette, a heresy both expressed and answered through a learned medium and method, and which derives from a deliberate application of knowledge and learning. Patschovsky, in examining the condition of Waldensian literacy in the same period, outlines the criteria for true reception: a productive application of knowledge by an intellectually active readership, and the development of original writings based on this reception of knowledge.[39] What he finds to be lacking in a Waldensian context at this time, seems very close to what our Italian polemicists are presenting as the condition of Cathar learning.

If we want to look for reasons for this representation of heresy as learned, the interaction and exchange visible in these texts must be a significant factor. The fact that the heretical doctrines discussed by the polemics can be seen to derive from heretical texts, at least in part, must indicate to some extent that the academic framework that the Catholic texts use was not entirely removed from heretical

---

[37] Pseudo-James also seems to make use of Aristotelian terms, Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.xxi; xxxii; cl-cli; cxcix.
[38] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.275-76.
[39] A. Patschovsky, 'The Literacy of Waldensianism from Valdes to c.1400', in Biller and Hudson, 112-135, pp.116-117.

reality, not just a structure into which the ideas of their opponents were artificially inserted, but a format common to both. The two lay texts are both presented as tools for personal encounter with heresy, George's as a weapon, Salvo's as a defence against wiles, but both suggest contact.[40] The *Disputatio* is of course by definition constructed according to scholastic principles of debate, but as we noted earlier, in describing the method that he will use, George tells us that he will proceed 'more hereticorum', and the fact that a layman can use this phrase as a shorthand for a scholastic style of debate points to a general familiarity with, and recognition of the condition of heretical learning among his readership, which, to judge from the manuscript tradition, seems to have been wide. It also again suggests an exterior existence to this learning, rather than simply a superimposed rhetorical framework. Certainly, in the first half of the thirteenth century, public debates between heretical and orthodox figures seem to have been common in northern Italian cities, as they had been in southern France in preceding years. Paolini points to two famous public debates that took place in 1260s Vicenza, between the Cathar and Catholic bishops of that city. Debates also appear to have been frequent between the different Cathar churches; Salvo tells us that the Albanenses and Concorrezenses met often to resolve the schism between them. This 'disputatiousness' is identified by Paolini as a characteristic of the Cathars, and one that had troubled Catholic commentators, such as Joachim of Fiore, for some time.[41] Even as late as the 1320s, Bernard Gui was warning less experienced scholars not to be too ready to take heretics on in public. It may be worth highlighting here Vicaire's suggestion that such scholarly engagement was in part responsible for the development of Cathar scholarship, of which the acceptance by John of Lugio of the whole Bible, for example, represents a significant step.[42]

To highlight the possible exchange between orthodox and heterodox ideas is not to argue that the polemicists intended their work for a scholarly heretical readership, however. Though he sometimes seems to address them throughout his long refutations, Moneta is not talking to heretics but rather to an orthodox

---

[40] This could more be general than debates; references to the heretics teaching and preaching are frequent throughout the anti-heretical corpus, including some of the polemics, see for example Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.6, 342, Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.x; xi; xvii; lxxxiii. On Cathar preaching see J. Arnold, 'The Preaching of the Cathars', in C. Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden, 1998), 183-205.

[41] Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.90; pp.90-91; Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.5-6.

[42] M.-H. Vicaire, 'Les Cathares albigeois vus par les polémistes', *CF*, 3 (1968), 107-28.

audience: 'unum autem peto a Lectoribus istius operis, ut si qua argumenta, vel responsiones contra Haereticos sibi visa fuerint debilia, non me mordeant'.[43] On the other hand, this in turn is not to say that these texts had no application outside an academic milieu. There are several connections between the texts both of Moneta and of the Pseudo-James with the *Summae auctoritatum* that will be discussed in the next chapter that might suggest that the polemics were closer to the real work of repression than might at first be apparent; the *Quaedam obiectiones* seems indeed to contain one of these *summae* as an integral part. A more physical suggestion of use might be found in a miniature copy of Moneta's *Summa*, to be found in a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century manuscript of the Bibliothèque nationale, Lat.3656. The latter is a tiny book, smaller than a modern sheet of A5, filled with notes and glosses and the occasional drawn hand pointing to relevant parts of the text. It is even slightly more miniature than the Bible of the Bibliothèque nationale manuscript Lat.174 that contains the first of Douais' *Summae auctoritatum*. Another less small but still quite little copy of (most of) Moneta can be found in Vatican manuscript Reg. Lat.428, which also contains Raniero Sacconi's handbook. The dimensions of these manuscripts suggest the ready portability of the vade-mecum books used by travelling preachers – again, something discussed further in the next chapter.

The learning, or otherwise of heretics was not, however, an unprecedented aspect of anti-heretical writing, and the influence of this tradition needs also to be considered here. Though these polemics present heresy, particularly Catharism as a set of learned doctrines, at the same time there is a certain amount of invective in these works that paints both the heresy and heretics as stupid, or foolish. The heretic as *illiteratus* was indeed one of the more prevalent elements of anti-heretical polemic of the preceding century, the general pattern of which was to emphasize, and perhaps overstate, the ignorance of the heretics in question, principally through the use of words such as *rusticus* and *illiteratus*. Although it is important to remember, as Grundmann made clear, that in this context, *illiteratus* principally indicated that a person was not Latin literate, rather than unable to read altogether, in contrast to our texts the use of that term is still significant.[44]

---

[43] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p. 2.ii.

[44] H. Grundmann, '*Litteratus-illiteratus*. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XL (1958), 1-65.

Recent examinations of this treatment have revealed two levels to the accusation of illiteracy; the principal element was a general division between the educated church and ignorant heretics. That duality represented the main line of the earlier Catholic attacks on heresy, the effect, though perhaps not necessarily the aim of which was to neatly sidestep the need to deal with the error closely: it invalidated the heresy because the ignorance of the heretic precluded its having any real substance, dismissing the error by dismissing the capability of its proponents. The one exception to this early pattern was perhaps the *Contra Petrobrusianos* of Peter the Venerable, in which, according to Iogna-Prat, Peter employed a 'defensive argument' that allied a more argumentative approach to the solely imprecatory style of his contemporaries.[45] A further distinction in the illiteracy topos was sometimes made amongst the ranks of the heretics, when the internal constitution of a sect was under discussion without direct reference to the Catholic church, between the cunning, sophistical leaders and their simple and deluded followers.[46] The focus of the earlier attacks was therefore on the heretic himself, on his behaviour and personal qualities, with little engagement with, or extensive reporting of the actual error.

The topos of the illiterate heretic was prevalent during the early re-emergence and development of Catholic anti-heretical polemic in the twelfth century, but its application was not uniform. It had a weak tradition in northern French polemic, but continued to be strong in the south of France until the 1190s, after which time it was rarely employed against the Cathars, though some writers in this region continued to employ the illiterate heretic device against the Waldensians beyond this date. Where it did maintain a strong tradition, well into the thirteenth century, was in German discussions of heresy, in the several handbooks written for inquisitors, though perhaps significantly, the principal concern in this region was with Waldensianism.[47]

Our thirteenth-century polemical treatment of Catharism, which emerges from an Italian context, has abandoned this imagery, and no longer centres on the simple duality of literate churchmen, illiterate heretics. In the first place, the

---

[45] For a discussion of the approach of earlier polemics, see Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, pp.120-47, and below, p.231, n.147.
[46] Biller, 'Northern Cathars', p.48f., and introduction to Biller and Hudson, p.4.
[47] P. Biller, 'The *topos* and Reality of the Heretic as *illiteratus*', in Biller, *Waldenses*, pp. 169-90, also 'Northern Cathars', p.48, and 'The Cathars of Languedoc and Written Materials', in Biller and Hudson, 61-82, p.80; Patschovsky, 'The Literacy of Waldensianism', p.127.

manner in which these texts engage with their subject represents a departure in its own right. Unlike the earlier polemical approach which rarely involved itself in a discussion of error, our texts engage precisely with that error and little else. Where the thirteenth-century construct also departs from most earlier material, and where Catharism seems distinguished from descriptions of Waldensianism in particular is in its depiction of heretical use and application of Scriptural knowledge. What is striking is not only that the heresy, or rather the Catharism that these texts present is a learned phenomenon, but also that it consists primarily, and in fact almost entirely of doctrinal and theological error, rather than the more externalized, behavioural error of belief presented by earlier texts, or indeed by other genres that we will look at in turn. There are still remnants of the illiteracy topos: there remains in these texts varying degrees of the inherited invective of previous polemic, in particular in the *Disputatio,* the Pseudo-James, and the *Liber suprastella.* In one particularly impressive sentence, Salvo manages to fit six 'stulti's into seven lines: 'stulti et insensati eretici, non est autem mirum si stulti estis eretici, quia stulta loquimini; stultorum enim in anima penitus et stulta proferre consuetudo est... [quotation from Mt.21.12] ...O stulti, ubi erat tunc corpus Christi? Stulti estis'.[48] The type of language exhibited here is much more restricted in the sober prose of Moneta; wherever it does occur, though, in our polemics, it is belied by the manner in which each of these texts engages with its subject, which always presents, or assumes an educated opponent.

These texts present us not only with a learned doctrine, but also at times with learned individuals who either create or transmit that doctrine. *Doctores* and *magistri* begin to appear among the Cathar ranks from the end of twelfth century; in a letter preserved in Matthew Paris' *Chronica majora*, Yves of Narbonne, telling of his induction into Cathars secrets, relates that the Cathars told him that they sent their 'capable students' to Paris from most Lombard and some Tuscan cities, to study logic or theology, in order to bolster their own error and overthrow the Catholic faith.[49] Of our authors, the Pseudo-James uses the term *magistri* of at least some of the heretics he presents and Salvo mentions a certain *medicus* called

---

[48] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.20-21.
[49] Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.88; Yves of Narbonne to Gerald archbishop of Bordeaux, Wakefield and Evans, p.186; for analysis of this letter see Biller, 'Northern Cathars', pp.50-51.

Andrew as a source.[50] The most concrete figures are probably the heretics named by Moneta as authors.

In the context of the construction of heresy that these polemics present, the learned/unlearned duality would not, then, present a valid line of attack and indeed attacks of this type are no longer the location of the real polemic, rather a rhetorical relic. Clearly, if it is necessary to present an opponent as capable not only of learned exposition, but of exposition of the same texts, then the struggle becomes about two opposed readings, and which is dominant. Though there is still invective, the real polemic is elsewhere in our authors' representation of the exchange between heretical and orthodox doctrine, and on a level that is present in each of the texts considered here.

The principal reconciliation of the problem of a learned heresy with its inherent wrongness occurs through the continuing emphasis that all our authors place on interpretation. Both the manner in which the authors address the (hypothetical) heretics in their texts, and the way in which the texts are arranged construct the erroneousness of the heresy on the basis of interpretation, that is, they address the content of the heresy, not the condition of the heretic. The interpretation of the shared Scriptural basis offered by the heretics is always declared to be based on a skewed, perverse, or simply wrong understanding. So Moneta tells his opponent 'patet quod male intelligis' or 'perversam intelligentiam', usually at the introduction of his alternate, Catholic, reading. Pseudo-James similarly: 'falsam esse vestram expositionem probabimus', and George: 'pessimum intellectum'. Salvo echoes George, 'in istis rebus habent pessimum intellectum', though charitably also allows his heretical opponent to make the same claim of 'non est intelligendum quod…' against the Catholic proposition, perhaps again a result of relying on a heretical text.[51] They do not understand, and so they are unable to reach the clear truth of Catholic teaching, against which heretical exposition is always set: 'male exponitis…sed ita intelligitur'.[52] Many more examples could be

---

[50] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, 'magistri' p.cviii, also a heresiarch p.cxii; This would traditionally be the author of a heresy, but here, and elsewhere it can mean both this and a high ranking heretic, such as Lugio, or Raniero. Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.314, Andrew figure: 'sic audivi quod Andreas medicus predicabat qui dicebatur esse de vestris'.

[51] Moneta, *Adversos catharos* p.86.i, also pp.79.ii; 138.ii 22.ii, etc.; Capelli, *Adversus haereticos* p.lxii; also pp.iv; cxlv; clviii; clxv; cxcvi, cci; etc.; *Disputatio* p.13.vi; also pp.15.xviii; 28.xix; 41.xiii; 56.vi etc.; Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.8.iii; 8.xxiv; 13.xix; 70.xix; etc. from heretic, p.13.ix;

[52] *Disputatio*, p.13.xv-xvi.

given from each of our texts. The emphasis on interpretation is in itself is a development from the previous polemical trope, identified by Peter Biller, in which heretical stupidity is demonstrated by their inaccurate understanding or misunderstanding of the Latin itself; now their Latinity is accepted, only their interpretation of it questioned.

The manner in which these texts are structured, in couplets of heretical and Catholic exposition as described above, not only shows a recognition of learning, but also further contributes to the presentation of the error as one of interpretation. Each text consistently reinterprets the authorities used to support heretical arguments, before going on to outline a statement of the orthodox position, offering refutation both by statement of Catholic doctrine, and by Catholic reinterpretation of heretical exposition. The same exchange between interpretation and re-interpretation remains the general pattern even in the more loosely structured and less systematic text of Salvo. The fundamental role of interpretation is also perhaps emphasized by the concessions that are made where an overlap occurs: Moneta and George will both acknowledge the correctness of the heretical interpretation where it coincides with the orthodox one; in the *Disputatio*, the heretic is allowed to make similar concessions to his orthodox opponent.[53] Where previous polemics would, if they dealt with heretical error at all, tend to report it as necessary information, the Catharism presented by these texts consists almost entirely of doctrine. In the course of that construction, exegesis is presented and recognized as the medium of the conflict; this heresy is learned but it is also an error of learning.

In an extension of that construction, the lack of understanding that results in so much misinterpretation is in several places shown to be the result of overreaching, or connected in some way to a fault of human reason operating without the guidance of faith, 'a doctis magistris Ecclesie Romane separati'.[54] There is perhaps an oblique attack on this level by Moneta; he condemns the use of Aristotle's *dictum* 'contrarium contraria sunt principia' and other terminology derived from that philosopher by his heretical opponent, but he also later makes a substantial attack on Aristotle in his own right, in book five. Moneta describes his own understanding as a divine gift, 'Dominus...mihi...det intellectum, ut sciam

---

[53] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.82.i; *Disputatio*, pp.7; 9; 39; 46; 58, concessions from both Catholic and Heretic. Moneta also makes allowance for heretical disagreement over interpretation, where the heretic questions Catholic interpretation, Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.12.
[54] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.10.xiv.

testimonia eius'.[55] That attack is more explicit and more extended in the Pseudo-James, who links many of the Cathars' errors, for example their position on the Trinity, to their misapplication of human reason to mystery, 'quia humana non potest ratione cognoscere trinitatem...credere nolunt', for example, or 'verum quia hereticus non credit ideo non intelligit...multas quidem blasphemandi habens occasiones si sumpta scripturarum intelligentia consuetae naturae cursum vult attendere'. [56] They learn too quickly to be able to understand, 'legunt evangelium doctores esse cupientes non intelligunt quae loquuntur', and 'semper discentes et nuncam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes'.[57] George perhaps makes a similar inference, stating that: 'expavesco etiam, ne ipsius mihi dati nominis ratio exigatur', but it is the Pseudo-James that is the most vehement in his denunciation of heretical learning.[58] His dismissal of their interpretations is reinforced with accusations of invention, created through the most wonderful vocabulary of stories, fables, and fictions: *fabulas, nenias, figmenta, nugas, fabulas fingentes, hystoria, multa mendaciter fingunt deliramenta*; along with various verbs concerned with construction and invention: *fabulare, delirare, garrire, fingere, opinari, machinari, intexere* .[59] These words form a stock common to most of these texts, but the Pseudo-James seems to have the most fun with them.[60]

Catharism now looks in these texts as if it is being treated as a learned, intellectual heresy. These polemics do not criticize the fact of books and learning in their presentation of heresy, only the error of the interpretation contained within them. So, the previous approach that allowed the dismissal of heresy via the ignorance of its authors/followers now shifts to a presentation of a developed exegetical and textual tradition based on educated method and means, which accepts and engages with this tradition. The tension that this creates between the presence of a learned doctrine, based on the same foundation as Catholicism, and the fact that heresy must be condemned as false and foolish, is resolved in the shift of emphasis from a result of ignorance to an error of learning. The path to correct,

---

[55] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.1-2.
[56] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.cxci; cli.
[57] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.xcvi; cxii; also e.g.s pp.xl; xlix; lxxxi; cl.
[58] *Disputatio*, p.46.
[59] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, 'intexunt', p. cxv; e.g.s pp. xlv, xciii, xlvii, xciv, lii, cx, cxii, cxlvi, xcii.
[60] See similar list in Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.85. Where the word means some sort of 'story', it is also possible that this may be a reference to Cathar 'myths'.

that is Catholic, understanding, is careful attention to the text.[61] The diligent reader is invoked in both the *Liber suprastella* and the work of the Pseudo-James, as the antidote to heretical doctrine: 'cuius expositionem diligens lector falsitatis potest arguere'.[62] More than this, if we can accept that it is more likely that these authors were all responding in their own way to a common opponent than that all of them, from a trained theologian, to over-zealous layman, were simultaneously seized by a common compulsion to be the next Augustine, then we must also see learning as a received element in the polemical construction of heresy. That is to say, that heresy is presented as learned because that was the guise in which it was encountered, and that this encounter, whether written or oral, is as much a part of the source material as the anti-heretical tradition.

II

One characteristic of the polemical image of Catharism that must already be apparent to some degree is that the various errors presented always appear as a structured and established system of belief. It is described in terms that reflect such a system: Salvo calls the Cathars' beliefs a 'doctrine' many times, as does George, though it is of course a false doctrine.[63] Pseudo-James has 'dogma', rather, and George also uses this.[64] The presence of Cathar myth and history, although not overwhelming, also helps to create a picture of a developed system of belief.[65] The structured appearance of heretical error is present even at a most basic level; all the texts, with the exception of George who deals only with one group of Cathars, divide Catharism into a minimum of two parts, always on doctrinal grounds. That division is in part achieved through the structure of the texts themselves: Moneta devotes book one to the absolute dualists, book two to the mitigated, and three and

---

[61] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, e.g. p.141.ii.
[62] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.cxlv.
[63] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, many examples, e.g. pp. 62; 135: 'hec doctrina demonum est', etc. *Disputatio*, p.37: 'falsa sit doctrina vestra'.
[64] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, e.g. pp.lxxxii, xciii, clxiii, clxxxvii, ccx. *Disputatio*, p.13.
[65] Pseudo-James: the story of Lucifer ascending to heaven, Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.vii. Both he and Moneta also recount the unpleasant Eve story, see below, p.40, n.80. Moneta attempts to give some account of Cathar history, though brief, Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.411.

four to both, while the Pseudo-James begins in a similar way, though the division of the later parts is less strict. Although his text is not really organized around this, or indeed any other principle, Salvo nonetheless does describe the divisions between the groups, and in fact does so in more detail than the other texts here, of which more will be said later. The *Disputatio* only deals with the doctrine of one of the Italian Cathar churches, which can perhaps be identified as the beliefs held by the Bagnolenses, by means of Raniero Sacconi's detailed descriptions of the different groups.[66] Implicit beneath these texts is an underlying system that is coherent enough to contain differences built on a doctrinal basis.

Behind the doctrinal structure an organized group structure is also visible, though the development of this aspect is negligible in some texts, much greater in others. Of course, at a most basic level, all these texts present their subject material as a group, an identifiable body that can be given a name. All use the word 'sect' to describe the Cathars, and indeed all save George use the term 'Cathar' at least once.[67] It appears very sparingly in Moneta and the Pseudo-James, both of whom tend to rely more on the generic 'heretic'. Salvo uses the names of the individual Cathar churches alongside this term when naming his subject, and the author of the *Disputatio*, as mentioned, never calls them 'Cathars', but either 'Patarines', a northern Italian name, or, more usually, the rather old-fashioned 'Manichee'.

Beyond that general idea of a body of people, two of our texts also provide more detailed information on the internal workings of the Cathar church. The *Summa contra haereticos* includes an incongruous section that deals with the customs and lifestyle of the Cathars themselves, a section that the author acknowledges as a digression which departs from the otherwise doctrinal content of the work: 'facimus digressionem, nunc ad propositum redeamus'.[68] Here, the Pseudo-James presents his reader with a detailed account of the hierarchical structure of the Cathar churches. The hierarchy includes the different orders, sacraments and rituals and applies to all the different Cathar groups.[69] The

---

[66] Ilarino da Milano identifies them with this group, 'Fr. Gregorio, O.P., Vescovo di Fano, e la "Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum"', *Aevum*, XIV (1940), 85-140, p.114f.; and so do *Disputatio*, pp.xiv ff.; and Wakefield and Evans, p.289. (Raniero places this group at Mantua, Brescia, Bergamo, Romagna and a small number at Milan. This is not one of the largest Cathar groups, only about 200 in total, according to Sacconi's account, Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.50.)

[67] Pseudo-James has 'sect', Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.xcv; George has 'sect', *Disputatio*, p.3; Salvo also uses it occasionally, Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.284, 290, 333.

[68] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.cxxxix.

[69] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.cxxxvii-cxxxix.

information given by the Pseudo-James closely reflects the picture presented by Raniero Sacconi's text, which also presents a picture of Catharism as a highly structured and hierarchical organization, and gives details of their sacraments, orders, and the doctrine that lies behind each of these. Parts of the *Liber suprastella* again imply a similar structure, in casual references to the Cathars' followers, and more clearly in his description of the schism between the Albanenses and Concorrezenses.[70] Conversely, Moneta and George have almost nothing to say on this subject, and though Moneta does indicate that there are heretical sacraments in his prologue, this is really just to say that they are bad.[71] The two latter authors show their subject more fully as a structured belief, but less as structured church.

Different levels of detail in the presentation of Cathar church structure might in some part be accounted for by different levels of contact or familiarity. We noted above that Salvo, who presents one of the more complex pictures of Cathar organization, was a native of Piacenza, a town greatly troubled by heresy in this period, and that Salvo was perhaps closely connected to heretical circles on a personal level. It is also an issue of scope however; George deals only with one branch of the Cathar church, or rather, in the framework that he has set out, only one member of that particular branch, and division and structure are neither available nor relevant to his construct.

As may already be apparent, built into this depiction of a structured heresy is another, of heresy as inherently divided. According to accounts in the handbook of Anselm of Alessandria, and in the anonymous *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, that division was long-standing and had come about after the visit of the Bogomil papa Nicetas in the 1160s to the Cathar west. Subsequent to his visit, say the authors of these two texts, there were two schools of Cathar thought, the absolute dualists, who believed in two eternal creative principles, and the mitigated dualists, who held that there was only one eternal principle, but two creators. Most of the Cathars of southern France converted to the former variety after Nicetas' mission, but in Italy there remained deep divides between, and indeed within, the two groups.[72] Our texts, all products of the Lombardy region, all represent to some

---

[70] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.5-7.
[71] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.2.
[72] *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia* is ed. in Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie, I', pp.306-12; Anselm of Alessandria's text is ed. in Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie, II, III', pp.308-324. On Nicetas, see now B.

degree a similar picture of an internally divided Catharism. As we have seen, each of the texts, with the exception of the *Disputatio*, represents the Cathar church as split doctrinally into at least two halves. For the Pseudo-James, this is expressed not only through structure, albeit a less consistent structure than the *Summa adversus catharos et valdenses*, but also by an occasional awareness of the difference between the mitigated and absolute versions of this heresy – they think (x), though others think (y), and they all agree on (z): 'diverse inter eos sunt opiniones'.[73]

The *Liber suprastella* presents a greater complexity of division, in dealing with the different churches of the Albanenses, of Concorezzo, and of Bagnolo. Salvo, like his fellow Piacenzan Raniero describes the rivalry between the Albanenses and the Concorrezenses, not only a division between churches, but also an irreparable divide. For both Salvo and the Pseudo-James, who is similarly critical of the Cathars on account of the divisions amongst them, the internal divisions of the Cathar church also serve a polemical purpose, and are taken as proof of the Cathars' heretical status: 'ab invicem cum litigatione dissidentes ut per hoc manifeste heretici comprobentur', according to the Pseudo-James. Salvo draws the same conclusion after discussing the north Italian schism: 'in una quaque persona sunt divisiones magna. Unde manifestum est quod non sunt Ecclesia Dei, et hoc in Evangelio legitur: *Omne regnum in se ipsum divisum desolabitur*. Ergo manifestum est quod sunt ecclesie diaboli'.[74] As we will discuss at a later juncture, this is one of the criteria on which the Anonymous of Passau defines the true church, from which qualification the heretics are excluded on the basis of their divided nature.[75]

In contrast to this, there is a sense of the Catholic church as a unity, from which the heretics are also divided. If Salvo feels that the heretics are the church of the devil this is 'quia primo de Romana Ecclesia per baptismum fuerunt, nec hoc negare possunt'.[76] The Pseudo-James, perhaps significantly, puts heretics together with other groups external to the Catholic faith, Saracens and other 'hominum qui

---

Hamilton, 'Introduction', in Hugh Eteriano, *Contra Patarenos*, ed. B., J. and S. Hamilton (Leiden and Boston, 2004), pp. 73-98.

[73] These examples from Capelli, *Adversus haereticos* pp.xxvi-xxviii, but throughout, e.g. pp.xxxviii; l-li; xciii; xciv; cxiv; cl, etc.

[74] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos* p.cxii; Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.6, quotation from Lc.XI.17.

[75] Anonymous of Passau, p.263, and see below, p.170, n.141.

[76] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.6.xii-xiii.

dapnantur' (sic), and has them 'ab unitate catholicae fidei heretici aberrantes'.[77] The *Disputatio*'s Patarine does most of the work in this regard, building a picture of a unified Catholic body through references to 'your' Augustine or Gregory, and 'your' Pope, though George himself also talks of Catholic unity, and of the division of the heretics from it.[78] Heresy then, or rather in this instance Catharism, is divided, both amongst its own ranks, and from the Catholic church, but more prominently it is presented as a structured system of belief, and in some places also of behaviour and ritual, one that is available for comparison with the Catholic church. Though the complexity of the structure varies, it is always a structure defined by belief and doctrine.

III

The different aspects of the polemical construct examined so far all operate within a framework in which both heresy and the heretic are abstract entities. The actual Cathar heresy in these texts, the subject matter itself, is abstract in as much as it consists entirely of doctrine and belief, a conceptual error of understanding. More importantly, despite the historical detail of the different Cathar groups, and occasional appearance of some historical individual heretics such as Tetricus, or Andrew the medic, the majority of the 'heretics' that we find in these texts are rhetorical.

The 'rhetorical' heretic is most obvious in the *Disputatio*, which constructs a heretical opponent, clearly labelled *paterinus* in the rubric, to argue against the similarly abstracted Catholic; only in the *Disputatio* is the heretic also consistently given a first person voice.[79] The *Summa* of Moneta also contains with some regularity a label of *haereticus* to indicate heretical 'speech', where the error under discussion is first laid out, perhaps another indication of a direct quotation from a

---

[77] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.vi; cxii.
[78] *Disputatio*, pp.18.ix; 29; 45; 47; 63; 58.
[79] The version of the *Disputatio* contained in Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 14927 begins with clear rubrication for the two parties, but it is not maintained throughout the text, ff.14va-33va. The Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, MS Vat. Lat. 3978 copy though marks each point 'patarinus/manicheus' and 'catholicus' clearly throughout, and is very easy to navigate, ff.59^{rb}-71^{vb}.

textual source, and the authors of both the *Liber Suprastella* and the *Summa contra haereticos* both present heretical doctrine as spoken by some unspecified third person, whether singular or plural. In the same way, the Catholic responses and refutations of all these treatises are often addressed to the heretic, or heretics, in the second person, though we know that wider frames of the texts direct them to a Catholic audience. It is a hypothetical heretic, an abstract mouthpiece created to give voice to the doctrine. The clearest indication of this hypothetical status perhaps, is the use, by Moneta, Salvo and George, of the *forte dicent* formula, positing a possible heretical statement. Such a construction is necessary for Moneta's scholastic framework of a written debate, and George and Salvo for their reproduction of, or preparation for public, spoken debate.

All of which sounds rather dry: our heretics do not have a great deal of colour in these texts. Although their constructed characters can occasionally be livened up a little with some of the imagery that is traditionally attached to heretics in Catholic sources, and although our texts are no doubt thoroughly immersed in the anti-heretical tradition of their time, as a whole they employ the standard topoi of that tradition rather sparingly. Those commonplaces that receive the most coverage in these texts are probably the image of the serpent – who makes several rather unsavoury appearances – and the theme of false appearance.[80] A minor, but significant presence in our mid-thirteenth-century polemical construct of heresy, false appearance characterizes the heretical figures that do appear as inwardly evil, in direct opposition to their outer piety. The contrast between inner and outer conditions was of course already an established trope of anti-heretical writing, which centred on the association of heretics with the biblical figures of the false prophets of 2 Peter, and with the wolf in sheep's clothing.[81] For the most part in our texts, though the wolf image does make the occasional appearance, the depiction of heretics as cloaked, disguised figures is the more general form in which we find false appearance. The text that uses this topos the most is probably the *Summa contra hereticos*.

Traditionally, the Pseudo-James' work is seen as remarkable for its moderation. Wakefield points out that Moneta used the same parts of the preacher's

---

[80] See for example the story about Eve, the serpent's tail, the birth of Cain, and Eve's consequent discovery of the delights of the world. Moneta and the Pseudo-James Capelli both recount this gruesome tale, Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.111.ii; Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.xxviii.
[81] Mt. VII.15.

manual that the author of this work did, but without attaching the same moderating pleas. However, the impression of moderation relies on only a few passages in the text. The tone of the work as a whole is hardly in keeping with this reading, and even taken in isolation, these passages seem less concerned with restoring the Cathars' injured reputation than a first glance might suggest. Though the author admits, and even insists on the austerity of Cathar life, he then uses this to identify them as the false apostles that Paul describes in Corinthians. As such, they are also those that 'emulationem dei habent sed non secundum scientiam dei', and so lead others astray, both by their teachings, and by 'maliciam malosque clericorum mores exaggerantes'. Using their asceticism to prove their error, rather than simply denying it, the author is able to more firmly and authoritatively reject their claims.[82] Similarly, though they are chaste, this is only a physical chastity: 'spiritualiter fornicentur et verbum dei adulterent, tantum castissimi quidem sunt corpore'. The author rejects the rumours of fornication because it is the persecution that they have endured on that account that allows the Cathars to claim apostolic status, while at the same time he rejects the basis on which the Cathars observe this chastity: 'supersticiosa siquidem, et falsa religione...ad continentiae votum astringuntur'.[83] If he accepts the external truth of the Cathars' piety, he can dismiss it on doctrinal grounds, while demonstrating their lack of true understanding, and reinforcing the superficiality of their piety.

So, inwardly evil, diabolical creatures, they nonetheless create concern with their ability to appear pious and holy. George too, sees the Cathars as duplicitous, though his Patarine seems to hold the very same opinion of the Catholic church.[84] False appearance is less prominent in most of these texts than perhaps it might be, however, because it is concerned with behaviour and actions and with the heretics themselves, a subject that these texts treat only fleetingly. Where it features it is usually linked to the learning of heretics presented here, and is to do with their leading astray of the simple-minded. Moneta warns that what seems like natural or logical reason is really sophistry.[85] The Pseudo-James, as we might expect, probably has the most to say on this subject, calling the Cathars pseudo-preachers,

---

[82] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.cxxxix.
[83] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp. clvii-clviii; see also pp.clxxi, xlv, l.
[84] *Disputatio*: pp.14.x; 56.ii.
[85] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.23.i; *Disputatio*, pp.13.iv; 58.ix; 70.vii.

and characterizing them as deceptive.[86] Only Salvo is able to offer something more optimistic: even the stupidest people can see how heretical the heretics are.[87] Perhaps, as with the issue of learning, this is both an attempt to reconcile what the heretics appear to be with what they should be according to anti-heretical tradition, and also has some root in competition between Cathars and the Catholic clergy for the appearance of holiness and zeal. We will look at the place of these rhetorical topoi in greater detail in chapter five.

IV

The construct of heresy that emerges from these polemical sources is then, in overview, above all of heresy as a learned thing, a series of doctrinal articles and a structured and coherent body of thought, conceived in and expressed through an intellectual or educated mode. Hardly less prominent, though perhaps more implicit, heresy is in these texts a structured, systematic entity, both in its belief, and in its organization, though this is to some degree offset by a sense of division and internal rivalry. The system itself is often located in an abstracted representation of a heretic, but that figure is rarely anything more than a rhetorical device. An interesting question arises however, in part from this balance between figure and system, as to the intended arena for these texts, and this one of the questions that will be explored in the next chapter.

---

[86] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*: p.xviii, pseudo-preachers, p.xciii, deception p.civ; also pp.cxv, cxxi, cxxxix, clxxxvi.
[87] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.349.xxv: 'bene potest videri et etiam ab ydiotis quod estis pessimi erretici'.

Chapter 2 – Texts for Edification

per hoc a peccatis recederent et bonum appeterent [1]

The texts that we have looked at so far have approached heresy from a combative angle, yet it is also a standard rhetorical trope, even in those polemical texts, and certainly in much of the legal material, to couple the coercive repression of heresy with a positive movement to reinforce the Catholic message through word and example. The purpose of this chapter will be to examine the ways in which heresy is represented in this context, in texts whose aim is the edification or improvement of their ultimate audiences rather than attack, and where heresy is not necessarily always the principal focus of the text. For this reason, we will begin with the material that is aimed narrowly at heresy in particular, and then move to texts with a more general edifying purpose.

We will concentrate on three main groups of texts, the first of which will comprise those texts known as *summae auctoritatum*, lists of authorities on given subjects, compiled for the use of preachers, and directed specifically against heretics. The second two groups are made up of the general material, the first of which will be the collections of *exempla* that were coming into use in the mid-thirteenth century, also as a tool for preachers, to be used alongside the more traditional proofs of Scripture and reason in the construction of sermons.[2] These collections will be considered in turn, individually, using the text of Stephen of Bourbon as a primary example. Lastly, we will look at some Dominican texts, written by members of the order for the benefit of their brethren. There is not space here to consider sermons in any great detail, though we can to some degree consider the collections of *exempla*, which came to play such an important role in the

---

[1] *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus*, Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, p.3.
[2] J. Berlioz, '*Exemplum* et histoire: Césaire de Heisterbach (v.1180-v.1240) et la croisade albigeoise', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 147 (1989), 49-86.

construction of sermons, as representative. Brief descriptions of each text will, again, be given within the relevant section.

I – *Summae auctoritatum*

In the struggle against heresy, one of the tools the preachers had at their disposal was the *summa auctoritatum*, essentially a collection of Biblical materials and references that could be used to prove or disprove different points of doctrine, under which headings they were organized. The main examples from our period that will form the basis of this section, all mendicant productions, from northern Spain, southern France and northern Italy, have been edited by Douais:

Summae I, II, III [3]

A '*summa*' in several pieces, Douais' first text is in the end folios of an Aragonese pocket Bible, probably Franciscan, measuring 193 by 133 millimetres, while the second two are in the first folios of an even smaller French manuscript Bible, which measures only 170 by 120.[4] Their inclusion in these manuscripts places them squarely among the 'small, portable "vade-mecum" books ... produced in great numbers to meet the needs of the itinerant preaching friars'.[5] Because the last three chapters of number I overlap with the first three of number II, Douais regarded these two as representing two fragments of the same text; number III he saw as a complementary text. Wakefield's discovery of a manuscript in Leipzig containing the entire text of I and II, followed by III, would seem to confirm this. We will therefore consider these three texts in conjunction with each other, as Wakefield does, as two complementary texts, the *Summa contra haereticos et manichaeos*, made up of Douais I and II, and the *Summa auctoritatum de sacramentis ecclesiae*,

---

[3] *La Somme des autorités, à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1896); edn. of texts pp.34-66, hereafter referred to as 'Douais I, II, III'. (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 174, f.181^v; Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 13152, ff.1, 2 and ff.2, 3.). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.72-73

[4] Douais, *La Somme*, pp.7-10; Manselli, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale', p.335f, see below n.22 for full reference. Dimensions: Douais, *La Somme*, p.7.

[5] D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985), p. 57.

represented by Douais III.[6] Wakefield dates these texts to the early to the mid-thirteenth century, around 1225-1250.

Summa IV [7]

An anti-heretical *summa* in a Dominican manuscript of the second half of the thirteenth century. Douais describes the manuscript as southern French, and suggests that, as its provenance places it in the Dominican convent at Toulouse, it was probably made there too. The manuscript also contains other Dominican theological works. The text itself Douais dates to the same period, on the grounds that the tone of the work recalls this period of the fight against heresy.[8]

Brevis summula contra herrores notatos hereticorum [9]

Another *summa* from the second half of the thirteenth century in an Italian hand, again contained in a pocket Bible, whose calendar suggests a Franciscan origin. Douais suggests that the other contents of this manuscript, together with the *summula*, show the book to be aimed specifically at preaching against heresy.[10] This *summa*, originally thought to be of great significance to the study of Catharism, has since been shown to be less important, due to its composite nature. In his examination of the *De heresi catharorum,* while pointing out that both Douais and the text's other editor, Molinier, had never questioned the unity of the *summula*, Dondaine showed that in fact part three of the *summula* according to Douais' divisions reproduces a later, inferior version of the *De heresi catharorum*. Dondaine instead divided the text into six parts: a prologue, added later by a later owner; general Cathar doctrines; doctrines specific to the three main Italian churches (this section represents the insertion of the inferior text of the earlier

---

[6] Leipzig University Library, MS 894, I and II ff.74^{v} –77^{v}, III ff.77^{v} – 79^{r}; Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.299-300. See also Wakefield and Evans, p.297. (According to the BnF catalogue entry, in what it calls a 'note humoristique de xvie siècle', Lat. 174 is signed 'Pantagruel'.)

[7] Douais, *La Somme*, pp.67-113, hereafter referred to as 'Douais IV'. (Bibl. Toulouse, MS 379 ff.76^{b} - 82^{b}.). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.70-71.

[8] Douais, *La Somme*, pp.28-30. Manselli contends that parts of this work refer to Italian churches of Bagnolo and Concorezzo, Manselli, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale', p.335f. See also below, n.22.

[9] Douais, *La Somme*, pp.114-143, hereafter referred to as '*Brevis summula*'. (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 13151, ff.347^{c} - 350^{b}.). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.67-68.

[10] Douais, *La Somme*, p.25. Dondaine did not believe that the compiler had put together these pieces with any intention of creating something coherent, but merely for his own use. He pointed to the lack of any title or prologue original to the compilation; the added prologue, written into the margins and containing a polemic tone entirely absent from the rest of the work, he saw as a later attempt to join the pieces into a whole; Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie, I', pp.295-96.

Lombard text); doctrines of the Albanenses, here misnamed Albigensians; a catalogue of the errors of the three Italian churches; a refutation of these errors.[11] Dondaine believed that the second, third and fourth parts of this text were so different in tone that they could not have been written by the same author. Wakefield and Evans agree with this assessment, but they add that the fourth part does share common characteristics with the catalogue and the refutation, and that the last three elements represent the work of one author. Further, Wakefield points to the similarity between the second part, and part of Moneta's text, positing either a common source, or even an adaptation of Moneta himself.[12] Though the date of this work is problematic, the last part, the refutation, still provides a contemporary analogue to our other texts, and the context in which the compiler chose to place this refutation, that is, the other materials that he considered useful, remains valuable.

The first three of Douais' *Summae*, which we are treating together, contain little quotation and no exposition (except in one instance, to which we will return later), and are really no more than lists of Scriptural references, arranged under a heading that describes their purpose, for example, 'primo capitulo probatur quod patris, et filii et spiritus sancti sit una substantia et unus deus'.[13] The reason for their brevity becomes clear when we recall that these texts are copied into the end leaves of small, vade-mecum Bibles. Their function as portable tools of reference on these topics clearly demands their list form, though this form also means, as Douais observes, that it is not clear which part of the reference was supposed to carry the force of refutation, or indeed what interpretation the preacher would have placed upon it.[14] What is clear, however, is that it is possible to see articles of heretical faith reflected in the statements of Catholic doctrine that form the chapter titles.

While the first chapter of Douais I, the longest of the text, is concerned to prove the triune nature of God, the following three chapters address God's creative role in a manner that is unmistakeably a response to the Cathar doctrines of creation

---

[11] Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie, I', pp.294-302.
[12] Wakefield and Evans, p.351; Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.306-307. Dondaine also highlights a relationship with Moneta, as well as a connection to the *Liber Suprastella*, Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie, I', pp.297-90.
[13] Douais, *La Somme*, I, p.34.
[14] Douais, *La Somme,* p.18.

that we know from other texts: God is creator of all that is visible and invisible; He is not only creator, but also the maker; God fashioned the [nature] of Adam, Eve and all bodies, an action described here with the very physical verb 'plasmare'.[15] The subsequent chapters of Douais I and Douais II show similar concerns about aspects of faith challenged by Cathar doctrine. These remaining chapters address first the legitimacy of those Old Testament figures traditionally rejected by the Cathars, along with much of the Old Testament itself, as agents of the Evil principle, before moving on to the defence of New Testament figures and of Christ's humanity. The description in some of these chapter headings of the God who spoke to Abraham and whom Abel and Enoch pleased as 'bonus Deus' is telling.[16]

Similarly, a brief look at the chapter headings that constitute the section on the New Testament shows clearly the heretical belief underlying these statements of Catholic doctrine. To give a few examples: chapters nineteen and twenty, 'quod Deus novas animas infundit novis corporibus', and 'quod anima est in corpore, non angelus', together with twenty-three, 'quod spiritus angelici remanserunt in celo post lapsum Luciferi', make a fairly comprehensive treatment of the Cathar idea of the soul as a fallen angel trapped in a human body by Lucifer.[17] Chapters twenty-five and twenty-six address the contention made by some Cathars that Mary was not a physical being, stating not only 'quod beatissima Maria fuit mulier', but also 'quod beata Maria habuit patrem et matrem'.[18] The chapters on the nature of Christ insist very strongly on his physical existence, which was also denied by Cathar doctrine, a denial that prompts, in the course of the chapter on Christ's assumption of flesh from the Virgin, the only substantial piece of prose in this *summa*: a vitriolic attack against 'insane et furiosum caput hereticorum', which roundly dismisses the idea that Christ had only a 'fantasticum corpus'. A significant point

---

[15] Douais, *La Somme*, I, pp.36-37: '2: Probatur quod Deus qui est trinus personis et unus in essentia est creator omnium visibilum et invisibilum; 3: probatur quod Deus omnipotens non solum est creator set ethiam (sic) factor; 4: probatur quod omnipotens Deus Ade et Eve et aliorum corporum natura[m] plasmavit'.

[16] Douais, *La Somme*, I, caps v-viii, pp.37-38; there are also *boni angeli*, cap.ix, p.39.

[17] Douais, *La Somme*, II, pp.45-47. It also shows a familiarity with some of the more secret parts of Cathar mythology, and their text, the *Interrogatio iohannis*, or secret supper. Wakefield and Evans place the interrogatio's first arrival in Europe in 1190. Raniero Sacconi says Nazarius learned the error of the Virgin Mary's angelic body from a Cathar bishop and elder son in Bulgaria; Anselm of Alessandria, writing in 1266-76, tells us Nazarius has a book called 'The Secret', and says something similar, that contrary to Nazarius, Desiderius believes that Mary had a real body, Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.58; Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, p.311; Wakefield and Evans, pp.344; 362.

[18] Douais, *La Somme*, II, p.48.

here is that this attack is reproduced in the anti-heretical treatise by the Pseudo-James Capelli.[19] Finally, it is enough to note that Douais III and IV are constructed along the same lines as the first two; while the focus of Douais III is exclusively on the sacraments of the Catholic church, chapter titles such as 'quod baptismus prodest sine manum impositione', and 'quod in matrimonio carnali homines salva[n]tur', clearly show the Cathar challenge underlying these statements of faith.[20] Douais IV is by far the fullest of Douais's texts, and will be examined in more detail shortly, but it too is built on the same framework.

The outline given above would seem to be a generic pattern typical to texts of this sort, and not simply to these related examples: two summae of similar form can be found in MS Lat.14927 of the Bibliothèque nationale. As Wakefield tells us, the differences in the section titles, and in the references used, show these to be of a different family to Douais' *Summae*, but they nonetheless display the same structures and concerns in their composition.[21] The first, which is more skeletal even than Douais I, gives only the Biblical book and chapter reference under each heading, with no indication at all of the exact text to be used, but it is still noticeable that all the references are to the New Testament, and that the headings present, in the same way as Douais' texts, positive statements of Catholic articles that are nonetheless dependent on the refutation of heretical articles. The second of the two texts, fuller than the first but still no more than a list, works in exactly the same way. The same pattern is visible again in an earlier example of this genre, edited by Šanjek. Here, heretical propositions are sometimes used as the starting point against which the rest of the section argues, 'auctoritates contra manicheos qui vetus testamentum restituunt [et] respuunt', for example.[22] Though they are rarely made any fuller than this, they do point more clearly to an underlying system of

---

[19] Douais, *La Somme*, II, pp.49-51.
[20] Douais, *La Somme*, III, pp.59; 61.
[21] BnF MS lat14927, ff.2^{ra}-3^{rc}; ff.3^{rc}-7^{rb}. Wakefield, 'Notes', p.301, n.66.
[22] 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale (MS 47 della Bibliothèque municipale di Albi). Memoria di Raoul Manselli', in *Atti della Accademie Nazionale dei Lincei. 1: Classe di Scienze Morale Storiche e Filologiche*, Fasc.6 (1985) 324-397. Text of *Summa* in Appendix, ed. F. Šanjek, pp.355-395; this '*summa*' is really a collection of fragments, inserted between the other texts in the manuscript – two biblical texts, the Song of Songs and the Acts of the Apostles, and several patristic commentaries – which nonetheless seem to constitute something approaching a coherent body of work against heresy, specifically that of the Cathars. According to Manselli, there are some connections between this work and that of the convert Bonacursus, p.335f. The text is anonymous, but Šanjek believes the *summa* to be in a late twelfth-, possibly early thirteenth-century hand, either from Catalonia or Languedoc, p.358.

thought.[23] Like the Douais texts however, the earlier *Summa auctoritatum* usually responds to a heretical point by reinforcing the Catholic position: with no apparent direct reference to heresy, part seven of this text nevertheless appears to be a Catholic interpretation of the sources that the Cathars are normally shown to use as proof of an evil principle.[24]

There is one of our *Summae* which differs in some respects from the general pattern established above, though in its form it remains very similar. The last section of the *Brevis summula*, the fourth in Douais' edition, the sixth by Dondaine's reckoning, although it is a fuller text with greater amounts of exposition, is very like the texts just discussed in its character, that is, it is a collection of authorities organized in chapters dealing with different points of belief. Where it departs from our other examples though is in its arrangement of the points of Catholic doctrine. These are presented as explicit contradictions of the Cathar doctrines that are outlined in the other sections of the collection, by a framework of chapter headings that begin *contra primum*, *contra secundum*, and so on. The first chapter is even formulated as 'contra primum: dicunt heretici quod sint duo dii et duo principia', where the other texts would begin with a statement such as 'there is only one God'. The underlying presence of error is much more fore-grounded here than in the other texts, and appears not just as a series of points, but as something approaching a coherent and established doctrine.

More significant is the free use of Old Testament authorities by the refutation section of the *Brevis summula*, where the other texts restrict themselves mostly or entirely to the New Testament, a fact that is surely attributable to its Italian origin. We know from Raniero's account that some of the Italian Cathar churches accepted parts of the Old Testament, and the texts that accompany the *Summula* similarly make it clear that the Italian Cathars' rejection of the Old Testament was not total. That John of Lugio, whose teaching accepted the Old Testament in its entirety, is mentioned here as a source, cannot be coincidental.[25] The use of the Old Testament by the *Summula* at the same time serves to highlight further the almost complete absence of this material from the French sources.

---

[23] Šanjek, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale', pp.365, 375; also 393.
[24] Šanjek, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale', pp.359, 360.
[25] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, pp.51-53; *Brevis summula*, pp.116; 121. The identification of this heretic as the John of Lugio that Raniero describes is not entirely secure, see Wakefield and Evans, p.748, n.3.

Despite the concern demonstrated by Douais I and II, Douais IV, and the two summae of BnF MS lat14927 to prove the legitimacy of the Old Testament as a source of authority, their defence rests almost exclusively on New Testament authorities.[26] As noted above, the contents of all the chapters, even those consisting solely of references, derive almost in their entirety from the New Testament. Where Old Testament authorities are used, and this is rare, they appear always at the end of the list of authorities, with the exception of chapter twenty-eight of Douais II, the chapter with the prose entry.[27]

Given the nature and structure of these *Summae*, it is perhaps to be expected that the picture of heresy that emerges from reading them is one consisting almost entirely of points of doctrine or belief. In their expression and structure these articles are presented as positive Catholic statements of faith. The titles of these texts are nonetheless directed 'against heretics' and even were they not, it is easy to retrieve the underlying construct of heresy on which the Catholic statements rest. Broadly, that construct is one which consists of a series of points, here given a Catholic unity by the framework in which they are set, which is based around the structure of Creation, Old Testament, New Testament, Resurrection, and Catholic sacraments. This is not so much heresy itself, but heresy as it impacts on Catholic doctrine. The predominance of New Testament material perhaps reflects a concern that the arguments remain acceptable to Cathar opponents, and perhaps suggests an intended arena for the use of these texts that makes their purpose more ambiguous than it would seem at first glance.

Douais saw these texts as intended in part for the instruction of the faithful; though informed by heretical opinions, they were essentially a reduced version of the Catholic faith for proper instruction, a catechism in order to avoid contamination. At the same time, he described the *Summae* as collections of witnesses used by preachers against heretics, alongside the Bible, which had the same virtue for attack

---

[26] It may show, as Iogna-Prat demonstrates for Peter the Venerable in the Cluniac tradition (and Vicaire for Lugio in the Cathar), a desire to expand the base of reference for debate. Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, p.141; M.-H. Vicaire, 'Les Cathares albigeois vus par les polémistes', *CF*, 3 (1968), 107-28. The first part of the *Quaedam obiectiones hereticorum et responsiones Christianorum*, Doat 36 f.91^{v}ff., is concerned entirely with the defence of the Old Testament.

[27] Douais, *La Somme*, end of chapters: I,II: i p.36, iiii p.37, vi p.38, xvi p.44, xix p.45; III: xvi (penultimate) p.62, xxii pp.64-65; chapter II, xxviii p.49.

as for defence.[28] These texts could be seen in either light. The refutation of heresy in the *Brevis summula* simultaneously provides a defence of Catholicism.[29] Certainly the author of the prologue saw the text as being aimed at the reinforcement of the faithful, the protection of the vineyard from the foxes; the prologue emphasizes that those outside the faith are lost, and that people must therefore be prevented from being led away by heretics, a concern which would seem to point to a defence of the flock, rather than an attack of those outside it. Douais IV presents the truth of Catholic doctrine as excluding any different belief; 'patet rationibus manifestis quod fides est fundamentum virtutum, et primum bonum, et principium; et quod in ea non debet esse divisio'.[30]

However, though their statements of Catholic doctrine would appear to lend themselves to preaching to the faithful, the *Summae auctoritatum* in several places seem to provide material more for debate than for sermonizing, and to raise questions about the nature of the context in which these texts addressed Catharism. The titles and incipits of each text after all direct themselves 'against heretics', rather than heresy. The prologue added to the *Brevis summula* also proposes the defeat of heresy by the example of good works, speech and authorities. Perhaps more interestingly, the author of the refutation part of this collection urges that Scriptural supports be demanded from heretics, if they present their argument without: 'si herethicus dicit contrarium, dices ei quod ostendat tibi per Scripturam divinam. Si dicat quod non potest, dicas quod stulte deviat a fide, cum nesciat quare'.[31]

It is worth pausing briefly at this point, to remind ourselves of the context that is suggested by chronicle and inquisition texts. Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's history presents a picture of Languedoc before the crusade, where preaching and debate and the exchange of lists of *auctoritates* and *rationes* between the opposing parties, are common. In Peter's account, the participants vary from Catholic preachers to Cathars and Waldensians and also include lay observers of either

---

[28] Douais, *La Somme*, pp.14-15; 22; 9.
[29] *Brevis summula*, p.133f.
[30] Douais, *La Somme*, IV, p.113. The same pattern appears also in the *Summa auctoritatum*, which responds to a heretical point by reinforcing the Catholic position, Šanjek, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale', pp.359, 360. An assertion that the Catholic interpretation of Scripture is the true one, necessarily excluding any other interpretation, heretical or not, is something that we see happening in polemical texts as well, and is also employed by Aquinas in the *Summa Contra Gentiles*.
[31] *Brevis summula*, pp.115; 138. Douais, *La Somme*, IV, pp.71, 76, 77, 82, 92, 95, 96.

Catholic or heretical sympathies.[32] In our period, that picture to some extent remains valid, but while heretics are often seen to debate with each other – whether Cathars with Waldensians, or different factions of either with each other – more pertinent to our discussion are those occasions on which the heretics are in dispute with Catholics, particularly the friars. Mendicant hagiography provides one obvious example. St. Dominic can be seen with some frequency to enter into debate with heretics, and though in St. Dominic's case, the accounts refer to an earlier period, later anti-heretical saints such as Peter Martyr, and Anthony of Padua can likewise be seen disputing publicly with the heretics.[33] The picture presented by these sources is reflected in the inquisition records; the penances of Peter Cellan, in particular, present many occasions where deponents report having witnessed a *disputatio,* or heard that someone *disputavit* about points of faith. One layman 'disputavit cum Fratribus Minoribus utrum homo deberet occidere', on the basis of what he had learned from the Waldensians. Another describes accommodating three *hereticos* for a day and a night, during which time 'fuit disputatio inter ipsos et sacerdotem loci quasi per totum diem'.[34] One of the more extended examples of debate with the mendicants can be found in the depositions of the *credens* Pierre Garcias, which are examined in more detail in chapter four, below.[35]

The debate of points of belief and doctrine is then a fully plausible context for the authors and users of our *Summae auctoritatum*, whether it is with undecided laity, or with the heretics themselves. However, the first three of Douais' texts give little away as to their purpose, though there is, as noted, one section of prose in the otherwise spare text of Douais II within which we can find a suggestion, nothing more, of the text's use. The author asks, in a manner also typical of the anti-heretical polemics, 'si [heretical proposition] ut mentiuntur, dicant quem [opposing

---

[32] Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, *Hystoria albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon (3 vols., Paris, 1926-39), pp.47-49.
[33] For examples of St. Dominic and Peter Martyr in debate see this chapter, below, p.88; *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae quarum altera huosque inedita*, ed. Leon de Kerval (Paris, 1904), pp.220-21.
[34] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, pp.96, 222. See also for example pp.64, 68, 78, 102, 112, 132, 160, 174, 182, 184. A nice example can be found in the penance of one Bernard Raimond, who, having heard the Waldensians preach, decides to visit the Cathars, 'volens temptare qui essent milieres (sic)', and see below, p.156, n.92. After spending time with the Cathars, 'disputavit cum quodam de fide hereticorum et Valdensium, et approbavit fidem hereticorum', p.146.
[35] See below, pp.151-52.

proofs]'. After this string of proofs is finished, is the line: 'set respondeant iterum nunc subversores veritatis', and more proofs are supplied.[36]

The lean lists of authorities presented by these *Summae* cannot ultimately tell us to what end they were intended, but the *Summa contra haereticos et manichaeos*, and the *Summa auctoritatum de sacramentis ecclesiae*, that is, Douais I and II, and Douais III, belong to a family of texts that has some plumper relatives, namely Douais IV, and the second half of the *Quaedam obiectiones hereticorum et responsiones Christianorum*, the text located in the Doat collection that we also looked at briefly in the previous chapter. Wakefield has demonstrated that three chapters of the fourth text in Douais' collection bear a marked resemblance to chapters in Douais II, one of which is nearly identical, a resemblance that he feels must indicate a direct relationship of some kind.[37] He further observes that the second part of the *Quaedam obiectiones* is in fact a fuller version of Douais IV, though the chapters, and in places the sequence of authorities, are not always the same.[38] Whether or not the *Quaedam obiectiones* ought to be seen as two separate texts as Wakefield suggests, the version of Douais IV that is represented by its second part can at least be used without difficulty as a comparison, and as members of the same family as our more instrumental *Summae*, both it and Douais IV can be seen to represent a version of what these might have ultimately looked like once expanded and employed by a preacher.[39] We can therefore look to these two for a more precise idea of the function of the group as a whole.

The fourth of Douais' *Summae* is similar in style and structure to the first three: it too is a collection of Scriptural authorities, arranged under headings which describe the argument that they can be used to prove. The chapters of this fourth *Summa* follow a sequence very like the first three, presenting expositions of Catholic doctrine as challenged by the implications of Cathar ideas, in a structure

---

[36] Douais, *La Somme*, II, p.49-51.
[37] Wakefield observes that other texts of this sort, which cover the same areas, use different authorities, and feels that this overlap in content and order must indicate dependence; Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.300-301.
[38] Wakefield, 'Notes', p.300, n.65 and pp.307-308. The full text can be found on ff. 91^{v}-203^{r}; Wakefield identifies 129^{r}, line 6 as the starting point of that text corresponding to Douais, *La Somme*, IV. Parts of this have been edited by I.von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (2 vols., Munich 1890), vol.2, pp.375-76. See above cap.1, p.25, n.30
[39] Douais implies that these short, condensed works acted as complements to longer more detailed informative works, though doesn't say this explicitly, *La Somme*, p.13.

built around Catholic principles.[40] This *summa* appears not in a portable book, but in a manuscript containing general theological works, and is perhaps less intended for use in the field. Though still in essence a list of authorities, these are presented not as a series of citations, but as part of an exposition; the references are usually quoted in full, and here, the interpretation or argument that derives from them, which, as Douais pointed out, is missing from the first three texts, is often given as well, for example: 'Mt.VI [26]: "Respicite volatilia celi quoniam non serunt, neque metunt, neque congregant in orrea, et Pater vester celestis pascit illa." Ergo creature sunt opera eius'.[41]

The written text of Douais IV is of course intended for a Catholic audience: 'nota tu, catholice, quod hoc dicunt heretici'. The author of this text nevertheless frequently employs direct address towards the heretics: 'si velles dicere, heretice'; 'o heretice nequam'; 'nec potes dare', though in the same chapter, 'secundum opinionem hereticorum'.[42] The refutation section of the *Brevis summula* also occasionally uses a vocative/imperative to address his heretical 'opponent'.[43] However, while there is no consistency between the use of the second and third person, and while, to a large extent, these heretics must of course be rhetorical, there are other indications of a more active function. There is, for example, a great deal of the type of debate rhetoric similar to that found in the polemics, such as words and phrases that mean 'clearly' placed after expositions.[44] More suggestions of exchange can be seen at the very end of chapter sixteen, after the last Biblical citation: 'hec respondeat hereticus, quia si vere non est passus nec vere resurrexit', and again, after a quotation in chapter twenty-three: 'si autem dicat hereticus quod...'.[45] Significantly, the *explicit* to Douais IV indeed advocates debate with heretics as a means of defending the faith: 'et quod de ipsa omnibus querentibus

---

[40] One chapter of the sacramental section is suggestively concerned to prove 'quod homo non sit adorandus', Douais, *La Somme*, IV, cap.xxx, p.106.
[41] Douais, *La Somme*, IV, cap.i, p.67.
[42] Douais, *La Somme*, IV, cap.ix, p.77; cap.vii, p.75; cap.xvi, p.85.
[43] The earlier *Summa auctoritatum* edited by Šanjek, addresses heretics frequently in the second person, but just as often in the third, while the work as a whole is clearly addressed to an orthodox audience. *Brevis summula*, e.g. pp.359, 361, 371 (many); e.g. pp.360, 365, 380, 383 (again, many).
[44] *Brevis summula*, pp.142, 139, 141. There is a similar echo of debate rhetoric in the *Brevis summula,* phrases such as 'si forte dicat hereticus', 'si dicit spiritualiter', and 'si dicis, heretice'; also in the earlier *summa,* edited by Šanjek, 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale': 'forte dicis', p.393.
[45] Douais, *La Somme*, IV, cap.xvi, p.87; cap.xxiii, p.99.

respondendum est, et quod de ipsa prius est disputandum. Que est prima et maxima cum hereticis altercatio'.[46]

If Douais IV's extended version of the lists of authorities suggests that we understand these texts as tools for attack, perhaps an even stronger suggestion is to be found in the Doat analogue. Here we find not only all the same echoes of dispute as contained in Douais IV, including the *explicit* urging confrontation, but the even fuller exposition of the authorities presented by this version also provides a further suggestion that this text was to function in a context not only of debate, but of active debate. The chapter that argues the point 'quod iuramentum possit aliquando fieri sine peccato', after presenting and expounding its authorities, then bids the reader 'nota in hoc articulo quatuor modis procedit contra haereticum'. There then follows an explanation of the four stages in which this particular argument can be constructed, including questions that can be used to prove the heretic wrong. To give the first of these stages as an example: 'primo ut quaerens ab haeretico si iuramentum est peccatum ita quod nulle casu possit benefieri qui respondebit quod sic, cui Catholicus respondebit fornicatio est tale peccatum sed Deus non potuit benefieri'.[47] This would seem to indicate very strongly that the purpose of the lists of authorities given by this text and its relatives was, at least in part, to be used in the dispute with heretics that the explicit indeed advocates.

At this point, the several textual connections that Wakefield outlines between the *Summae auctoritatum* and the major polemical treatises of the period, which have been mentioned briefly already, appear significant. The author of the Pseudo-James Capelli used *summae auctoritatum* of the family to which the first four Douais texts belong in the construction of several of his chapters on Catholic doctrine. One example, noted above, is the one prose section of Douais II, which also appears in Pseudo-James' text. Less dependent connections can also be seen between Moneta of Cremona's treatise, and some of the *Summae auctoritatum*, where Moneta seems to share some source material with both the *Quaedam obiectiones* and the *Brevis summula*.[48] The textual connections between these *Summae* and the polemics are reflected also in their style, which, as we noted earlier, is in places very similar.

---

[46] Douais, *La Somme*, IV, pp.70, 73, 87, 99-100, 101; explicit p.113, (though chapter 38 exhorts faithful to avoid excommunicates p.110).
[47] Doat 36, ff.181^{r}-181^{v}.
[48] Wakefield, 'Notes', pp.301-304; pp.306-308.

Another connection can perhaps be seen in the case of the *Quaedam obiectiones*. Though Wakefield sees this as two texts in one, there is no indication whatsoever from the Doat scribes that this text should be considered as something other than one whole; there is only one set of the usual introductory and concluding notes that give information about the source, and they bracket the whole of this text. Obviously, if the two parts can be seen as a whole then the implications for the connection between the polemics and the *Summae* are significant, but even if this is not the case, then the fact that they are presented by the Doat volume as a coherent whole contained in one manuscript would suggest that they were closely associated in the original. A more concrete example of such an association is the manuscript that contains the two short *summae*, mentioned above as analogues to the first three of Douais' texts, BnF MS lat14927. The two *Summae auctoritatum* are followed by an extract from the *De hereticis*, after which there appears what Hoécker calls a fragmentary Italian treatise against the Cathars, here called Patarines. This brief text takes the form of a dialogue on Eucharistic doctrine between a Catholic and a heretic, which resembles very much the texture of the *Disputatio*, a copy of which it in fact precedes. In such juxtaposition with texts framed as disputes, and a text of a polemical purpose, suggestions of debate in the brief lists of our *Summae auctoritatum* are perhaps reinforced.[49]

In general, and especially in what we can perhaps regard as the expanded format of the fuller texts, the *Summae auctoritatum* in fact have more in common with polemic than with homily. If, in that context, we now turn to look at the construction of heresy itself in these *Summae*, what emerges is a picture that resembles that presented by the polemics very closely. Although the discussion of each article is of course less developed, the language not as rich or rhetorical, nonetheless the basic principle remains very similar: heresy here is a doctrinal thing, and where it is more visible, it constitutes a developed theological system, and indeed little else. In the case of the Italian *Brevis summula*, that system includes a complex division of doctrine among different Cathar groups, a significant feature that we will return to in a later chapter. Again, as in the polemics, we can see the heresy of the *Summae auctoritatum* as learned, both in terms of its expression through Scripturally based argument, and in terms of the Catholic reaction to it,

[49] BnF MS Lat14927 ff.8^{vb}-10ra.

which sees it as something to be engaged with through exegesis and re-interpretation, addressing the error in an academic mode. Indeed, if we can read the *Summae auctoritatum* at least in part as tools for debate, then this engagement is a very direct one, and there is perhaps a level of contrast with the polemics here in that heresy appears as a learned thing, but expressed through an oral and public medium. Though the heretical ideas here are no doubt derived from a written source, as indeed can be proved in some cases, verbal exchange, and not the book, is built into the picture here as source and medium.

It would seem that the use of 'heretic' in the *Summae* is also very similar to that found in the polemics. While it is clear enough from the nature of errors refuted within them that all of these texts are directed against the Cathar heresy, these latter are mentioned by name only rarely, and *heretici* remains the most common term used throughout all of these texts. The first three of Douais' *Summae* name their subjects only in their incipits and explicits, and here they are called only 'hereticos et manicheos'; the explicit of Douais III extends this to cover 'manicheos, patarinos et hereticos', as well as 'passaginos et circumcisos, et contra multos alios hereticos'. The fourth of our *Summae* addresses itself *contra hereticos*, but throughout the text refers to them not only as heretics, but also as *paterini*.[50] Though the *Brevis summula* includes detailed descriptions of the differences between the Cathar groups in Italy, which consistently use these specific group names to refer to their subject, and though we know that the author of the refutation knew the names of the different groups through his list of errors, which describes and divides the heretics according to those names, within the refutation itself only once is anything more specific than 'heretic' used. Nonetheless, as in the polemical construction, the heretics seem to be educated proponents of their error: in the *Quaedam obiectiones*, they are shown here to have a sound grasp of the Old Testament, despite rejecting it in its majority. It is to, or against these heretics that the texts address themselves, and to which all beliefs and arguments are attributed, but they remain, for the most part rhetorical figures that provide a focus for the error, a mouthpiece, who here perhaps also have a more practical purpose as providing a framework for active debate. As with the polemical texts though, the

[50] Douais, *La Somme*, I, II, III, pp.66; Douais, *La Somme*, IV, pp.73, 86, 96, 98, 100, 104, 106, 107, 108; *Brevis summula*, pp.115, 130, 121f.; Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.286, 289, 299, 300, 303. Also note the juxtaposition of orthodox and heretical name, good man, in the *Summa auctoritatum* ed. by Šanjek, p.363-4, see above, n.22.

heretics are carriers of the errors that the texts address, not the subject under discussion.[51]

II – *Exempla* Collections

i – *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus* [52]

Stephen of Bourbon, a Dominican scholar and inquisitor, wrote his *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus* some time between 1250 and his death in 1261. What we know of Stephen himself can be gleaned mainly from this work and from a brief notice by the later Dominican, Bernard Gui, which describes the work and its author. The treatise itself is constructed around the scheme of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, though Stephen only reached the fifth gift, or book, before he died. This lengthy, though unfinished work was intended as a manual for his brethren, and aims to present authorities, arguments and *exempla* from which to construct sermons on any given subject. Each book is divided systematically into titles, chapters, and paragraphs, although in each of the manuscripts consulted for this study, only the book and title numbers are indicated in the running titles; the reader must rely on the contents lists and marginal indications for more precise access to the text.[53]

Examination of Stephen's use and construction of heresy is at the moment made more difficult by the lack of a complete edition; Lecoy de la Marche extracted and edited many *exempla* from the work, selecting those that seem to derive from

---

[51] Jiménez-Sanchez sees the anonymous Cathar treatise reproduced in part in the *Liber contra Manicheos* of Durand of Huesca, published by Thouzellier, as a preachers' manual for Cathar preachers, in a similar mould to the Catholic *summae auctoritatum* that we have considered here, rather than as a coherent treatise; P. Jiménez-Sanchez, 'Le "Traité cathare anonyme": un recueil d'autorités à l'usage des prédicateurs cathares', *Heresis*, 31 (1999 for 1996), 73-100, esp. pp.84-85; *Traité cathare Anonyme languedocien*, ed. C. Thouzellier (Louvain, 1964).

[52] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilbuis*, ed A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirées du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle,* Société de l'histoire de France, Publications, CLXXXV (Paris, 1877); Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus: prologus, prima pars, de dono timoris*, ed. J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis, 124 (Turnhout, 2002). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, p.153.

[53] Oriel College, Oxford, MS 68, content list at 1^{r}-5^{va}; Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 14598-14599, contents at beginning each MS; Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 15970 has almost no navigational apparatus.

Stephen's more immediate experience. A new edition is under way, but so far only book one has been published, and the comparison between this and Lecoy's volume (they are the same size) provides an instant demonstration of how much is missing from the latter. Nonetheless, Lecoy's edition is sound, if highly selective, and reading the two together can give a good impression of the overall nature of the text. With these caveats in mind, it would seem that heresy appears in Stephen's work relatively rarely, and in two main forms: on the one hand as an abstracted, figurative thing, with little or no doctrinal content, and on the other, as a more fully formed system of thought and practice. The incidence of these two types is disproportionate; the second is restricted almost entirely to the section in the fourth book entitled *De heresi*, and the first is represented by occurrences outside this section, as well as some within. It seems helpful then, initially, to separate artificially the *De heresi* section from the rest of the text, and look first at the incidence of heresy outside this section, using the full edition of book one as some kind of control, however slight.

Stephen draws his material from a variety of sources, and indeed lists these extensively in his prologue; apart of course from the Scriptures and the works of the Fathers, some of his stories are from early Christian texts, some from contemporary chronicles, from Lives of saints and rulers, and some from his own experience and that of others with whom he has spoken, reflecting a similar network of personal exchanges and interactions to that which McGuire has outlined in Caesarius of Heisterbach's collection.[54] The material stemming from this latter source forms the basis of Lecoy's edition, which tries to bring together those parts that seem to reflect on Stephen personally, and in this context we might expect Stephen to know something of heresy, given his background.

We know Stephen acted as a papal inquisitor in the south of France because he tells us so himself at various points throughout this text. Several times in the *Tractatus* his anti-heretical work provides the backdrop to an *exemplum*, or authenticity for its source (Stephen is always concerned to show from where he has

---

[54] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, pp.5-8/5-6. B.P. McGuire, 'Friends and Tales in the Cloister: Oral Sources in Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*', *Analecta Cisterciensia*, 36 (1980), 167-247.

acquired his material). He tells us from time to time that he has been present at the sentencing of the heretics in his story, and on two occasions he frames his story as part of his experience as an inquisitor: 'cum ego in quadam civitate essem contra hereticos et inquirerem de mandato apostolico'.[55] We also know that he preached a crusade against the Albigensians, though the story here has nothing to do with heresy, except to be Stephen's reason for being in that place.[56] Heresy seems to be a sort of context for Stephen, at least at certain periods of his life, and it is therefore perhaps surprising that relatively few of his *exempla* are concerned with or mention heresy. The number of occurrences of heresy in this text is, after all, rather small: in Lecoy's edition, roughly forty-five out of 519 have some firm connection with heresy, but only seventeen of these are outside the section dedicated to heresy. Though an examination of the Berlioz and Eichenlaub edition of book one doubles the number of *exempla* containing heresy we can find in this book from three to six (the extra stories all derive from early sources), the editors count 421 *exempla* in this book alone.[57]

When we look for heresy outside the *De heresi* section of the *Tractatus*, what we almost always find is the heretic. That heretic is usually, though not always, an abstracted nameless figure; in book one, of the six *exempla* in which heresy appears in some form, in only one of these is the heretic, pope Leo, named.[58] Of the three occurrences that Lecoy reproduces from book two, only two actually feature heresy, again in the form of nameless heretics, described no further than *heretici*; in the third, heresy, or rather the preaching of the Albigensian crusade, is merely the context in which Stephen says he picked up a story, about a man with a toad on his face.[59] Book three, or Lecoy's skeletal book three, gives us two *exempla* that concern heretics; in one, an anonymous heretic is seen to be confused by the arguments of a jester. The other presents us with the more developed character,

---

[55] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, sentencing e.g.: pp.150; 415; inquisition e.g.: pp.196, 323.
[56] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.144.
[57] Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, *tabula concordantiae exemplorum*, pp.545-56; Welter gives the total number of *exempla* in the *Tractatus* at around 2,900, J. T. Welter, *L'*exemplum *dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du Moyen âge; La* tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti, *recueil d'*exempla *compilé en France à la fine du XIIIe siècle,* (Paris-Toulouse, 1027, repr. Geneva, 1973), p.215.
[58] Three antique: Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1: Hilary p.24; Theodosius pp.207-208; Constantine p.238. Three contemporary, Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1: St. Dominic pp.34-35/165-166; Alverniensis pp.25/114; a mention of Albigensian crusade pp.29/176 (only two of these contain any real presence of heresy).
[59] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.79; 97; 140.

'quedam vetula', a contemporary of Stephen named Alberea, whom everyone thought a saint. Stephen tells us that, while she did indeed live an austere life, this was a result of her mistaken belief that everything was made by the devil, and Stephen identifies her as a Manichean heretic.[60]

Even if we discount the dedicated *De heresi* section of book four, this book still provides us with more incidents of heresy that the other books appear to. Here we meet a distraught lady who, wishing to be burned as a heretic, is dissuaded and reassured by Stephen. We are also presented with the following: some heretics who attempt to argue with Catholic priests, but who must resort to attacking the priests' bad example when they are refuted via Scriptural argument and reason; a priest who becomes a heretic, and leads others astray; a heretic who tries to confound St. Francis and fails; and a slightly incongruous notice of the burning of 180 Manichean heretics, the only occurrence of named heretics in these *exempla*.[61] Book five, by contrast offers only one *exemplum*, containing 'a certain heretic'.[62]

Occasionally there will be an identification with a group, such as the Manicheans mentioned above, or a designation by place of origin; this is the case with a heretic from the Auvergne, described in book one, who gave off a terrible smell when he was burned, though he is nonetheless distinguished no further than that he was 'quidam hereticus'.[63] Of all the examples mentioned above, in only two are the heretics named personally; more typically, the heretics in question are identified no further than the label of heretic, distinguished neither by name, nor belief, only by opposition to the Catholic truth.

In a few places, some points of heretical belief penetrate the stories; two of the heretics that appear in book three refuse meat on account of their belief, that is the heretic who is confounded by the arguments of a jester, and Alberea. Indeed, within Stephen's account is a brief report of Alberea's exposition of this belief

---

[60] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.148; 149-50. Here is a nice parallel with Pseudo-James Capelli, who argues several times that heretics' actions are right, but their motivations wrong. On Alberea, see P. Biller, 'The Earliest Heretical Englishwomen', in *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy*, ed. J. Wogan-Browne et. al. (Turnhout, 2000), 363-76, pp. 370-72.

[61] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.196; 213-14; 215; 265; 415. There are also *exempla* concerning a large dog, and an extinguishing of lights story, but these are describing superstition, rather than heresy, pp.322-23. The story about St. Francis is duplicated in the *De heresi* section, p.304.

[62] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.430.

[63] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, pp.25-26/114. Tubach cites only Stephen as a source for this *exemplum*.

before the inquisition. The heretic who confronts St. Francis appears to hold a Donatist view of ministers, and the story of Theodosius in book one presents heretics denying the resurrection of the body. In this last case, the heretical belief is an integral part of the narrative, and Theodosius has tombs opened to prove them wrong, thus also proving the moral of the story, which is to demonstrate future corporal resurrection. Similarly, with the St. Francis story, the heretic is attempting to denigrate St. Francis by saying that the priest, from whom he is receiving Mass, has a concubine, and his failure exemplifies Stephen's argument, which is to do with irreverence. As we might expect in this type of source, where heretical doctrine appears, it is as a necessary element in the progress of the narrative, and not the subject of it. Indeed, heretics are only made to speak when attacking church, and never give voice to their own doctrines, which if they appear at all, are described by Stephen, and which, he tells us, they cannot support. Although he mentions that there is a lot of heretical doctrine to be found in Milan, he gives no indication of what that doctrine might be.[64] Heresy then, in the principal form in which it appears in this text, outside of the *De heresi* section, is a concrete, figural thing, consisting of the actions, and often even just the presence of an otherwise undifferentiated 'heretic', with little or nothing of heresy, or doctrinal error, presented. Error only appears in this type of abstracted construct when it serves the purpose of the story.

That Stephen's representation of heresy in these cases is as an abstracted, representative thing results of course from their role as elements of *exempla*. *Exempla* are at the heart of the *Tractatus*; they are given prominence beside, and perhaps over the other elements of the work. The incipit introduces the work as consisting of 'auctoritatibus et rationibus et exemplis diversis', a principle that is further elaborated in the Prologue. It begins: 'Quoniam multi multipliciter, subtiliter et utiliter elaboraverunt auctoritates diversas...necnon et rationes diversas auctoritatibus connectere, ut homines instruerent', and continues by giving a list of the good effects of *auctoritates* and *rationes*, as instructing, defending, and edifying. It is to make these benefits effective, to carry them home, that Stephen will employ, or rather provide, *exempla*: 'ad hec suggerenda et ingerenda et imprimenda in humanis cordibus, maxime valent exempla, que maxime erudiunt

---

[64] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.213-14, 215.

simplicium hominum ruditatem, et faciliorem et longiorem ingerunt et imprimunt in memoria tenacitatem'. He goes on to cite Gregory, who proved, in his Dialogues, that deeds speak louder than words, and *exempla* louder than preaching, and to point out that Christ taught first by example.[65] It is for these reasons that he has collected various *exempla* from the many sources, which, as we have noted, he lists in great detail.

The stated aim of the *Tractatus* is to promote a Christian life among the simple by means of arguments reinforced and illuminated by story, or rather, to provide the means by which Stephen's brothers, the readers of the text, what d'Avray calls the 'proximate' audience, can construct sermons. The *Tractatus* is one of the earliest purpose-built collections designed to serve the needs of preachers, providing all the materials that they might need, though here for the first time not in the form of model sermons, but as raw materials from which to build those models.[66] Stephen's 'ultimate' audience then, to continue d'Avray's terminology, is Catholic, the congregation of the faithful, and his concern is with their welfare and defence, not the attack of outsiders.[67]

In this context then, heresy is only one part of the illustrative mechanism of the *exemplum*, and subordinate to the purpose of that *exemplum*, that is, the illustration of some part of orthodox behaviour or belief, and also to the wider plan of the text. So, for example, the Auvergnat heretic must smell bad when he is burnt because Stephen wishes to show, by this example, in what condition heretics and other evildoers will suffer in Hell. That story functions as an illustration 'de feditate et fetore eorum', which is one of a series of chapters that describes the nasty things that happens to the damned in this title, which is on hell, and which in turn is part of the book on the gift of Fear.[68] In the same way as the appearance of heretical doctrine, mentioned above in the case of Alberea, heresy here is illustrative of something else. While here it is at least necessary that the figure be a heretic, and in some of the *exempla* these heretical figures have a historical ring to them, especially

---

[65] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, pp.3-4/3-4.
[66] The first to use all three in one treatise, though not the first to use *ratio*, authority and *exempla*, and the first to present not model sermons but the materials to build one, Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, p.xxxviii.
[67] D'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars*, p.105. Welter, but quoting Lecoy's introduction, points to the fact that the language of the *exempla* is often quite simple, and seems to be written for the purpose of bringing together simple stories for use of preachers, Welter, *L'exemplum*, p.218.
[68] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, pp.25/114.

in the stories concerning the Order's founders, Diego and Dominic, there are occasions when the heretic is reduced to a mere device. When Stephen tells us that a heretic cut out a priest's tongue, here in order to give Mary, whose miracles are the subject of this chapter, the chance to restore it, he could have replaced 'heretic' with 'evil person', and the effect would have been the same. The rhetorical nature of the exemplary heretic in these stories is perhaps best demonstrated by the fact that the story of St. Francis' encounter with the Donatist heretic occurs twice in the *Tractatus*, but each time to convey different messages.[69]

Given that Lecoy's edition concentrates almost exclusively on the exemplary material from the *Tractatus*, it is difficult to look at the appearance of heresy in this text outside of its *exempla*. We can, though, look at the full text of book one for an idea of how heresy functions and is represented in the other two elements around which Stephen built his work, that is, authority and reason. In book one at least, and it is only a very general control, it appears very seldom. There is very little discussion or mention of heresy in these parts of the text, even in places where it might be expected, such as the exposition on bodily resurrection, something that the Cathars denied to much condemnation. In fact, there appears to be only one mention of heresy in the discursive parts of this book: during a discussion on the proofs for the existence of punishment in Purgatory, in the course of the second chapter of the fifth title, there is a repudiation of heretics, especially Waldensians, who deny purgatory. Here we are given some detail of error, 'dicentes non esse loca animarum descendentium nisi infernum et paradisum...', which Stephen goes some way to refute, but it remains, as with the *exempla*, a subordinate part of the wider discussion of orthodox faith.[70] Perhaps one of the main things to be noticed here about Stephen's discussion is that his first response is to attack not the error, but the holders of it, by comparing them to biblical models that held the same tenets; they are hyenas, and devils, and the children of devils, and so they 'manifestant eorum stultitiam'. While he does refute a later point with authorities, this seems to be in order to show that they are sinners, and the attack, for it is quite polemical, remains focussed around the heretics themselves.

---

[69] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.265; 304-305. It is perhaps unusual that Stephen doesn't use one of the many Dominican stories here, in which St. Dominic argues with heretics and wins. Certainly he makes use of the Lives of St. Dominic elsewhere.
[70] Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, pp.144-45.

A useful analogue to Stephen's non-*exempla* treatment here is to be found in a roughly contemporary and surely related work. Humbert de Romans' *Tractatus de habundantia exemplorum* is a work very similar to the *Tractatus de diversiis materiis* in both structure and intention, though its date is hard to pin down with precision; Kaeppeli and Panella give 1240-1277 as the widest range for its composition. The surviving manuscripts of this work suggest that it had a reasonably wide distribution.[71] A collection of *exempla* that are woven, like Stephen's, into a didactic/moral narrative, and subordinate to this framework, the work was compiled by Humbert for the use of preachers, working 'ad edificationem omnium et salutem'. For, as he tells us in a prologue highly reminiscent of Stephen's opening gambit, 'plus exempla quam verba moveat secundum Gregorium et facilius intellectu capiuntur'.[72] The organization of Humbert's text is presented, like Stephen's, as being structured around the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, though apparently only the first part of this was written, or survives. The book that we have, on the gift of Fear, is rather smaller than the first part of Stephen's text, but its division and chapter titles are almost identical to the latter.

Humbert's book seems to contain little material on heresy; the alphabetical list of exempla that accompanies the Paris copy of the text contains no entries under heresy in any of its guises.[73] There is however, at the very beginning of the section dealing with Purgatory, a discussion of the 'heretici et praecipue valdenses qui negant purgatorium'. The discussion stands out as a contemporary element in a book otherwise dominated by material drawn from the Fathers and the early church, but while the position of Humbert's treatment of the Waldensian error in the framework of the text resembles that of the *Tractatus*, the nature of this treatment is quite different. Unlike Stephen's rather polemical line, Humbert approaches the problem as a scholastic question, presenting first the Waldensian position, which is based on the words of Christ to the thief at the crucifixion, and then proceeding to a systematic refutation, devoid of invective and focussed entirely on the error: 'pono contra illos est evangelium quod recipiunt ubi dicitur...', and then a little later, 'item non solum auctoritas sed ratio est contra eos'.[74] Humbert's engagement with

---

[71] *SOPMA* vol.2, pp.283-87.
[72] Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, MS Lat. 2584, ff.130^{r}-163^{r} (table of contents 161^{v}-163^{r}), 130ra.
[73] Though this is not necessarily reliable: there is at least one mention of the 'Arriani', on f.139ra.
[74] BnF MS Lat. 2584, ff.142^{r}.

the subject on a purely doctrinal level throws into relief Stephen's continued treatment, even in this situation, of heresy through the figure of the heretic, and his lack of engagement with heresy as error.[75]

Heresy then, in the majority of Stephen's text, appears always in the guise of the more or less defined heretic, and always in the service of the grand plan, of the chapter, of the book, not an end in itself. It is, however, a common enough fact of life to be either really involved in different events, or to provide a plausible character. Heresy, or the figure of the heretic, is an integral part of the contemporary fabric of Stephen's experience.

Stephen's treatment of heresy as a subject matter, *De heresi,* is contained within the seventh title, on Pride, of the fourth book of the *Tractatus*, the gift of Fortitude. There is a further division within this section, which provides five different kinds of information. As he always does, Stephen explains in a brief prologue the plan of what he is about to do, which it seems easiest to quote in full:

> 1: per quas persuasiones contra heresim fides catholica vera esse monstratur, et heresis confutatur, et fides in cordibus credencium roboratur.
> 2: quomodo error in suis malis effectibus bonis fidei effectibus adversatur.
> 3: quibus malis condicionibus hereticus a fide devians circumvolvatur.
> 4: quibus erroribus heretici nostri temporis, Valdenses scilicet et Albigenses, dicti Patareni vel Bulgari, inficiantur.
> 5: quibus sophismatibus operire se conantur, et quomodo detegantur.

The first three parts of this, that is the list of things by which the Catholic faith is shown to be the true one, and the lists of the good effects of the Catholic faith, and of the evil conditions and qualities of heretics, form the bulk of the *De heresi* section, though Lecoy's edition abridges these sections quite significantly. However, his numbers 342 to 352 inclusive, represent the unbroken text of the

---

[75] The difference between the two might also suggest the division in Dominican traditions, between the southern and Paris Dominicans, that Reltgen-Tallon suggests, A. Reltgen-Tallon, 'L'historiographie des Dominicains du Midi: une mémoire originale?', *CF*, 36 (2001), 395-414.

fourth and fifth parts in the original.[76] It is in the fourth section that Stephen engages with heresy proper, with a description and refutation of their doctrinal errors. Finally, he gives us four different ways in which a heretic may be recognized. As with the rest of the text, most of the *exempla* that feature heresy, which is by no means all of them, treat it as a generic thing, and are centred on the heretic. The difference in this section is that, though the heresy appears in the *exempla*, now, in some parts at least, heresy also constitutes the subject of much of the surrounding material, that is, the theological discussion made up by *auctoritates* and *rationes*.

The first two sections concentrate on why the Catholic faith is superior to heresy. Section one is essentially a statement of faith. It involves, in the first place, a comparison of Catholicism not only with heresy but also with Islam, an association that Stephen will make again in his list of heretical attributes. Stephen then goes on to demonstrate that where heresy is divided, Catholicism is united, and he also points to some diabolical persuasion, where presumably, Catholicism is divinely inspired, and so on. All of this follows Stephen's usual pattern of Scriptural proofs, arguments, and illustrative *exempla*. Heresy here clearly provides the scheme for Stephen's defence of Catholicism, though perhaps this defence constitutes a greater part of the doctrinal discussion here. Many of the *exempla* too, feature heresy from various periods, whether contemporary or from an earlier period, but by no means are all of them concerned with heretical material, and even where they are, they are, as with the *exempla* outside this section, concerned rather with the elucidation of the main point, in this case, proof of the truth of Catholic faith. The same pattern is even more pronounced in the second part, the good effects of faith. Very little of the theological discussion here deals with heresy, and though there are many *exempla* that contain heretics, there are also many that do not, and again the point is to illustrate a different argument.

In the third section there is a shift, in as much as the *exempla* are now aimed at illustrating heresy, that is, heresy forms the basis of the discussion on which the *exempla* are dependent. There remains however, an emphasis on the abstract and the generic, and rather than echo the previous two sections, which deal with the Catholic faith, and treat heresy as a doctrinal phenomenon, Stephen gives us instead

---

[76] Oriel MS 68, *De heresi* occurs at ff.208^{rb} - 221^{vb}; Lecoy's numbers 342-52 are represented by ff.219ra – 221^{vb}.

a description of the characteristics of the heretic. Heretics are 'elati et inflati', 'venenati', 'confusi', 'avari et cupidi'. These characteristics revolve for the most part around defects in moral condition, and all our favourite anti-heretical staples are to be found here. Our heretics are 'falsati ornati, fictis virtutibus, lupi vestiti vellibus ovium mt.vi.c.[vii.15] intrinsecus sunt lupi rapaces, tym.iii.b[5] habentes speciem pietatis vitutem negantes, cor.xi.d.[2Cor.11.14-15] angelus sathane transfigurat se in angelum lucis non ergo mirum si transfigurant se ministri sathane ut ministri iusticie'.[77] There is in several places here an emphasis on the harm that heretics do to others: 'nono, sunt maculati et maculantes alios'.[78] The fifth item on the list, which tells us that heretics are liars, includes an *exemplum*, taken apparently from the preaching of a bishop in the 'terra albigensium', in which a simple man is persuaded by the words of some heretics into believing his lamb to be a dog.[79] Next to the ravening wolves is invoked the familiar image of Samson's foxes, the heretics are 'colligati ex parte posteriori in caudis quia omnis tendunt ad unum quia intendunt impugnare ecclesiam ut vulpes sampsonis'.[80] These are all very personal attacks, where concern with error is in the minority. There is nothing here about heresy as doctrine, and none of these elements are presented as a result of heresy.

The shift in emphasis is continued into the fourth section, but of course here there is also a change in the presentation of heresy, because this is where Stephen gives us his descriptions of the 'heretics of our times'.[81] What we find here is very similar to the treatment of heresy that might be found in an anti-heretical treatise, or an inquisitor's manual, with descriptions of the background to the heresies and their origins, and a detailed list of errors.

As with polemical texts, heretics are here presented as learned, with a view to deceit. There are many *magister* figures, and much Scriptural reference, especially from the Cathars. There are even a few small exchanges in a scholastic style, again as we find in contemporary polemic, between the Cathar scholar and a 'Catholic'.[82] They are also organized: the Cathars have lands, schools, and different

---

[77] BnF MS Lat. 14599 f.234ra.
[78] Oriel MS 68, f.218^{rb}.
[79] BnF MS Lat. 14599 f.232va.
[80] BnF MS Lat. 14599 f.234ra.
[81] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.290.
[82] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.303f.

regional names, as well as an internal differentiation between levels of initiation.[83] From this it is clear that heresy in this section is still firmly grounded in the figure of the heretic, but here it is less a case of action than of belief: there is still a strong presence of the individual, perhaps more so, as these are usually heretics with whom Stephen has spoken personally, but the heretic does not do, rather he believes, argues, misunderstands. The representation of heresy is not completely divorced from this figure at any point, but it now carries a different content, not the rhetorical purpose of the story, but information, specifically doctrinal information. The heretics are more differentiated here than they are anywhere else in the text, and they are differentiated on the grounds of belief.

Something else that sets this section apart, and similarly the next, is that here all the illustrative material, although there is not much of it, is taken only from Stephen's own experience, what he has heard from heretics himself, usually in examination, or what he has heard about them. There are no *exempla* drawn from early Church sources or histories as there are throughout the rest of the *Tractatus,* and indeed even in the earlier parts of the *De heresi* section. There is however, in this regard, a difference between Stephen's treatments of the two sects that he describes, namely, the Waldensians and the Cathars. Stephen frames his account of the Waldensians within his own experience: 'sicut ego cognovi et inveni per multas inquisiciones et confessiones eorum in jure, perfectorum quam credencium, ab ore eorum conscriptas, et per multos testes contra eos receptos'. This is reinforced throughout the description of their error, by frequent statements from the author that he has gained this information directly from members of this group: 'quidam magnus magister et legatus eorum hanc distictionem mihi faciebat; audivi per confessionem'.[84] Compare this with the immediate referral to the authority of Augustine and Isidore when he reaches the description of the Cathars: 'Manichei, quorum pestis adhuc multa loca inficit, secundum quod dicunt beatus Augustinus et Ysidorus…'; and 'errores illius perversi dogmatis sunt hi qui colliguntur ex verbis beati Augustini, de tribus ejus libris'.

Though Stephen uses his own experience for illustration, and for the Scriptural supports that he says they use for their arguments, which, again, are obtained through discussions with 'quodam litterato qui et diu fuerat de secta

---

[83] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.289, 300, 302.
[84] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp. 296, 298.

eorum', he defers to authority for the initial doctrinal framework of the Cathar error, offering 'un aperçu schématique des croyances cathares, à travers le prisme augustinien'.[85] He refers to the Cathars using the patristic name of Manicheans, and continues to do so, not just here but elsewhere in the text, though we know from his descriptions of their regional varieties that he is aware of the contemporary names. Stephen perhaps sees, or wishes to present, a continuous progression from Manichean history to contemporary Cathars, a progression that he attributes also to the Cathars themselves: as they appear here, they regard Mani as their founder, though undoubtedly this again is partly due to Stephen's use of Augustine's description of the fourth-century group.[86] Perhaps for Stephen, the Cathars represent a more archetypal kind of heretic; he introduces this section with the quotation from 1Timothy, 4.i-iii, concerning the errors of the last days, verses often associated with heretics, and there may be a resonance here with the biblical heretics' denial of marriage and food.[87] Or perhaps more likely, Stephen is showing a preference for established authority here, where it is available, as it was not for the Waldensians, in the same way that Bernard Gui in the next century used Stephen's text as a basis for the Waldensians, and had to rely on his own material for the newer groups such as Beguines and Pseudo-Apostles.

The material on error seems to be a little incongruous, and to present a slight shift in emphasis. As mentioned, it is very resonant of inquisitor's manuals; Gui as mentioned uses some of this material almost without alteration in his later manual, the *Practica inquisitionis*. A possible clue may be at the end of Waldensian section, where Stephen gives some justification for the inclusion of this information, which would surely not have been used in sermons to the faithful: 'hec autem inserui estimans fratres fidei defensores bonum non ignorare'.[88]

With the fifth part we move back to the condition we have in the third: a discussion that is primarily concerned with heresy, in the form of the heretic, who is now undifferentiated by belief, and once again mostly generic. Stephen lays down

---

[85] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.303; J. Berlioz, '"Les erreurs de cette doctrine pervertie...". Les croyances des Cathares selon le Dominicain et inquisiteur Étienne de Bourbon (mort. v.1261)', *Heresis*, 32 (2000), 53-67, p.67.

[86] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus* p.302: 'item promissionem factam de Spiritu Paraclito mittendo dicunt in suo heresiarcha fuisse completam, quem dicunt fuisse Spiritum Paraclitum'; perhaps also p.306: 'sicut magister eorum Manes Paraclitum se dicebat, ita dicunt ipse eos Paraclitos'.

[87] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.303; 304.

[88] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.299.

four indications of a heretic: usurpation of office, diffusion of venom, hiding of affairs, and sophistry. Interestingly, in the Oxford manuscript at least, the first three indications in the list continue from the previous text, though indicated by coloured *item* marks. Perhaps because it is through this device that the heretics seek to deceive the simple, the apparent target audience of the *Tractatus' exempla*, the fourth item, sophistry, is divided in the rubrication of this manuscript by a separate, decorated initial.[89] The use of the term 'heretic' has moved back to a general use of this term, after being used by Stephen with little distinction to describe the 'Manicheans' in the previous section. Some points here may be more applicable to one group than the other; the usurpation of the office of preaching and the owning of vernacular gospels must apply more to the Waldensians than the Cathars, and it is indeed to the former, 'heretici Valdenses', that Stephen refers here.[90] Similarly, the section on sophisms could be seen to apply more closely to the Cathars, closing with a warning that 'illi autem qui ponunt rerum duplicitatem, ut Manichei, difficulter possunt convinci'.[91] What is clear, though, is that even though the fourth section demonstrates very plainly that Stephen is fully aware of the differences between contemporary heretics, as would be expected, this does not prevent him from creating, or perceiving, markers that can identify all heretics from their behaviour, regardless of their differences. Their doctrinal errors do not restrict a generic identity as 'heretics'.

The *Tractatus* presents us with a figural, and, to varying degrees, abstract heretic. That pattern seems to dominate most of the appearances that heresy makes in this text; certainly most instances outside the dedicated section, *De heresi,* show this type of construction, and this is in turn largely because these instances are within the context of *exempla*, and so need to serve a higher moralizing purpose. Though it is hard to be sure without the full edition, heresy does not seem to feature much in the framework of the text, those parts made up of the *auctoritates* and *rationes* elements that Stephen describes in his prologue, and this is partly because the book is addressed to the edification of an orthodox audience, where tales of heretics' defeat provide plausible and useful illustration of the correctness of orthodoxy, and of the perils of dissent, when safely cleansed of doctrinal content. It

---

[89] Oriel MS 68, f. 221^{vb}.
[90] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.308.
[91] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.313-14.

is also of course because heresy does have its own dedicated section, and here it does form part of the framework, in its right place according to the careful structure of the book. It remains contained within the figure of the heretic, but it is only here where it forms the basis of discussion, that it is ever really described in terms of doctrine.

The *De heresi* section indeed appears in some ways rather different from the rest of the text, resembling more an inquisitor's handbook than the preacher's collection of stories and authorities that constitutes the rest of the text. Despite the relatively small role of heresy as an aspect of the work as a whole, parts of this section were nonetheless copied into an anthology containing material useful for inquisitors, and later of course by Bernard Gui, giving it perhaps a different function then that for which it was intended, though it is hard to imagine how the long exposition of heretical doctrine and recognizable characteristics could have been helpful in the construction of sermons.[92] The flexible way in which these texts were used and adapted is something to which we will return in a fuller discussion of inquisitor's manuals.

ii – *Dialogus miraculorum* [93]

Caesarius, the author of this text, was a monk in the Cistercian monastery at Heisterbach, where he held the position of master of novices. It was out of this role as master that the *Dialogus miraculorum*, or *Dialogus magnus visionum atque miraculorum*, was born, between the years of 1219 and 1223. Essentially a collection of spiritual anecdotes, arranged as a dialogue between a monk and a novice over seven hundred and forty six chapters, it was intended to be used for the edification and instruction of novices in the order.[94] According to the appendix entry on this text in Tubach's *Index exemplorum*, the *Dialogus* represents the oldest

---

[92] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp. 132-4.

[93] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum,* ed. J. Strange, (2 vols., Cologne, Bonn and Brussels, 1851, repub. Ridgewood, N.J., 1966); English transl. *The dialogue on Miracles,* transl. H. von Essen Scott and C.C. Swinton Bland, (2 vols., London, 1929).

[94] Berlioz, '*Exemplum* et histoire', pp.50-51; J. Berlioz, *"Tuez les tous, Dieu reconnaîtra les siens". Le massacre de Béziers (22 juillet 1209) et la croisade contre les Albigeois vus par Césaire de Heisterbach* (Portet-sur-Garonne, 1994), p.6; B.P. McGuire, 'Written Sources and Cistercian Inspirations in Caesarius of Heisterbach', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 35 (1979), 222-82, p.227. For date of text, see McGuire, 'Friends and Tales in the Cloister', p.197ff.

surviving monastic *exemplum* tradition in Europe from this period. Tubach sees the *Dialogus* as providing a link between the older monastic tale-tradition and the later mendicant sermon *exempla* collections, though McGuire's view is of a more active text, combining the older story tradition with the contemporary developments in Cistercian written and oral culture.[95] The *Dialogus* was of course compiled slightly earlier than our period, and in almost every case, for each of the *exempla* concerning heresy or heretics that occur in the *Dialogus miraculorum*, Caesarius is the only source cited by the corresponding entry in the *Index exemplorum*, with no apparently dependent later tradition. It is therefore difficult to know the reception of the work, or rather of those stories that concern themselves with heresy, and how they might have influenced later sources. Given that it remains extant in over fifty manuscripts however, it warrants at least a brief look here, especially since later in his life, Caesarius remained interested in heretics and the question of heresy.[96]

In the *Tractatus de diversis materiis*, as we have seen, the representation of heresy is dominated by the figure of the heretic and it is the figure that similarly dominates Caesarius's material. Again, the level of detail with which that figure is described depends on how close the heretic is to the central purpose of the *exemplum*, and the only occasions on which descriptions of error are included are those in which the heresy itself is the subject of the moral lesson. Just as often, as with the *exempla* that we find in Stephen of Bourbon's collection, the heretic appears in Caesarius's stories as a fact of life. Though Caesarius lived far from the *foveae hereticorum* that were the south of France and Lombardy, in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries there had been in his region several incidents of and inquisitions into heresy, notably in nearby Bonn and Cologne, and Caesarius's

---

[95] F.C. Tubach, *Index exemplorum, A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales* (Helsinki, 1981), pp.521-22; McGuire, 'Written Sources', pp.236-7, 247. Caesarius, according to Tubach, apparently draws mostly from Gregory's *Dialogues* and the *Vitae patrum* for his material, though presenting some of the older material within a contemporary setting; McGuire believes that Caesarius relied much more on contemporary Cistercian traditions. Of course, most of the heresy *exempla* deal with recent and current events, and are unlikely to be taken from earlier sources. Tubach, *Index exemplorum*, p.521; McGuire, 'Written Sources', p.229 and ff.; Berlioz, '*Exemplum* et histoire', p.58.

[96] One of his works, now lost, was, as McGuire observes, a dialogue 'contra hereticos huius temporis et errores eorum'. There is also a letter, 'satis longam', against the heresy of Lucifer, at the request of master John, 'tortoris hereticorum', A. Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, vol.1, *Einleitung,* exempla *und Auszüge aus den Predigen des Caesarius von Heisterbach* (Bonn, 1933), p.6, described in a letter detailing his works to Peter, prior of Marienstatt.

reports of the Cologne incident are recalling local and recent memory.[97] The stories of heresy spreading from the south were in any case accessible to Caesarius through the lively network of travellers and monks who passed through his abbey at Heisterbach, as McGuire has shown, and many stories from those regions are in fact included in the *Dialogus*.[98] There would therefore have been enough familiarity with heretics in and around Caesarius's community to allow their background presence to be accepted, or their significance understood. So, heretics are included in an account of an earthquake in Brescia, for example, but bear no relevance to the moral or the narrative of the *exempla*, they are simply present. They appear in a similar way in the context of the death of count Fulk of Toulouse, a heretic and associate of heretics, with little bearing on the story besides the possible implication of cause and effect.[99]

At the other end of the scale are those accounts in which heretics constitute the focus of the *exemplum*, and where the purpose of the story is to relate the events surrounding an incident of heresy, rather than heresy comprising one of the events surrounding something else. All such occasions occur within book five of Caesarius's collection, *De daemonibus*, in chapters eighteen to twenty-five. These chapters describe, in the following order: two stories dating from the 1160s, about heretics burned at Besançon, and heretics burned at Cologne; a chapter on the Waldensians at Metz; another on the Albigensians (a long chapter that includes an account of the siege of Béziers in 1209); a story of heretics burned at Paris (the Amalricians); a story of heretics burned at Troyes; some more heretics at Verona (the obligatory chapter on sexual depravity); and finally a heretical teacher who said that the devil was the ruler of this world.[100]

Apart from the theme of burning heretics that emerges from these brief descriptions, it is possible also to see that there is little distinction made, in terms of the organization of the chapters along the lines of different sects, but rather they are

---

[97] On heresy in north-western Europe see chapters in J. Duvernoy, *L'histoire des Cathares* (Toulouse, 1979).
[98] McGuire, 'Friends and Tales in the Cloister', *passim*.
[99] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.2, pp.251, 306-07. Similar in this respect is Gervase of Tilbury's inability to not mention the fact that Raymond of Toulouse was a heretic, despite the fact that the story in question has nothing to do with heresy, or even with Raymond, Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia imperialia: recreation for an Emperor*, ed. S.E. Banks and J.W. Binns (Oxford, 2002), p.784/785.
[100] 'Amalricians' is not a name that Caesarius uses for this group, but it is used here for the sake of convenience. On depravity, devil worship, and underground lairs, see also Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte*, vol.1, pp.27,149.

all mixed in together, the Cathars, the Waldensians, and the intellectual Amalrician heresy, with the undefined 'heretics'. The lack of differentiation by sect reflects the overall lack of concern that Caesarius shows to include detail of the beliefs of the heretics. The only occasions on which we are provided with such information are within the accounts of the Albigensians and the Amalricians, and though the presence of that information appears incongruous with the other accounts of heresy, it is perhaps understandable in the framework of the text as a whole. McGuire describes the *Dialogus* as a 'finished work of monastic theology, spiritual experience, and moral instruction', in which the *exempla* are used to illuminate doctrine, and 'straight historical narrative' is generally absent. Within that model, the presence of heretics or heresy is typically used to demonstrate a moral message or a Catholic article of belief, but at the same time error can in its own right occasionally be the subject, or point of doctrine under discussion.[101]

For the most part, the heretics included by Caesarius have few distinguishing features, and tend to be described less in terms of error, than of actions and characteristics. Several common themes can be discerned in those characterizations which apply in most cases, regardless of the depth of detail given about the heretics themselves. As we see in the case of the Amalricians for example, heretics can be educated in Caesarius's world, but the level of that education varies according to the demands of the *exemplum*. Caesarius will sometimes emphasize the learning of the clergy in this context; the Bishop of Bescançon for example, is a learned man, while the people are simple – in this instance, the heretics are somehow neither, they seem to be outside that construct, just as they are outsiders in the town, and their heresy is neither educated, nor rustic, but diabolical. The heretics at Cologne are examined by learned men, but no mention is made of their errors, which in reality may have been quite complex, and with which Caesarius may have been familiar from his time there as a young scholar.[102] Meanwhile the Waldensians are refuted by the clerks of Metz, and for their part have to rely on a scholar that they have brought with them.[103]

The Cathars, on the other hand, can be shown as learned. The heresiarch visited by the bishop of Cambrai and two other Catholic scholars, who we can

---

[101] McGuire, 'Written Sources', pp.258, 282.
[102] As McGuire points out, that fact is known from the *Dialogus* itself, book 6 chapter 4, McGuire, 'Written Sources', p.275.
[103] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, pp.299-300.

presume to be a Cathar given the discussion of devil as creator that follows, is able to dispute a point with his visitors 'non solum ex scripturis, sed etiam ex ratione'.[104] The novice, remarking that he has heard that there are many heretics in Lombardy, receives the reply: 'hoc mirum non est, habent enim suos magistros in diversis civitatibus, aperte legentes, et sacram paginam perverse exponentes'.[105] Though heretical learning is admitted by the latter example, at the same time it is made clear that it is a turned to a perverse end. After the monk's description of the Albigensians, the novice remarks that if they only had 'viri literati'(sic) among them, none of this would have happened. Caesarius, or the 'monk', to introduce his next chapter on the very learned sect of the Amalricians, made up almost entirely of Paris theologians, replies that when learned men begin to fall into error, the devil pushes them further than the illiterate – learning can be a tool of the devil if not applied within Catholic limits.[106]

Another noticeable feature of nearly all Caesarius's depictions of heretics is how frequently they are found in public, and how equally public and spoken is their mode of expression, rather than written or interior. One of the most common arenas in which we find heretics in this text is in the context of public debate or confrontation, usually with the local clergy, or, in the case of an *exemplum* from Caesarius's sermon collections, with a papal legate.[107] Similarly, heretics are described in several places as preaching in Caesarius's stories, or impeding the preaching of the Catholics, and the Amalricians go on a three month missionary journey from Paris to the dioceses of Paris, Lyons, Troyes and Sens.[108] Elsewhere, in another *exemplum* taken from his homilies, Caesarius tells us of 'hereticorum Albiensium aperte fidem catholicam impugnancium'.[109] This public arena for heretics is something that in fact is also common to the *exempla* of Stephen and Jacques de Vitry.

Paradoxically, despite their often public nature, one characteristic that some of Caesarius's heretics have in common with both the other *exempla* collections,

---

[104] Caesarius, *Dialogus* vol.1, p.309.
[105] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.308.
[106] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, pp.300-303.
[107] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.297; vol.1, p.300; Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte*, vol.1, 210, pp.150-51: Albienses; interesting here, 'nullum ex scripturis admitteret testimonium hereticus'.
[108] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, pp.297, 300, 304, 306; Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte,* vol.1, 210, pp.150.
[109] Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte,* vol.1, 260, p.171.

and indeed with a large part of the anti-heretical tradition as a whole, is that of deception and of hiddenness. Hiddenness can apply to behaviour, as can be seen in a rather sensationalist account, in which some Lombard heretics hold secret conventicles during which much moral depravity ensues, but for the most part the behaviour of the heretics in these *exempla* remains very open, debating and preaching in public.[110] It is not that their error is hidden, indeed it must be publicly defended to be heresy, as Caesarius himself acknowledges elsewhere; mostly, their hiddenness occurs rather in the context of their pretended appearance.[111] In his homilies, Caesarius labels heretics false prophets, 'in habitu simplici simplices adeunt, simplicitatis verba pretendunt et...lupine malicie dentes in illos defigunt'.[112] In the same way, the two heretics that Caesarius describes at Besançon are marked, before anything else, by a false appearance, of piety and of nature: 'Duo homines, non mente, sed in habitu simplices, non oves sed lupi rapaces...summam simulantes religiositatem'.[113] It is by this deception and their false miracles, which are powered by the devil, that they persuade people of their sincerity and of the truth of their teachings.

The equation between heretics and the devil, or diabolical forces is almost omnipresent in Caesarius's description of heretics – 'membra sunt diaboli'.[114] Indeed, the devil represents for Caesarius, as McGuire puts it, a manifestation of all the evils of man, and is in fact a central part of Caesarius's whole text, but Berlioz also sees this diabolical connection as central specifically to Caesarius's conception of heresy and the heretic, and it is not hard to see why.[115] In nearly every case, the heretics are either the agents of the devil, moved by the devil, or their doctrine is derived from him; in one story, the devil himself is called up to say that the teaching of the heretics belongs to him: 'quae in ore illorum posui, illa praedicant'.[116] Within book five, *De daemonibus*, though some of the chapters that contain heresy are concerned directly to discuss heresy in its own right, those discussions, like the other *exempla* included here, are all still subject to the overall demonic theme of the

---

[110] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.308.
[111] 'error non facit hereticum, sed defensio erroris', in the letter to the prior of Marienstatt, Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte*, vol.1, p.3; see also letter prefacing *sermones dominicales*: 'non enim error hereticum facit, sed defensio erroris', Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte*, vol.1, p.21.
[112] Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichte*, vol.1, 208, pp.147-49
[113] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.296.
[114] Caesarius, *Dialogus* vol.1, p.309.
[115] McGuire, 'Written Sources', p.260-61; Berlioz, '*Exemplum* et histoire', p.52.
[116] Caesarius, *Dialogus* vol.1, p.297.

book. However, even outside the group of stories in that book, heretics are characterized above all by this connection. That diabolical involvement can in some ways be seen as a part of a wider construct that is visible also in the intervention of God in these stories; if the heretics are inspired or empowered by the devil, then they are always punished by God, not by men, unless those men are acting clearly as the agents of God. A tendency to remove the actual punishment from the responsibility of men is something that can also be seen within the Dominican tradition, but given that the *Dialogus* as a whole is concerned with miracles, this dependence on supernatural forces is neither surprising, nor exclusive to the sections involving heresy.

iii – *Bonum universale de apibus* [117]

Our third collection of *exempla* is a moralizing treatise on bees, composed between 1256 and 1263 by Thomas of Cantimpré, an itinerant Dominican from Louvain. The *Bonum universale* contains a large number of *exempla*, of which many, but not all, have been extracted and translated by Henri Platelle. According to Berlioz, about a third have been omitted from Platelle's translation.[118] Though Thomas gathers his stories from the Low countries and the nearest parts of northern France and the Rhineland, heretics appear infrequently in Thomas's book, and only twice in their own right; none of the *exempla* that Berlioz adds appear to contain heresy. The two stories that Thomas does include revolve around the common theme of deception and false appearance. The first, contained in a chapter that seeks to demonstrate why the bounds of orthodoxy ought to be obeyed, is the story of a man named William Cornelius; considered holy all his life because of his poverty, his deception was so effective that it was discovered only after his death that he had believed that poverty destroyed all sin, as rust is destroyed by fire.[119] The only other full account of heresy in the *Bonum universale* involves one Gilles Boogris, a 'cunning heretic' of Cambrai, who pretends to be possessed in order to escape the

---

[117] Thomas of Cantimpré, *Les exemples du Livre des Abeilles,* ed. and transl. H. Platelle (Turnhout, 1997).
[118] J. Berlioz, 'La face cachée de Thomas de Cantimpré. Compléments à une traduction française récente du *Bonum universale de apibus*', *AHDLMA*, 68 (2001), 73-94.
[119] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, p.198-99.

inquisitors. Gilles's story appears in a chapter describing the enemies of bees, that is good Christians, and here Thomas uses heretics to represent wasps, that is demons.[120] Thomas does not say to which heresy Gilles is supposed to have adhered.

In both of the latter examples, though the heretic is to the foreground, it is still as a figure, functioning as an illustrative device, rather than as the focus or purpose of the story. Indeed, heretics are an otherwise infrequent part of the landscape for Thomas, though there are instances in which heretics make the odd appearance in the background. Thomas relates the story of Foulques, a good canon of Lille, who is punished with twenty five years of illness, because he would not follow Jacques de Vitry on the Albigensian crusade. The chapter that contains that story, in the first part of Thomas' book, on superiors, is meant to demonstrate the importance of obedience. In a similar way, the death of Guiard bishop of Cambrai at Affligem occurs in the context of heresy, but the general point of this section is clemency; the bishop is on his way to combat the heretics at Anvers when he dies, and his time in Purgatory is lessened by the work he has done to purify the church from heretics during his life. In part two of the *Bonum universale*, a saintly recluse sees signs of the cross in the sky at the preaching of all the crusades of this time; these are listed, the Albigensian among them. Heresy is a historical fact for Thomas, but largely as part of the background, and not the focus of the story.[121] All of Thomas' material on heresy is drawn from his home region of Louvain and its surroundings, and he only includes the events of other parts of France, or Europe where they touch on his home ground, as in the case of the canon of Lille's encounter with Jacques de Vitry. The only time that Thomas ventures outside Louvain in the context of heresy, is to attribute the appearance of heretics in the 'near and very noble province of Lombardy', those same heretics who inflicted such a horrible death on Peter of Verona, to the schism that occurred in the mid-twelfth century between the emperor and the papacy.[122]

---

[120] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, pp.269-70.
[121] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, pp.68, 88-89, 114.
[122] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, pp.68-69.

iv – The *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry

No survey of the *exemplum* tradition of this period could legitimately ignore this author, one of its leading proponents. Though we know little of Jacques de Vitry's life before his ordination in 1210, we know of his connection with Marie d'Oignies, whom he continued to revere throughout his life, and of his studies at Paris. We know also that he was elected bishop of Acre in 1214, a post he held until 1227, after which he returned to the West and was made cardinal and bishop of Tusculum, in 1228. Jacques had a personal connection with the heresy of his time, having acted as a preacher for the Albigensian Crusade in the south of France in 1213 and 1214, and in Belgium and Rheims in 1228.[123]

Though Jacques de Vitry's various *exempla* were later collected into dedicated volumes, they were originally located within the sermons contained in his sermon collections, of which, according to Crane, there were four: the *Sermones dominicales*; the *Sermones de sanctis*; the *Sermones vulgares*, which provide the content of Crane's collection; and the *Sermones communes vel quotidiani*, which provide the content of both Greven's and Frenken's collections.[124] Yet, while Jacques wrote or used a great many *exempla* in his collections, relatively few of them contain or concern heresy in any way. Given the time that Jacques spent working against heretics, either preaching the Albigensian Crusade or giving sermons against the Cathars, to rather less effect, whilst in northern Italy, heresy might be expected to appear with greater frequency in his writings. However, even in his historical works, there is little to be found. The only real instance of heresy in the *Historia orientalis*, for example is a chapter on the Nestorians, who 'poison in large part the religion of the east with their evil doctrine'. Other than this, there are only a few brief mentions in the context of Mohammed, where again, heresy is characterized as a venom.[125]

---

[123] *The* Exempla *or Illustrative Stories from the* Sermones Vulgares *of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. T.F. Crane (repr. New York, 1971, originally published 1890), pp.xxii-xxxiv. On Jacques' attitude toward and preaching against the Cathars, see C. Muessig, 'Les sermons de Jacques de Vitry sur les cathares', *CF*, 32 (1997), 69-83.

[124] Vitry, Crane, pp.xxxviii-xlvii; J. Greven, *Die* Exempla *aus den* Sermones feriales et communes *des Jakob von Vitry* (Heidelberg, 1914); *Die* Exempla *des Jacob von Vitry: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Erzahlungsliteratur des Mittelalters*, ed. G. Frenken (Munchen, 1914).

[125] C. Buridant, *La traduction de l'historia orientalis de Jacques de Vitry* (Paris, 1986), pp.67-68; 123-24.

What is perhaps more surprising than the lack of instances to be found in the eastern history is the similar dearth in Jacques' *Historia occidentalis*. Here the only mention of the heresy with which he must have been familiar occurs at the end of a description of the *Humiliati* of northern Italy, who, Jacques tells us, were particularly effective in combating the 'hereticis quos patarinos appellant'. As well as revealing their lies and confounding them in public, they caused many to return to the faith and turn against their own kind; the heretics are described here as 'vulpeculae'.[126] Jacques' contact with, and respect for, the *Humiliati* perhaps grew out of his own attempts to preach against the 'Patarines' in this region while on his way to Rome to be consecrated as bishop of Acre, which he described in one of his letters. After nearly losing all his belongings and his books, his 'arma', in a swollen river, he arrives at Milan, which he calls 'fovea hereticorum'. He tries to preach there, but 'vix autem invenitur in tota civitate qui resistat hereticis', except for the *Humiliati*.[127] There appears to be nothing in these historical texts that reflects Jacques' knowledge of the heretics in his own country, and indeed very few of his *exempla* are framed within his experience there, as, for example, several of Stephen of Bourbon's are.[128]

If we turn to look at Jacques' *exempla* collections themselves, of those *exempla* collected by Crane from his *Sermones vulgares*, only two appear to contain heresy. In a sermon on the theme 'that we should refresh ourselves in the treasury of the Scriptures before refreshing others', one *exemplum* shows Jacques in direct contact with heretics, and represents his fullest description of them. It concerns an occasion on which Jacques, in 'terra que dicitur Albigensium', is involved in a debate with some heretics, unspecified by name, but identifiable from the later description as Cathars; the Catholic party appear not to be succeeding, the heretics shouting that the Catholics are unable to convince them clearly by authorities. One of Jacques' party demands that one of the heretics, here again called 'vulpeculae', to make the sign of a cross, and his inability to do so means that they are recognized as heretics. Jacques also includes a brief description of their error, 'asserunt quod

---

[126] J.F. Hinnebusch, *The* Historia occidentalis *of Jacques de Vitry. A Critical Edition* (Fribourg, 1972), pp.144-46.
[127] R.B.C. Huygens, *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/70-1240), évêque de St.-Jean-d'Acre* (Leiden, 1960), Letter 1.34-54, pp.72-73.
[128] Though Jacques does use his experience as a framework in other places, see for example, preaching the Crusade, Vitry, Crane, cxxii, p.56.

omnia visibilia et corporalia creavit diabolus'.[129] It is hard to know exactly what purpose Jacques intended for this *exemplum*, given that it is removed from its homiletic context here, but the subject of the sermon might suggest that this would be a convenient illustration of the uses of Scriptural knowledge.

The only other instance of heresy in the *Sermones vulgares* occurs in a sermon addressed to 'citizens and burghers', and is really a defence of the administration of sacraments. The story relates how a certain man, 'ex nimia simplicitate', would not receive the sacraments from an unworthy priest. God, to recall him from error, sends him a dream in which he sees a well from which a leper draws clear water in a beautiful vessel. When the man approaches to drink with the many others gathered there, the leper refuses him, saying 'quomodo de manu leprosa vis aquam recipere qui a malis sacerdotibus dedignaris accipere sacramenta?' 'Pessima igitur hereticorum doctrina', Jacques glosses, 'qui ex una ministri dicunt pendere virtutem sacramentorum'.[130] Where the former *exemplum* used heresy to illustrate (presumably) a separate point, here an apparently unconnected story is used to demonstrate a lesson about heresy, and it is this latter form that seems the more common in Jacques' other *exempla*, those culled by Greven from Jacques' *Sermones communes*.

Again, it is difficult to be sure of the context of the *exempla* when removed from their surroundings in this way, but in Greven's edition small tags have been preserved to give the intended moral of the story. Here, as before, where heresy appears within the story its presence is simply illustrative; two stories about the Arians serve to illustrate the character of St. Athanasius, while giving very little attention to the heresy that they contain.[131] As with so many of the other *exempla* that we have looked at, in these two cases, the fact of heresy is simply a part of the story's fabric. Only on one occasion can a story of heresy perhaps be seen also to illustrate a teaching on heresy. The story concerns a daughter of the count of Toulouse, born into a heretical family, but remaining firm in her Catholic faith until her mother calls an evil spirit to torment her. The girl's faith is reinforced by the Holy Spirit, and the story ends when the evil spirit 'incidit in foveam quam fecit' (a quotation from the seventh Psalm that Jacques also uses to describe the defeat of the

---

[129] Vitry, Crane, xxvi, p.9.
[130] Vitry, Crane, clv, p.68; 'una' is not clear here – possibly a mistake for 'manu'.
[131] Vitry, Greven, 92, 93, p.55.

Patarines at the hands of the *Humiliati*).[132] Heresy is here, again, described as a 'venenum perfidie', and a disease, with many words of corruption and dirt. It is not entirely clear though, whether the phrase which ends this story, 'multi quidem nocere volunt et prosunt', refers specifically to heretics, but there are several other *exempla* in which we are left in no doubt as to the intended target.

Some sheep, here representing those who lend their support to heretics, foolishly allow wolves to enter among them because they are protected by the dog; they are tricked by the wolves, that is, the heretics, into giving up their protector, that is, the prelates of the church, and this, Jacques tells us 'omnibus heretici intendunt'.[133] The harm, or the good, that heretics can do, is further illustrated by a wonderful couplet of stories involving eye-trouble, which also provide an interesting insight into Jacques' view of heresy. A Saracen, seeking help from a woman for his eye complaint, is given some quicklime by her servant, instead of ointment. He returns, cured, after eight days to thank the woman, at which, unsurprisingly, the servant is amazed. The interpretation which Jacques puts on this story, a story that he says he remembers from his time in the east, is that while heretics try to harm Catholics, 'eos magis exercitatos et acutos in scripturis et fidei defensione reddunt'.[134] Contrary to this, he tells us, harm can be done when trying to do good, as in the case of a certain rustic, who, remembering that his foot problem was cured with hot onions tries to heal his neighbour's eye condition with the same remedy, which has the opposite effect to the one he had hoped for. So it is, we are told, that the same medicine does not do for all illnesses, and so the church does not treat all heretics in the same way; those wishing to return are reconciled, others put in prison, others handed over to the secular arm, depending on their obstinacy.[135]

Finally, there are two further *exempla* that serve to illustrate heresy, or rather heretics, in the same way, which also warrant a brief look. Two penitents receive unequal penance depending on the level of their contrition; the one that has a hard

---

[132] Vitry, Greven, 98, p.58; Hinnebusch, Historia occidentalis, p.146. The same phrase is also in *Vergentis in senium* – 'se ipsum laqueis suae fraudis innectit, et incidit in foveam, quam paravit', Friedberg, vol.2, col.782.

[133] He also takes the opportunity to condemn the rejection of sacraments based on the merits of the minister, Vitry, Greven, 96, p.57. A similar sheep story, in which dogs are preachers, though wolves are not specified as anything particular within the *exemplum*, occurs in Crane's collection from the *Sermones vulgares*; Vitry, Crane, xlv, pp.17-18.

[134] Vitry, Greven, 99, pp.58-59.

[135] Vitry, Greven, 100, p.59.

heart receives a heavy penance. Jacques uses this to exemplify the hardness of heart, the obstinacy that distinguishes heresy in the Biblical model given in Titus, though paraphrased here with a contemporary interpolation, 'quos consolatos et perfectos nominant'.[136] The use here of the term 'consolatos' would suggest a rather greater familiarity with the Cathars than the lack of *exempla* containing them might imply. The second of these *exempla* involves a rather good story about a monkey, which apparently demonstrates that heretics, though preaching against the church out of envy, in fact are inwardly tormented as they know that 'perversa est eorum doctrina'.[137] All these examples would seem to follow the pattern described above, namely that heresy in Jacques' sermon stories is much less often the content of the *exemplum* than the thing to be illustrated by it.

Jacques de Vitry does not appear to use his experience or knowledge of the heresy of his times to illustrate other things perhaps as much as the authors of the other *exempla* collections might, and his portrayal of heresy is, as such, rather thin. As with our other collections, the representation of heresy that Jacques does include centres around heretics, rather then error, and those heretics are usually very generalized, often, though not always, with no doctrinal affiliation. Heretics are mostly generic in Jacques' work and the images that surround them are similarly generic; the association with venom and pollution is common to all, as is the identification with the *vulpeculae* of the Song of Songs.

Where Jacques' treatment of heresy seems to depart somewhat from the other collections however, is that it more commonly appears in his work as an issue that needs to be addressed through this medium, that is, in his sermons. That Jacques was generally concerned with the combat of heresy through preaching is clear from the fact that the preface to his life of the northern saint, Marie d'Oignies, directs the work to this end, answering Fulk, bishop of Toulouse's request for accounts of contemporary saints, by means of which he can preach against the heretics of his region. Though the life itself contains no heresy as such, Jessalyn

---

[136] Vitry, Greven, 101, pp.59-60; Titus 3.10,11: 'hereticum hominem post unam et secundam correptionem devita, sciens quia subversus est qui huiusmodi est'.

[137] Whilst travelling by sea to Santiago, a man, though already wealthy, has acquired even more wealth by selling the pilgrims badly measured and frothy wine. Upon seeing the purse in which he keeps this money, a monkey steals away with it and climbs the mast of the ship, whereupon it proceeds to put the coins to its nose, and to cast some into the sea as though they were filthy. The monkey and the purse are eventually retrieved by a sailor. Imagine the man's surprise to find his ill-gotten gains cast into the deep by the monkey, and only his lawfully inherited money left behind, Vitry, Greven, 102, pp.60-61.

Bird demonstrates clearly that the emphases that this text places on the power of the Eucharist and sacraments were nonetheless shaped by an anti-heretical design.[138] Jacques' stories are aimed toward indirect action, not coercion or debate, but protection of the flock via preaching.

III – Dominican Sources

The texts that we now turn to, written by Dominicans for use and circulation within the Order and for the edification of their brethren, not only present another example of ways in which contemporary writers portrayed and wrote about heresy; they also provide an insight into the way that heresy formed a part of a different construction, that of a Dominican identity. We will return to this issue later, after first considering more generally the ways in which heresy and heretics appear in these texts. From our period, the principal sources of this type are hagiographical: early lives of the Order's founder Saint, Dominic, and of its first martyr, Peter of Verona. Next to these there is also a collection of stories about the lives of the earliest Dominicans, known as the *Vitae fratrum*.

There are four main *vitae* of St. Dominic from this period, beginning with that contained in the *Libellus* of Jordan of Saxony in 1232-33, an account of the origins of the Order, upon which the subsequent lives are ultimately based. There then follow the *legendae* by: Peter Ferrandi in 1235-39; Constantine of Orvieto in the mid 1240s (perhaps 1246?); and Humbert de Romans's version, which became the official Life of St. Dominic for the Order in 1260, to the exclusion of those written previously, though it is essentially a cunning amalgam of the earlier accounts.[139] There are three accounts of Peter Martyr's life and death from this

---

[138] J. Bird, 'The Construction of Orthodoxy and the (De)construction of Heretical Attacks on the Eucharist in *Pastoralia* from Peter the Chanter's Circle in Paris', in Bruschi and Biller, 45-61, p.54.

[139] All these 'lives' are to be found edited in *MOPH* XVI (1935): Jordan of Saxony, *Libellus de principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. H.C. Scheeben, pp.1-88 (English edition of *Libellus* by Simon Tugwell, *Jordan of Saxony: On the Beginnings of the Order of Preachers*, (Dublin, 1982). Tugwell advises reading the Scheeben edition alongside the older but more reliable *Acta Sanctorum* edition, Tugwell, *Jordan of Saxony*, p.xiii); Peter Ferrandi, *Legenda*, ed. M.H. Laurent, pp.197-260; Constantine of Orvieto, *Legenda*, ed. H.C. Scheeben, pp.263-352; Humbert de Romans, *Legenda*, ed. A. Walz, pp.355-433. There is also a brief abridged Life by Bartholomew of Trent, 1245-50, ed.

period, the principal one being that by Thomas Agni of Lentino, written before 1267. It is from this text that the *Legenda aurea* version is lifted.[140] The other account, though much shorter, is apparently by a close friend of the Saint, Henry of Scacabarazzi, and is to be found in the *Vitae fratrum*.[141]

According to Simon Tugwell's examination of its development, the *Vitae fratrum*, also known as the *Vitas fratrum*, was originally begun by Gerard de Frachet in the 1250s as an instructional book for novices of the same type as Caesarius's *Dialogus miraculorum*, before it was gradually incorporated into the collection of stories about the Order's members that was started in the General chapter of 1255, of which Gerard, and subsequently Humbert de Romans was editor. There is no one definitive manuscript version of this text.[142] It was a text aimed solely at the brethren and at their edification, as well as the preservation of Dominican history; some of the stories that it contains have the character of *exempla*.

i – The representation of heresy

The picture here is very like that which appears in the exempla collections, where representations of heresy centre around heretics as figures, their actions, their behaviour, and their status as heretics. Heresy as an error of belief makes only rare appearances and the main examples of those appearances centre on one particular episode: Thomas Agni's life of Peter of Verona includes relatively detailed doctrinal points in its description of the martyr's formative disagreement with his heretical kin, an inclusion that is therefore repeated in the Golden Legend version. The *Vitae fratrum* account of this story also provides detail at this point, in one of only two descriptions of error in this text's coverage of heresy. Generally, 'error' is

---

by B. Altaner, *Der hl. Dominikus. Untersuchungen und texte*, Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, II (Breslau, 1922), edn. of text on pp.229-39.

[140] Thomas Agni de Lentino, *Legenda beati Petri Martyris*, *Acta Sanctorum*, April III, 29, cols.686-719; Golden Legend version: *Iacopo da Varazze, Legenda Aurea*, ed. G.P. Maggioni (2nd edn., 2 vols., Florence, 1998), vol.1, pp.421-442; English transl. *Jacobus de Voragine, The Golden Legend, Readings on the Saints*, transl. W. Granger Ryan (2 vols., Princeton, 1993), vol.1, pp.254-266.

[141] According to Conway, p,205, n.1, Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae fratrum ordinis praedicatorum nec non cronica ordinis ab anno MCCII usque ad MCCLIV*, ed. B.M. Reichert, *MOPH*, I (1896). English transl. *Lives of the Brethren of the Order of Preachers*, transl. P. Conway, ed. with notes and intro. B. Jarrett, (London, 1955). *Vitae fratrum* account of Peter of Verona *Vitae fratrum* on pp.236-48.

[142] S. Tugwell, 'L'évolution des *vitae fratrum*. Résumé des conclusions provisoires', in *CF*, 36 (2001), 415-18.

simply one of the things that mark individuals out as heretics. Even the label used to describe those individuals is unspecific: each of the lives of St. Dominic describes Dominic's opponents only by the term 'heretic', and never gives details of their beliefs. One *Vitae fratrum* story, set in Tuscany, uses the term 'Albigensians', though, and the occasional differentiation of Waldensian heretics might suggest in these instances a corresponding use of 'heretic' to mean Cathar, in the southern French mode. Gerard de Frachet's text is less uniform in its presentation than the others by virtue of its nature as a collection, but most of the entries nonetheless use the term 'heretic' with little distinction.

With a few exceptions then, heretics are generic in this hagiographical and biographical body of work, and it is their status as heretics that is significant.[143] Outside the section which covers Peter of Verona, and one incident involving St. Dominic, heresy appears in the *Vitae fratrum* in the context of stories which demonstrate, through visions and divine signs, the merit of individual brothers, or of the Order in general.[144] Two Lombard women, both heretics but in separate stories, are converted after visions of the Order as divinely appointed. A Provençal medic, led astray by the apparently greater piety of the Waldensians, returns to the faith again by virtue of a vision that shows this piety to be only superficial. Gerard's chapter on miracles wrought by the brethren contains several stories in which heretics are converted by the miracles' power.[145] In these accounts, the heretics function in much the same way as they do in the *exempla* collections proper, as narrative elements rather than as subject matter. Their presence is dependent on their dissent in as much as it is their conversion that drives the force of the story – it is important that they are heretics, but the error that makes them heretics is not. Further to this, in the widely focussed *Vitae fratrum* at least, heretics seem often to be present almost incidentally. Those heretics that feature as proof of the miracles of the brethren feature amongst other very similar stories, which do not depend on

---

[143] For the Dominican writers, though the heretics are less explicitly demonic, they are still equated with evil types. Diego, in Jordan's account, draws a parallel between the heretics and the pseudo-apostles, Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, p.36. Parallels between heretics and Biblical models of evil also appear at times in Stephen of Bourbon's text, where we find the 'doctrines of devils' of 1Tim.IV.1 describing heresy generally; this one again in reference to the 'Manicheans'; and the scorpions that punish those without the mark of God in the last days, Rev.IX.3-5. Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.287; 299; 310.

[144] The *Vitae fratrum* account of St. Dominic is limited by the fact that it does not cover the same ground as the *legendae*, and so there is little material on the founder in general, and only one occasion in which heresy is involved.

[145] *Vitae fratrum*, pp.22, 183-84, 225-28,193-95.

the presence of heretics at all, and their inclusion seems to rely as much on their general presence in the world of the stories' authors as on the purpose of the stories themselves. That Gerard is not writing these accounts for himself, but editing contributions from brothers living all over Europe, leads one to suppose that to some extent heretics are again included as a commonplace of contemporary life.

If it is, once again, the figure of the heretic that comprises the main incidence of heresy in these texts, and this figure is for the most part nominally and doctrinally unspecific, in what ways is this figure represented? Though the three strands of this body of texts – St. Dominic, St Peter Martyr, and the Order generally – are not homogenous, they do present similar themes in their representation of heretics, namely that they are educated, and that their outward appearance is not what it might seem.

In nearly all of the encounters that our heroes have with heretics, and in several of the other reported, *exempla*-like stories of the *Vitae fratrum* the heretics appear to be learned; they are able to write their beliefs down, and in some cases are running their own schools.[146] The primary reason for this appearance is that the main arena for contact between the Dominicans and the heretics is nearly always that of debate or verbal confrontation. The various accounts of Diego of Osma's mission all recount the stories of St. Dominic in private discussion with his heretical host, and in public debate with the local heretics. Indeed, Dominic and his opponents, in the debate at Montréal, are so evenly matched that the judges are unable to decide between them; noticeable also is that both parties' arguments are in a written, text-based form.[147] Peter Martyr, too, is involved in debates, both in private with his heretical family, and in public with the heretical élite. We see him confront in debate a 'heretic of great ability and eloquence', as well as a Catholic bishop turned bad. He argues with his own family members, in a dispute based on

---

[146] *Vitae fratrum*, pp.67-68. In a brief aside to this, it may be worth noting that the demon, in the appendix to the *Libellus,* is learned, and correctly learned, it is only his attitude that is wrong, proud of his learning for its own sake. He can even speak like a preacher, and be fully convincing. Perhaps this is relevant given the occasional equation of heretics and demons; Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, pp.78-79. A Dominican sermon glosses a distortion of understanding as applying to heretics, 'A Sermon on St. Dominic, by St. Thomas Agni of Lentini', in S. Tugwell (ed. and transl.), *Early Dominicans, Selected Writings* (New York, 1984), p.64. A good theologian speaks plainly, according to the *codex vindobonensis 2554* gloss of Exodus XXXIV.32-35, *Bible moralisée: Codex Vindobonensis 2554, Vienna, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, comm. and transl. G.B. Guest, Manuscripts in Miniature, 2 (London, 1995), 26^{v}Cc, p.83, a resolution through interpretation.

[147] Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, pp.33-34, 37-38; Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.54; Testimony of John of Spain, for canonization of St. Dominic, in Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.75; Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, p.37; Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.54.

written authorities: 'tunc patruus nisus est ei probare per auctoritates...quod dyabolus ista creaverit...sed mirum valde, quod ita omnes illas auctoritates contra eum convertit, quod in nullo potuit ei resistere'.[148] It is principally the prevalence of high level debates in the Dominican picture of heresy that results in the portrayal of educated heretics

More prominent, or more deliberately manufactured than this background picture of learned heretics is a theme of a false appearance of piety that characterizes heretics in the Dominican sources, as it does in many places in the anti-heretical tradition. In the *Libellus* account of Diego of Osma's journey to France, a church council at Montpellier explains to Diego, when he enquires, that the local heretics deceive the people by arguing and preaching, and by 'simulate sanctitatis exemplis'.[149] Jean de Mailly, who produced an abbreviated version of Jordan's account, omits the arguing and preaching, and reports only the 'false appearance of virtue'.[150] A rather striking example of the same theme can be found in one of the stories in the *Vitae fratrum* – a story that represents the only other inclusion in this text of doctrinal detail – in which Florimund, a young Tuscan adherent of the Cathar sect, here called the 'Albigensians', discovers after years of membership that the true nature of the doctrine is dualist. 'Nescis tu adhuc, quod dyabolus hec visibilia fecit?' he is asked, to which he relies that no, he did not know that, though he has been in the sect for twelve years, an omission reminiscent, if nothing else, of the differing levels of initiation that Raniero Sacconi makes so clear. On learning of this deception, Florimund demands Scriptural proof, and, when this proves inadequate, he decides he cannot accept this belief, and looks for another; unsurprisingly he chooses Catholicism and becomes a Dominican, hence the story's inclusion here.[151]

The same idea again finds another interesting expression in the work of a now familiar Dominican, Stephen of Bourbon, who also employs this motif. He uses a quotation from Matthew, 'excoriant facies suas, ut videantur ab hominibus jejunantes' to reinforce his point that heretics mislead people with the sophistry and duplicity of their words. Stephen's description of the Waldensians, 'speciem sanctitatis et fidei pretendentes', also includes the very illustrative though more

---

[148] *Vitae fratrum*, pp.236-39.
[149] Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, p.36.
[150] Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.54.
[151] *Vitae fratrum*, pp.184-86.

literally intended, 'quasi Proteus se transfigurabat'. The latter description refers rather to their physical appearance, but it also recalls the language of the Corinthians verse on the pseudo-apostles, often attached to heretics' false appearance.[152]

The theme of false appearance, for which many examples could be given from these sources, is of course not peculiar to the Dominican material, but is rather a staple of anti-heretical writing. Within the Dominican tradition, however, at least as it is presented in these texts, that false appearance, and indeed the heretics more generally, seem to serve as a foil to the brethren, to emphasize the importance of example, as well as preaching and debate, in the Dominican ethos. Heresy, or rather the activities of the heretics are presented as a stimulus to Dominican activity, and for many of the Order's early recruits, such as Peter Martyr and the young Tuscan man, Florimund. The most obvious example of this function is the occasion on which Diego, in Jordan's account, draws a parallel between the heretics and the pseudo-apostles, and persuades the Cistercian legates that the false sanctity of the heretics can only be defeated by a display of genuine holiness, 'fictam sanctitatem vera religione fugate, quia fastus pseudoapostolorum evidento vult humilitate convinci'; so they must lose their luxuries, and in this Diego leads the way himself.[153] The one story involving heretics that Gerard includes in his account of St. Dominic revolves around the quiet and steadfast patience shown by the saint towards a heretic who has deliberately led him astray, through thorns and brambles, while he is on his way to the famous debate at Montréal. By his shining example, which is of course the point of the story, he is able to win the man over and convert him.[154] There is further mockery of St. Dominic himself, in the *Libellus* and Jean de Mailly's account, all of which allows an opportunity for the Dominican figures to demonstrate their forbearance, as well as their divine sanction, when such mockery is punished by miracles.[155] Likewise, in the story of the heretic who feigns

---

[152] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.311, 293. In the Württemberg Bible Society edition of the vulgate, the text of Mt VI.16 runs thus: 'demoliuntur enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes', *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. R. Weber et. al. (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1969), vol. 2, p. 1534; Clementine version, 'exterminant enim facies suas, ut appareant hominibus ieiunantes', *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam Clementinam*, ed. A. Colunga and L. Turrado (4th edn., Salamanca, 1965). 2.Cor.XI.13-15.

[153] Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, p.36.

[154] *Vitae fratrum*, p.68. Other examples of Dominicans enduring the mockery of heretics, *Vitae fratrum* pp.225f.; p.240.

[155] Jordan, *MOPH* XVI, pp.41-42; Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.55.

possession to escape the attention of the inquisitors that we saw earlier in Thomas of Cantimpré's *exempla* collection, the 'possessed' heretic pays no respect to the ability of St. Acharius, and is duly punished.[156] The representation of heretics, then, also plays a wider role in the construction of the Dominicans themselves, in their own self-awareness, and it is to this function that we will now turn.

ii –The role of heresy in Dominican self-consciousness

The Order of Preachers was an important element in the church's fight against heresy; it supplied many of the papal inquisitors of heretical depravity and some of the polemicists who appeared in the previous chapter, in particular Moneta of Cremona. Perhaps more effective against heresy in the long term however, was their preaching mission, which provided an alternative to the Cathar preachers in an area long deprived of a strong church presence. It seems useful then, at this point, to consider the significance of heresy and its repression to Dominican identity in the writings that we have just looked at.

Such an examination must follow Luigi Canetti's work *L'invenzione della memoria,* which looks specifically at the development of this internal tradition of the Order, of a Dominican idea of themselves in these early hagiographical works.[157] For Canetti, the development of Dominican identity is closely tied to, and indeed can be traced through the development of the image of their founder-Saint, St. Dominic, as he is redefined into a series of prototypes, or models, for the Order's contemporary needs.[158] Using his framework of a consciously created Dominican identity, we can look at how heresy and the repression of heresy fits into the Dominicans' idea of themselves, in terms of their origin, their vocation, and their ongoing mission and activity.

Heresy appears consistently in the Dominican tradition in connection with the Order's origins in Diego's mission in Toulouse in the opening decade of the

---

[156] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, pp.269-70.
[157] L. Canetti, *L'invenzione della memoria; il culto e l'immagine di Domenico nella storia dei primi frati Predicatori* (Spoleto, 1996).
[158] This seems perhaps to be a perspective on the Dominican written tradition not dissimilar to the re-imagining of the lives of St Francis and the early Franciscan brethren by successive biographers in light of debates over poverty and the interpretation of the Rule, see for example J. Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517* (Oxford, 1968), pp.278-291.

thirteenth century. During this time, Dominic was preaching as part of the anti-heretical movement which swept the south in these early decades, initially as a companion to his Bishop, Diego of Osma, and then at the head of his own small group, and several significant encounters between Dominic and heretics are recorded in the various Lives. All of these texts cover similar ground with regard to Dominic's early encounters with heresy, of which a sketch follows, based on Jordan's account.

Whilst on a mission to Toulouse, Bishop Diego is moved to pity by the level to which heresy is ingrained in the region; meanwhile, his subprior, Dominic, converts their host, who is a heretic, by arguing with him all night; 'non posset hereticus resistere'.[159] Diego and his party then join a Cistercian legation sent to combat heresy, which is meeting with little success. Diego advises the monks to dispense with their excessive clothing and provisions, and lead by apostolic example, as he himself then does, sending most of his followers home, and retaining only a few who will stay with him and spread the faith. Among this number is, of course, the future St. Dominic. Dominic is soon able to demonstrate his latent sanctity in the famous miracle, which Jordan places at Fanjeaux: at a public debate between heretical and Catholic groups, the written arguments of both sides are subjected to trial by fire.[160] Dominic's text, which has been chosen by the Catholic side to represent their views, leaps unharmed from the fire. The heretics understand this, according to Jordan, as a sign that Diego (not Dominic) is holy and has been sent to learn their faith. Diego founds the convent of Prouille, to provide for the daughters of poor nobles who, because of their poverty must be educated by heretics. He remains in Toulouse for two years, and dies on his return to Spain.

Dominic is now left on his own in an unofficial capacity, with only a few companions, and at this time the Albigensian crusade is launched in the region. No explicit connection is made by Jordan; he simply tells us that Dominic remains in the region until the death of Simon de Montfort, 'constantly preaching the word of God'. Though this is not specified as anti-heretical preaching, Dominic endures threats and mockery from the heretics with characteristic patience, and an apparent desire for martyrdom. He tries to sell himself to save a man who follows the

---

[159] Jordan, *MOPH* XVI pp.33-34.

[160] The earliest account of this miracle, by Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, to which Humbert returns in his version, places it not at Fanjeaux, but at Montréal; Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, *Hystoria albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon (3 vols., Paris, 1926-39), pp.47-49.

heretics only because, Jordan says, they provide for him funds that he cannot otherwise find. Dominic apparently continues in this vein for around ten years, until the time of the Fourth Lateran Council, but no further details of this time are provided, and heresy does not make another appearance in Jordan's account of the 'Origins of the Order of Preachers'.

What is interesting with regard to the role of heresy is the way in which the significance of these same basic events develops in the course of the later *legendae* and their representation of the Order's foundation, something that Canetti's evaluation of these sources makes clear. Perhaps the most obvious change is the gradual replacement over time of Diego with Dominic as the principal actor in this phase of the Saint's life, something which the promotion of Dominic's cult and the re-attribution to him of the role of founder would naturally have made necessary.[161] The next of the lives to appear, Ferrandi's *legenda*, is certainly based on Jordan's original version, but adds a lot of its own material. Diego is still present in the same capacity, but now it is Dominic who is presented as the one who is moved by the heresy he sees in the Midi, and the miracle of the fire at Fanjeaux is accentuated when the text is made to leap a further two times from the fire.[162] Ferrandi follows the same pattern as Jordan until Dominic's attempt to sell himself, at which point he adds a story in which Dominic converts some Toulousain nobles from heresy, by outdoing the heretics who are staying with them in his levels of abstinence and abnegation during Lent. That new section is striking in the invective that it introduces into the hitherto rather dry descriptions of the heretics inherited from Jordan, calling on many anti-heretical staples, including the ravening wolves and a false appearance of sanctity, to illustrate its attack. From this point, this story forms an integral part of the following lives. Ferrandi also adds that the heretics are twisted with envy at Dominic's all round perfection.[163] With Constantine's account,

---

[161] A. Reltgen-Tallon, 'L'historiographie des Dominicains du Midi: une mémoire originale?', *CF*, 36 (2001), 395-414, p.398.

[162] Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI, pp.216; 220; Perhaps influenced by Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's version, in which the paper leaps unharmed from the fire three times; Ferrandi also doubles the number of times Dominic tries to sell himself, adding a reflection of the original (itself of rather dubious veracity) in which Dominic tries again to sell himself to help a lady whose brother is held by Saracens.

[163] Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI, pp.225-26; 228.

the suggestion that the heretics wanted Diego is omitted from the Fanjeaux miracle account, and there is no mention of Prouille or its foundation. By the time we reach Humbert's *legenda*, again, it is Dominic who is initially disturbed by the heresy, as Humbert lifts this almost entirely from Ferrandi, but now it is also Dominic who is the founder of Prouille.[164]

The view of the Order's origins that these texts present seems to exist in varied perspectives in other 'internal' Dominican works. Stephen of Bourbon, for example, in an accidental remark, places the founding of the Order at Diego's abandonment of his retinue in order to preach in the Midi, but does not connect it with heresy.[165] However, though heresy is not given as the sole reason for, or tied explicitly to the foundation of the Order in even the later *legendae*, for Gerard of Frachet this is certainly the case. The first paragraph of his section on Brothers who have died for the faith, which begins with an account of the Martyrs of Avignonet and Peter of Verona, opens: 'cum ordo predicatorum a beato Dominico contra hereses et errores specialiter fuerit institutus Tolose', and goes on to make an explicit connection between this and the assignment of the office of inquisition to the brothers – though curiously he fails to mention any heretical involvement in his description of the murder of William Arnold and Stephen of St. Thibéry and their party.[166] Guillaume de Pelhisson is equally confident that the repression of heresy represents the vocation and principal reason for the founding of his order: 'beati Dominici…dictum Ordinem instituit contra hereticos et eorum credentes'.[167]

Perhaps more significant for the place of heresy in the Dominican tradition however, is the reinterpretation of Dominic's life and image in light of the Order's subsequent involvement in the office of inquisition. There has been some dispute, most notably between Thouzellier and Vicaire, over whether or not Dominic himself could ever be called an 'inquisitor'. Thouzellier believed that he was, if not

---

[164] Humbert, *MOPH* XVI, pp.377; 382; interesting here, Humbert leaves Ferrandi's account to revert to Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's for the fire miracle, making it not only a private event, but also placing it at Montréal, as Peter does. One MS of Constantine apparently also has this as an alternative, though here it gives this as an alternative happening at Montréal, whereas Humbert says that a similar event happened at Fanjeaux, Constantine, *MOPH* XVI, p.296.

[165] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.79; this version does not appear to correspond to those found in any of the Lives.

[166] *Vitae fratrum*, p.231. The account of Dominic in the *Vitae fratrum* only includes one occurrence of heresy, and it is not one recorded in the *legendae*, though this is perhaps because, being concurrent with Humbert's official account, this could not be a 'life' of Dominic, Canetti, *L'invenzione*, p.479.

[167] *Guillaume Pelhisson, Chronique (1229-1244) suivie du récit des troubles d'Albi,* ed. J. Duvernoy (Paris, 1994); p.34; see also pp.64; 96.

an inquisitor, then a 'precocious example of inquisitorial zeal', to use the phrase that so annoyed Vicaire, operating within a well-established papal tradition of repression. Vicaire thought the whole thing anachronistic, that Dominic did none of the things that mark inquisitorial behaviour, such as legal inquiry or interrogation of witnesses.[168]

Whichever is closer to the truth in real terms, in the written tradition of St. Dominic at least, as Canetti shows, the Saint came to be represented more and more as a prototype of Dominican inquisitors. For Canetti, the 'providential anti-heretical significance' of Dominic's sanctity was tied to the Order's involvement in inquisition.[169] He concurs with Merlo's theory that the canonization of St. Dominic to some degree sanctioned the office of inquisition, and extends this further by placing the canonization in the context of Innocent III's policy of 'confusio heretice', via persuasion and coercion. The canonization itself then arose partly out of a need, both of the Order and the Pope, to legitimize this unpopular office.[170] The change appears first in the mid-century *Legenda* of Constantine; up until this point in the hagiographical tradition, all contact between Dominic and heresy had taken place very firmly in the years before Dominic founded his Order. Now Constantine adds two more examples post-foundation, in the process of accumulating miracles around the figure of St. Dominic which marks this version of the Life.[171] The first is a story in which a huge and rather unpleasant cat assails Dominic and nine ladies who are wavering between heresy and Catholicism, and who have come to Dominic for advice; this story is repeated almost verbatim by Stephen of Bourbon. The second sees Dominic saving one of a group of heretics from the pyre after having a premonition that he will convert. What is perhaps significant about this account is

---

[168] This debate can be found in *Annales du Midi*, LXXX (1968) 121-138.

[169] Canetti, *L'invenzione*, p.103.

[170] Constantine, according to Father Tugwell, 'had all the instincts of the worst kind of hagiographer', S. Tugwell, 'Notes on the Life of St. Dominic', *AFP*, LXV (1995), 5-169, p.31. Canetti, *L'invenzione*, pp.244; 96. All of the Lives of St. Dominic are post-canonization, so the change in his image must be part of an ongoing process. At the time Jordan was writing his *Libellus*, the office of inquisition was still young, and had perhaps not yet built up the level of hostility that it later acquired. Papal policy certainly seems to be to regard the Order in this way, at least to some degree (though Cistercians and Franciscans continued to make up an equally important part of the Papal inquisition). Gregory's original mandate for the commission for Dominic's canonization does indeed mention heresy. A letter sent by the Cardinals to the Order after the killing of Peter of Verona, which Gerard of Frachet reproduces, seems similarly to regard the Order as being instituted to deal with heresy, at least in some capacity. A letter of Innocent IV to Raymond of Peñafort entitled *De haeresi extirpanda* similarly regards the Order in this light: 'in his autem, nobis fratres vestri ordinis Dominus specialiter voluit esse adjutores', Mansi, vol.23, col.568.

[171] Reltgen-Tallon, 'L'historiographie des Dominicains', p.399.

that Constantine tells us that it was Dominic himself who convicted the heretics, though he is said to be on a preaching mission.[172] Both of these additions are included by Humbert in his *legenda*. Stephen of Salanhac, writing slightly later, makes this connection explicit, in his gloss interpreting the signs around Dominic's birth. By the time of Bernard Gui's continuation of Stephen's *De quatuor in quibus* in the early part of the fourteenth century, this image of Dominic as the first inquisitor was firmly established.[173]

Canetti's very useful model of the role of St. Dominic as the key to the Dominican identity, both generally in the development of the Order's consciousness, and specifically in the case of their involvement in inquisition, helps us to understand also the role that heresy plays in these sources, even though the exact nature of this role is not necessarily always clear or consistent in these or in the more peripheral texts of the Dominican tradition. Not many of the witnesses of Dominic's canonization process, for example, seem to have felt heresy to be a significant part of Dominic's life; only two of the nine in the Bologna process, and five of the twenty-three in the Toulousain process mention it. Of course these are previous to the rewriting and reinterpretation, but even despite the developments in the tradition of Dominic, the majority of his contact with heresy in these sources is presented as occurring in the period of his life before he founded the Order; there was surely more anti-heretical material to be found in Dominic's later involvement in preaching missions in Lombardy, which was directed, not entirely, but primarily against heresy, for those looking to enhance his image as a specifically anti-heretical Saint.

There does in fact seem to be a certain level of ambivalence in the Dominican representation of their actions in connection with heresy. Action against heretics is rarely emphasized, and it is also rare to find any specifically judicial element. What is emphasized instead is the 'zeal for souls' with which St. Dominic is so frequently characterized, conversion and the good example of the brethren. Even in the story of Peter Martyr, which is full to the brim with heresy, there is no story concerning his action as an inquisitor – he debates with heretics, he is chosen by the Pope to be an inquisitor, we are told that he pursues heretics, but see none of this described, and then he is martyred. Gerard of Frachet, though he describes Peter

---

[172] Constantine, *MOPH* XVI, pp.320-21; 321-22.
[173] Canetti, *L'invenzione*, pp.253-55; 102-103.

as an inquisitor, does not frame any of his encounters with heretics in the context of an inquisition; similarly his account of the Martyrs of Avignonet.

Perhaps more significant is the fact that, in many of the texts cited above, where there is any action against heretics, inquisitorial or otherwise, there are no consequences for the heretics involved, unless it is conversion, or confutation. None of the heretical opponents in the various public debates that appear in these accounts are ever handed over to the secular arm; indeed often any retribution or defeats that they may suffer are not through the agency of the Friars Preacher, but by divine intervention. They may leave defeated, or converted, but they are not seen to be punished by the Dominicans.

No mention is made at all of the papal commission to the Order of the office of inquisition in the *Chronica ordinis*, despite the fact that it demonstrates a general concern to record official progression and appointments of the order, and to align itself with papal policy.[174] There appears to be some ambiguity, too, about the office of inquisition in Humbert de Romans's views on preaching. Humbert's *Liber eruditione* aims very determinedly to confirm and defend preaching as the vocation of the Order.[175] Heresy may perhaps form part of the stimulus to this vocation, if the 'demons' who have applied considerable diligence 'a longo tempore ad subjugandum sibi mundum totum' can be understood in this way, but it remains only one reason in this chapter on the necessity of preaching, and does not represent a vocation in itself.[176] Brett shows Humbert to be accepting of inquisition, but not uncritical.[177] He also points to Humbert's view that 'odious occupations' that cause hostility, such as 'receptio compromissorum, inquisitiones, visitationes, et hujusmodi judicalia', should be avoided by the preacher, so as not to prevent his preaching having good effects.[178] Though Tugwell's observation that this does not

---

[174] The *Chronica ordinis* is appended to Reichert's edition of the *Vitae fratrum* in *MOPH*, I (1896), 321-338.
[175] Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.182.
[176] Humbert de Romans, *Opera de vita regularis*, ed. J.J. Berthier (2 vols., orig. Rome, 1888-89, repr. Turin, 1956), vol.2, p.377; Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.187.
[177] E.T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans, his Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto, 1984), p.166.
[178] The phrase is echoed in another of Humbert's works, *Super constitutiones fratrum praedicatorum*: 'secundum est [impedimenta fructus animarum] officia odiosa, ut sunt inquisitiones, visitationes et correctiones violentae, exactiones testamentorum arbitrorum sententiae, ex quibus conturbatur frequenter hominum devotio ad fratres', Humbert, *Opera*, vol.2, pp.474; 36; ref. in Brett, *Humbert of Romans*, p.165.

necessarily refer exclusively to inquisitions of heretical depravity is of course true, these latter must surely still be covered by this list.[179]

At the same time however, a few of these authors are very matter of fact, and indeed quite explicit about the functions of, and their involvement in, the inquisitorial process. As we saw above, several times in his *Tractatus,* Stephen of Bourbon describes himself as an inquisitor, and occasionally he tells us also that he has been present at this or that trial, though he never implicates himself in their fate directly. Guillaume Pelhisson is even less coy than this, though of course inquisition is a much more central part of his narrative than it is for Stephen, where it is more incidental. Guillaume gives us the details of his own very explicit involvement, with no qualms whatsoever: 'Frater Arnaldus Cathalanus et Frater Guillelmus Pelhisso in Albia faciebant inquisitionem...contra hereticos, ubi Petrum de Podio Perdito et Petrum de Bono Mancipio condempnaverunt, qui vivi combusti sunt'.[180] Perhaps, as Reltgen-Tallon suggests, there is more than one Dominican tradition, or at least, more than one strand to the wider narrative, as these latter writers, both from the Midi, would be part of the southern tradition of writers that she describes who were more able than the northern, university based Dominicans to reconcile their involvement in inquisition with the wider Dominican vocation, and indeed saw their work as forming a continuum with the original purpose of Dominic's early years.[181] It is surely also worth considering that both these writers were themselves active inquisitors in the South of France for many years. Yet, we also find a view from a distance, in Thomas of Cantimpré's account of Gilles Boogris. He tells us that Gilles hides because he fears that he will be discovered and burned by the Dominicans. Moreover, he casually remarks, almost in an aside, that this was the time when 'they had made many climb upon the fire'.[182]

It is probably worth making a brief comparison here with the contemporary Franciscan equivalent tradition, and the role that heresy plays there, if any. A search for descriptions of heresy in these texts, the lives of St. Francis and of St Anthony, and the Order's chronicles, yields a very scanty return in comparison to the Dominican texts that we have just looked at. Like the Dominican construct, the Franciscan portrayal of heresy focuses on usually undistinguished, often

---

[179] Tugwell, *Early Dominicans*, p.324, n.76.
[180] Pelhisson, *Chronique*, p.58.
[181] Reltgen-Tallon, 'L'historiographie des Dominicains du Midi', *passim.*
[182] Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*, pp.269-70.

background figures, who tend to fulfil a similar *exemplum*-style purpose of illustrating the sanctity of Franciscan notables, with no involvement in inquisition made explicit.[183] While the appearance is similar however, there is no parallel in either the relative prominence that heretics have in the Dominican texts, or in the role that they play in the formation of a regular identity. Interestingly though, there is one story that is strangely analogous to the image of Dominican brothers competing with heretics on same criteria of piety and apostolic lifestyle in the south of France. Some Franciscan missionaries to France are asked if they are heretics, to which they respond, in all innocence, that yes, they are. The confusion is resolved in this case, but some missionaries to Germany who encounter the same situation are less fortunate.[184]

IV

Across the whole range of these texts, then, there is a strong impression of heresy as a contemporary phenomenon, of material that seems to address and describe events from memory or experience. Such an impression stems not only from the use of recent material and names, but also from the fact that in many of the places that heresy appears in these works, it is as a commonplace and sometimes un-remarked feature of contemporary life. Though the picture of heresy throughout these sources is varied, several constants seem to function in its representation, not least the anti-

---

[183] The main examples of this are: The holiness of St. Francis confounds heretics and extols the faithful, Thomas de Celano *vita prima*, pt.1, cap.xxii, p.47, Thomas de Celano *legenda chori*, para. 9, p.122, Julianus de Spira cap.x, p.357; St. Francis performs a miracle with a capon and confounds a heretic, Thomas de Celano, *vita secunda*, pt.2, cap.xlviii, pp.177-78, (see also *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Maggioni, vol.2, p.1028); St. Francis converts Patarines, Henrici Abrincensis, *legenda versificata.* lib.vi. l.140, p.447; page references are to *Analecta franciscana, sive chronica aliaque varia documenta ad historiam fratrum minorum,* vol.X (Quaracchi and Florence, 1926-41). Also, Anthony of Padua converts some heretics through preaching and debate: *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae quarum altera huosque inedita*, ed. Leon de Kerval (Paris, 1904), pp.41-42.

[184] *The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany*, tr. E. Gurney-Salter (London, 1926), pp.132-34. The dangers of the language barrier rear their head; the brothers spoke little German, and simply replied "ja" to all questions asked of them, that method having initially proved effective. The luckier ones seem only to have lost their habits, but Jordan says that, from this point on, 'Germany was considered ... to be such a ferocious country that only those inspired by a longing for martyrdom would dare to return thither'. The unfortunate fate of the Franciscan brothers perhaps suggests that heretics were common enough in both regions that all indeterminate wandering religious were assumed to be heretics.

heretical staple of false appearance. Often, also, a connection to supernatural powers is made, either in terms of the power or origin of the heretics, or in terms of their punishment.

In the context of edification and improvement more generally, stories of heresy and the lives of heretics, to a greater or lesser degree, seem to serve most often as plausible and effective cautionary elements, usually in the service of some wider point. Any edifying purpose is not aimed at the heretics themselves; rather heretics are used as a tool for the improvement of others, something that rests in large part on their plausibility and familiarity as a feature of the contemporary landscape. It is most obvious in the case of the *exempla* collections, but heresy also serves a similar function in the 'internal' Dominican texts, where the Order's historical involvement with heresy is not only reported, but also used selectively in the creation of a Dominican identity.

A final point that needs to be mentioned in the context of these sources is the predominance of the figure in their representation of heresy, with the exception of the *Summae auctoritatum*. The individual heretic forms the basis for, and usually the focus of these discussions, and not the heretical error or belief itself. The balance between the figure and the system is one of the more important aspects of the representations that emerges from the examinations of all our source materials, not only the texts that have been considered here, and will be explored in much greater detail in a subsequent chapter. That balance can become quite complex, as in the case of our polemical sources, and the condition of the heretic as an individual is certainly something that forms an important element of the picture of heresy found in inquisition records, as John Arnold's work has shown.

The only texts which seem rather incongruous in this category are those that we looked at first, the *Summae auctoritatum*, which seem to be, and indeed are framed as, expositions of Catholic doctrine to be used for preaching to the faithful and for teaching basic elements of doctrine to the general populace, a policy that was certainly beginning to emerge in contemporary canon-legal provisions against heresy.[185] They differ from our other edifying texts, however, in their lack of representation, surely due rather to their abbreviated nature, but also in their concentration not, as in the other material, on the figure and characteristics of the

[185] See below, p.115.

heretic, but instead on points of heretical doctrine. The *Summae auctoritatum* appear more connected, in fact, to the polemical tradition; we have seen with our polemics that they tend to proceed against heresy first by refutation, and then by defence and reinforcement of the Catholic faith, a pattern that the *Summae* resemble closely, their design allowing them to function both in an edifying role, and as a more active form of the polemic approach for use in the debate arena that the Dominican and *exempla* traditions describe so often. All this serves as a reminder of the fluidity of the generic boundaries between these texts.

Chapter 3 – Canon-Legal texts

quis in tenebris ambulet, quis in luce [1]

The representations of heresy that we have looked at so far have all been located in what could loosely be termed a literary context; next to that material, a substantial corpus of legislation against heresy was developing, which formed a distinctive anti-heretical tradition all of its own. Of course ultimately, in our period, that tradition increasingly meant the documentary output of inquisition, but the texts produced by that process will be considered in their own right in the following chapter. This chapter will consider the representation of heresy within the wider tradition of canon law, through conciliar material, and through the textbooks of canon law. The former group, which we will look at first, will include both the canons of the ecumenical councils, which for our period are principally those of the fourth Lateran council, as well as the canons of the various regional councils, in which much of the more specifically anti-heretical provisions were put in place. Next to the direct legislation, we will look at the textbook material that provided the basis for the teaching of canon law, those collections of authorities that informed the wider understanding of the law, namely Gratian's *Decretum*, and the *Liber Extra* of Gregory IX. A systematic and exhaustive description of the vast legal context of heresy is not the purpose here – there will be no serious consideration of imperial or civil law, for example. Rather, the aim is to delineate the main features of the canon-legal treatment of heresy, through an examination of those texts that either *are* the principal example of their genre, or which can be taken as representative. To that end, we will begin with a brief panoramic view of heresy as it appears in the conciliar decrees.

---

[1] Narbonne 43, canon 5, Mansi, vol.23, col.357.

I – Ecumenical Councils

Heresy had been a central concern of the ecumenical councils since the early days of the Catholic church. At the time of those early councils, Catholicism was itself crystallizing out of a variety of opinions. According to Markus's scheme of development, after the year 200 the church entered a new phase of self-definition in which the demarcation and ownership of true doctrine became the principal criteria for Christian identity.[2] For that reason, most of the early councils are directed specifically against one or more heretical groups: the first council of Nicaea addresses the Arian heresy, Ephesus deals with Nestorianism. The condemnation of heresy was usually accompanied by a statement of orthodox doctrine – the most notable example of such a statement being, of course, the Nicene creed.[3]

For our period, ecumenical meetings begin in earnest with the Lateran councils, the first of which was held in 1123.[4] At a broad level, the church councils of the twelfth century were beginning generally to devote more space, more often, to the repression of the re-emergent problem of heresy. Apart from those councils dedicated to specific individuals – the suppression of Abelard's writings at Sens in 1140, for example – regional meetings were also instituting measures against heresy on a wider scale. The view of heresy taken by these councils indicates a shift in attitude; the 1148 council at Rheims describes a differentiated group, with leaders and followers, but neither the names nor the errors of these leaders are given. The councils that took place at Toulouse in 1119, and at Tours in 1163, take a more general view of heresy still. Though brief, the canons dedicated to this subject by

---

[2] R.A. Markus, 'The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church', in E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, volume One, The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries* (London, 1980), 1-15, pp.11-13. W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (London, 1972), chapter 7, p.130ff. On this process in the high medieval period, see J. Nelson, 'Society, Theodicy and the Origins of Heresy: Towards a Reassessment of the Medieval Evidence', in D. Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Studies in Church History, 9 (1972), 65-77.

[3] J. Alberigo et al. (eds.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, transl. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London and Washington, 1990), vol.1 Nicaea 1 to Lateran 5; Nicaea 1 325, can.8 p.9; can.19 p.15; Constantinople 1 381, can.6-7 pp.33-35; Ephesus 431, pp.40-74; Nicaea 2 787, can.9, p.146. Orig. *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* ed. J. Alberigo et al. (Bologna, 1962).

[4] *DEC*, vol.1: Lateran 1 1123, pp.190-94, see can.5 p.190; Lateran 2 1139, pp.197-203, see can.30 p.203; Lateran 3 1179, pp.211-25, see can.27 pp.224-25. Lateran 4 is on pp.230-71 of *DEC*, but references here will be to the Garcia edition, *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*, ed. A. García y García (Vatican City, 1981), see cans.1-3, pp.41-51. See earlier discussion by Maisonneuve, *Études*, Lateran 3, esp. pp.133-39; Lateran 4, esp. pp.229-33.

these two councils describe and condemn large and undefined groups of 'heretics'.[5] It is worth noting briefly at this point that in all these canons, the condemnations are based on actions, whether this be opposition to church ritual or simply material support of those condemned. Overall a view is developing of a heresy that is located in a wider, less defined group than the named sects of the early councils.

The twelfth-century ecumenical councils also show a similar development. In both the first and second of the Lateran councils, in 1123 and 1139, specific individuals are condemned for heresy, namely, the anti-popes Gregory VIII and Anacletus II. In both these cases, the canons specifically outlaw and nullify ordinations and acts passed by these two, and in neither council do these canons represent a large or significant element of the council as a whole.[6] Both condemnations address a kind of heresy similar to that of the early councils, against named individuals, but the second, against Anacletus, includes 'aliis schismaticis et haereticis', and the 1139 council also contains a canon directed at a much less specific group. In response to the appearance of Arnold of Brescia, Peter of Bruys and the like, canon twenty-three repeats the sentence of Toulouse twenty years earlier. Here are condemned as heretics 'eos autem qui religiositatis speciem simulantes, Domini corporis et sanguinis sacramentum, baptisma puerorum…damnant' and so on, and further, 'defensores quoque ipsorum eiusdem damnationis vinculo innodamus'.[7]

The third Lateran council of 1179 develops that generalizing tone further, and reflects the trend developing in some of the lesser councils, such as Tours. In its final, twenty-seventh canon, alongside a condemnation of mercenary groups, the council focuses on a broad target, those that 'alii Catharos, alii Patrinos, alii Publicanos, alii aliis nominibus vocant'. Though still directed at a named enemy, this is now an enemy of much greater numbers, spread through Gascony, the

---

[5] P. Fredericq (ed.), *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae* (5 vols., Ghent, 1889), vol.1, Toulouse 1119, no.23, p.29; Rheims 1148, no.31, p.33; Rheims 1157, no.34, pp.35-36; Tours 1163, no.39, p.39. Heretics are further specified, geographically, as 'Albigensian' in the title of the Tours canon.

[6] Gregory VIII (*Burdinus haeresiarcha*), Lateran 1, can.5, *DEC* vol.1, p.190; Anacletus II ('…ordinationes factas a Petro Leonis et aliis schismaticis et haereticis'), in Lateran 2, can.30, *DEC* vol.1, p.203. On Gregory VIII and Anacletus in the Lateran councils see R. Foreville, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, *Latran I, II, III et Latran IV* (Paris, 1965), pp.44-45; 73-74.

[7] Lateran 2, can.23, *DEC*, vol.1, p.202. Foreville, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, pp.86-88.

regions of Albi and Toulouse 'et aliis locis'.[8] It is also at this point that refinements to the structure of the heretical group are made, as it is here that the familiar inquisitorial categories of *defensores* and *receptatores,* already present in a limited form the second Lateran council, and in some of the regional meetings, begin to appear in the language of the universal councils as more distinct categories.[9] Without doubt though, the most significant shift in the ecumenical treatment of heresy comes with the fourth Lateran council and the advent of the pontificate of Innocent III.

From the beginning of his reign in 1198, Innocent placed the fight against heresy at the forefront of his policy. In 1199 he issued the famous decretal *Vergentis in senium*, which we will look at in detail later, and of course the Albigensian crusade was launched under his auspices in the early decades of the thirteenth century; this was 'a pope known to be anxious about the growth of heresy'.[10] Innocent's determination to purge Christian society of heresy reached its legislative apex in the great council of 1215.[11] According to García, the marked juridical tone of this council was due in large part to Innocent the canonist, and though the precise authorship of the canons themselves is uncertain, the importance of Innocent's personal influence in their composition is indisputable.[12]

No longer tucked away in the recesses as in earlier councils, heresy and its repression are granted pride of place at the very beginning of the fourth Lateran canons, and it is these canons that continue to represent the main ecumenical treatment of heresy in our period. The two general councils that were held during the thirteenth century in Lyons, outside the reach of imperial influence, have little to say on the matter of heresy, despite the condemnation of Frederick II by the first of these councils in 1245.[13] Suspicion of heresy is only one of four charges levelled at Frederick by the bull of deposition, and the proofs of this heresy lie in erroneous

---

[8] *DEC*, vol.1, p.224.
[9] Foreville, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, pp.146-47.
[10] J. Nelson, 'Religion in "Histoire totale": Some Recent Work in Medieval Heresy and Popular Religion', in *Religion*, 10 (1980), 60-85, p.73.
[11] C. Morris, *The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050-1250* (Oxford, 1989), p.442ff.
[12] A. García y García, 'El concilio IV de Letrán (1215) y sus comentarios', *Traditio*, 14 (1958), 484-502, p.486; for a useful discussion of the authorship of the canons, see García, *Lateran 4*, pp.5-11.
[13] There is nothing on heresy in Lyons II, though its statement of the doctrine of the procession of the holy spirit insists that proceeds from Father and Son, but not as from two principles, *DEC*, vol.1, can.II.1, p.314. On Frederick II see H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol. 7, *Lyons I et Lyons II* (Paris, 1966), pp.17-26. On political uses of heresy, see A. Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society. On the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World', in Bruschi and Biller, 23-41.

actions rather than beliefs, including the demonstration of a general disregard for the authority of the papacy. In any case, the attachment of this condemnation to the council proper is not entirely secure, and its promulgation seems to have been limited.[14] The next serious attention paid to heresy by the canons of an ecumenical council comes with the council of Vienne, in 1311-12, which likewise opened with a doctrinal decree, and condemned, among others, the Templars and the Beguines.[15] The anti-heretical provisions of the fourth Lateran council, however, and indeed those of the third, continued to be influential throughout the thirteenth century and beyond, both in their own right, due to their wide manuscript distribution, and as a result of their inclusion in the section of the *Liber extra* that deals with heresy.[16]

The fourth Lateran constitutions define heresy in a very broad and generalized way. The second of its canons deals with specific doctrinal errors of Joachim of Fiore, and also outlaws the teaching of Amalric, to which we will return shortly, but the main provision against heresy, which constitutes the third canon, gives its subject no name, and no body of errors is described or addressed. Heresy is defined here not by what it is, but by what it is not, namely, by the creed that forms the opening constitution of the council.

For the first time since late antiquity, the 1215 council sets forth a full and clearly defined statement of faith, and, like previous creeds, its formulation can be seen to be in part motivated and determined by heresy and the need to draw lines of distinction.[17] The underlying presence of heresy in the fourth Lateran statement of faith, 'regarded as fully authoritative by subsequent synods' is easily discerned.[18] Error, especially that of the Cathars, has shaped the form and substance of the Catholic doctrine: like the *Summae auctoritatum*, a negative image of Catharism emerges from reading the articles set out here. The first paragraph begins with the statement 'quod unus solus et verus Deus' – not much of a departure – but the description of God as maker of all things visible and invisible, itself present in

---

[14] Introduction to council in *DEC*, vol.1, pp.274-77. Bull of deposition is on vol.1, pp.278-83.
[15] Vienne 1311-12, *DEC* vol.1, pp.360-401; error condemned on p.361; p.374; Beguines on pp. 380-3; *Ad nostrum* is on pp. 383-4. On Vienne and *Ad nostrum*, see R. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1972), pp.78-84; J. Leclerq, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.8, *Vienne* (Paris, 1964), Beguines and *Ad nostrum*, pp.159-61, Templars, pp.63-88, *passim*.
[16] According to García, the Lateran 4 constitutions are extant, either in whole or in part, in 64 manuscripts, García, *Lateran 4*, p.20; Introductions to councils in *DEC*, vol.1, pp.207-10, 228-29.
[17] Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, p.448.
[18] Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, p.512.

earlier creeds as a response to dualism, has been extended in a way that seems intended to counter specific Cathar claims about the nature of creation: 'unum universorum principium, creator omnium invisibilium et visibilium, spiritualium et corporalium...de nichilo condidit creaturam spiritualem et corporalem, angelicam videlicet et mundanam'. The statement that 'Diabolus enim et demones alii a Deo quidam natura creati sunt boni' is similarly suggestive, and there are other parts of the statement of faith which, again, seem to answer heretical tenets directly, 'omnes cum suis propriis resurgent corporibus', for example, or 'non solum autem virgines et continentes, verum etiam coniugati...placentes Deo'.[19]

It is not only Cathar heresy that has influenced the formulation of this constitution; other intellectual disputes and errors have also left their mark. The legacy of the various Eucharistic debates of the previous two centuries for example, means that Aristotelian language is used in the creed of the Eucharist, 'sub speciebus panis et vini', and 'transsubstantiatis', the first time non-Biblical language had been included in the decrees of the universal church.[20] The concerns over Trinitarian doctrine raised by the teaching of Joachim of Fiore, though treated in the second canon, also spill over into the creed. In fact, the first canon of the fourth Lateran council provides a neat answer for most of the doctrinal errors of its time.[21]

The creed is defined by heretical doctrine, and heresy in turn is defined specifically by the creed, as the opening line of canon three explicitly states: 'excommunicamus igitur et anathematizamus omnem heresim extollentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam et catholicam fidem, quam superius exposuimus'.[22] By this shift, from outlawing specific errors, to presenting a series of points which define error by exclusion, heresy as an error has been made a very general thing, doctrinally specific only in the negative, defined by its external status and undifferentiated within itself. The same shift that renders heresy general also demands that error be understood and dealt with in terms of these articles, as a point of doctrine.

---

[19] García, *Lateran 4*, pp.41-43. See comparison of Lateran 4 with Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds in Foreville, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, pp.276-79.
[20] Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, p.512.
[21] Foreville, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, pp.283-85.
[22] García, *Lateran 4*, p.47.

As if to prove this last point, the second canon of the council condemns Joachim of Fiore's treatise against Peter Lombard point by point, and defends the Lombard's Trinitarian doctrine in the same fashion. In its aim, this canon resembles those heresiarch-specific condemnations of earlier councils, and the brief denunciation of the 'perversissimum dogma impii Amalrici' is certainly in this mould, but the canon as a whole differs in its content in giving a rich description and exposition of the errors and doctrine involved, so much so that it can perhaps also be seen as an extension of the creed that constitutes that first canon. It also stands in marked contrast to the general and all-encompassing condemnation of heretics in the following constitution. The separation seems to represent the division between what are usually called 'popular' heresies, and the intellectual heresy of speculative theologians, but can perhaps also be seen as illustrative of the overlapping distinction between the heresy of individuals, and the heresy of groups.

Unlike previous councils, the fourth Lateran dispenses with names entirely in its general condemnation of heretics, and instead denounces 'universos hereticos quibuscumque nominibus censeantur, facies quidem habentes diversas, set caudas ad invicem colligatas'.[23] The above phrase is in fact drawn directly from *Ad abolendam*, and from Innocent's own decretal, *Vergentis in senium*, parts of which legislation in fact go into the make up of this canon.[24] The imagery that is contained in this phrase, and its wider significance will be explored in a later chapter, but it is worth noting at this point that it is a characterization that reflects the fact that all error is now defined by the same rejection of Catholic doctrine, although the connection between these heretics is their pride, not their belief. Like heresy, heretics are generalized, and no differentiation is made between different groups. The fourth Lateran treatment of heresy represents a movement from the brief, reactive, problem-specific articles of previous councils, to a universal condemnation of all heresy, defined here by opposition to a now more clearly defined orthodoxy.

---

[23] García, *Lateran 4*, p.47.

[24] *Vergentis in senium*, García, *Lateran 4*, p.49, lines 38-49; the council of Verona and *Ad abolendam*, García, *Lateran 4*, p.50, lines 64-75.

II – Regional Councils

The ecumenical constitutions were of course church-wide and influential, but in terms of quantity, the majority of conciliar material on the repression and treatment of heresy was being produced by the regional church councils. Although many regional meetings of this period concerned themselves in some way with the matter of heresy, our attention here will be turned toward only a selection of these smaller councils. So, we will pass gratefully over the issue of *Vox in Rama*, at Mainz in 1233, against an apparently Luciferan sect, and focus upon the richest and most concentrated cluster of regional meetings that were held in the south of France and Tarragona in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, and which were central to the construction of anti-heretical canon law.[25]

It was here in these lesser councils that much of the practical and legal regulations for action against heresy were set out, and a significant proportion of the body of laws that gradually came to comprise the procedure of inquisition were also introduced by their canons. According to Dossat's overview of the development of inquisitorial law, after 1255, during the pontificate of Alexander IV, conciliar activity was practically nil, and for the most part inquisitors were left to conduct their business under their own supervision.[26] He also observes that on the whole, Alexander's output with regard to heresy did little more than to reproduce earlier material; the period of real development for Dossat was during the reign of Gregory IX, 1227-1241.[27] Arnold identifies two phases to the accumulation of inquisitorial legislation, though he emphasizes that there is continuity, and that the two periods are not entirely exclusive. The first, driven by considerations arising out of the crusade, he places between 1227 and 1235. His second phase, between 1236 and 1254, is characterized by the emergence of a coherent and complete system, with properly defined categories.[28] The principal examples of regional conciliar action against heresy that will be considered here are therefore the councils of Narbonne, in 1227, Toulouse, in 1229, Béziers, in 1232, an important meeting at Tarragona in

---

[25] Mainz, 1233, Mansi, vol.23, cols.321-328.
[26] Dossat, *Crises*, p.195.
[27] Dossat, *Crises*, p.108ff.
[28] Arnold, *Inquisition*, pp.33-38.

1242, Narbonne again in 1243, another at Béziers in 1246, Valence, in 1248 and the 1254 council of Albi.[29]

A large proportion of the anti-heretical canons of these councils are concerned mainly to make provision for correct procedure, to ensure the legal obligations of secular authorities, and to lay down guidelines for punishment. Though relatively little space is devoted to the discussion of the real subject of all this procedure, it is nonetheless aimed squarely at the repression and control of the heretic, and of the several categories of individual that are attached to him; that is to say, the representation of heresy that we find here is, like the many of the texts that we looked at in the previous chapter, centred on the figures either of the heretic, or of his supporters. The different 'categories' of supporters, which indicated different grades of involvement and guilt, as noted above, began to appear in the twelfth century, and entered universal church legislation in the second and third Lateran councils. It was during the course of the thirteenth century, however, that they acquired their more precise meanings, as they came to be used in the context of inquisition. The canons produced by the council of Tarragona, a benchmark among these meetings, provided detailed definitions of the different grades, though as we shall see in the next chapter, the exact boundaries of these definitions remained problematic for inquisitors throughout this period.[30] In all the conciliar material considered here however, these groups remain in some way distinct from the heretic proper.

The definition of 'heretic' given by the council of Tarragona is very brief: 'heretici sunt, qui in suo errore perdurant'. Heretics are defined always in terms of belief, characterized as holders of error, and also by obstinacy in that error. Indeed obstinacy appears at least as frequently as error in the definition of a heretic. The first council of Béziers orders that all who are obstinate in their refusal to undergo

---

[29] *Sacrum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. G.D. Mansi (53 vols., Florence-Venice-Paris 1759-1927, repr. Graz 1961); vol.23: Narbonne 1227, cols.19-26; Toulouse 1229, cols.191-204; Béziers 1232 (dated 1233 in Mansi, see Dossat, *Crises*, p.109), cols.269-78; Tarragona 1242, cols. 553-58; Narbonne 1243 (dated 1235), cols.353-66; Béziers 1246, cols.689-704; Valence 1248, cols.769-780; Albi 1254, cols.829-852. Full text of Tarragona constitutions in Selge, *Texte*, pp.50-59. For council of Albi, 1230 see O. Pontal, *Les statuts synodaux Français du XIII^e siècle* (4 vols., Paris, 1971-95), vol.2, pp.8-33. See earlier discussion of these councils by Maisonneuve, *Études*, pp.287-307.

[30] The councils of Narbonne in 1227, Toulouse, and Béziers in 1232, all use some or all of the later familiar terms of *credentes, fautores, receptatores* and *defensores*. Narbonne 1227: *fautores* and *receptatores* canon 15, Mansi, vol.23, cols.24-25; Toulouse 1229: *credentes, fautores* and *receptatores* or *defensores* canon 1, Mansi, vol.23, cols.194-96; Béziers 1232: *credentes, fautores, receptatores* and *defensores*, canon 1, Mansi, vol.23, cols.270-71.

their punishment, that is, who will not wear their crosses, are to be considered as heretics.[31] Further, the first canon of this council, which states that 'haeretici et eorum credentes, fautores, eorum receptatores et defensores, singulis diebus Dominicis excommunicantur', then goes on, now omitting heretics deliberately from this list, to say that if one of 'praedictorum credentium, fautorum, receptatorum et defensorum', having been warned and excommunicated by name does not return to their senses, if they impede the inquisition, or remain stubborn in their refusal to make restitution within forty days of excommunication, then they should be punished as heretics, 'cum perseverantia et defensio erroris in talibus hominem faciat haereticum judicari'. This canon is repeated by the second of the councils held at Béziers.[32]

As the last example suggests, it is not only by definition that heretics are differentiated from the other grades of involvement, but also by the punishment and penances that are prescribed. Prison is the most common penance imposed on convicted heretics, though at times its punitive function appears more prominent: according to the council of Toulouse heretics who confess spontaneously are to receive penance, while only those who confess from fear can expect to be imprisoned. Later councils deny freedom to all converts, penitent or otherwise: a necessary measure, according to one council, because the conversion of many heretics is false.[33] A more structured system of punishment and penance is introduced into the conciliar material by the council of Tarragona. Here, 'haeretici perseverantes in errore' are to be given up to the secular arm, and prison is retained as a penitential measure. 'Perfecti haeretici', that is, the heretical élite, if they wish to convert, must be prepared for perpetual imprisonment.[34] The treatment is very brief in comparison with the penances handed down for the other levels of involvement. Even *credentes* are given much more opportunity to do penance outside prison, despite the fact that according to the definitions given by this council, their legal status is the same as *heretici.*

---

[31] Béziers 32, canon 4, Mansi, vol.23, col.271.
[32] Béziers 32, canon 1, Mansi, vol.23, col.270; Béziers 46, canon 8, Mansi, vol.23, cols.693-94.
[33] Toulouse, canons 10, 11, 15, Mansi, vol.23, cols.196-97. Arles, canon 6, Mansi, vol.23, col.338. 'Unde ne per tales, sub ficta conversionis specie, catholicae fidei professores perniciosius corrumpi contingat'.
[34] Tarragona, Selge, *Texte*, pp.51-52. Perhaps one reason why becoming an inquisitor was so appealing for converts like Raniero. Provisions were added in the council of Narbonne 1243 to allow those charged with heresy to enter religious orders, with special permission from the Pope, Narbonne 1243, canon 18, Mansi, vol.23, col.361.

Other punitive measures are imposed by these councils on those convicted as 'heretics' beyond a system of penance, and again different from the treatment of lesser grades. Like the social exclusion imposed by a prison sentence, these measures also segregate heretics legally and politically. The disinheritance of heretics and their families that was introduced by Innocent III in *Vergentis in senium* is reinforced in the regional meetings. Heretics, and those suspected of being heretics are barred from public office by the 1227 council of Narbonne, although these provisions are revised in later councils, and heretics seem cut off from the more inclusive approach taken to the lesser grades.[35] Heretics are therefore represented as different from the other groups, distinguished by the presence of belief, the brevity of treatment given to them, and by the physical and legal exclusion from the main body of believers that the sentence incurs.[36] They remain generic figures, only occasionally referred to by specific group names, though it is important to be aware that although 'heretic' is more often than not a general term, it can at times also be understood to refer specifically to the Cathars. Such a use is visible where 'heretics' are in direct contrast to another group, usually the Waldensians.[37]

Though the terminology that describes the supporters of heretics is in use for some time before the establishment of inquisition as the standard response to heresy, as with many aspects of anti-heretical procedure, it is not until the council of Tarragona in 1242 that they are explicitly defined in the conciliar legislation in a systematic way. The methodical and comprehensive nature of the Tarragona constitutions can be attributed to the presence at the council of the Dominican and renowned canon lawyer Raymond of Peñafort, compiler of the decretal collection that appeared under Gregory IX's name that will be discussed later in this chapter,

---

[35] Narbonne 27, canon 16, Mansi, vol.23, col.25; Béziers 32, canon 3, Mansi, vol.23, col.270, 'credentes et fautores hereticorum, seu defensores eorum' are forbidden from buying the office of bailiff. Selge, *Texte*, pp.57-59; Tarragona, Mansi, vol.23, cols.556-57, *formae poenitentiarum*.

[36] The term 'vested heretic' is also used to describe these individuals, 'heretici vestiti': Narbonne, canon 16, Mansi, vol.23, col.25; Toulouse, canon 10, Mansi, vol.23, col.196. Tarragona also has 'perfected heretics' Selge, *Texte*, p.52; Tarragona, Mansi, vol.23, col.555. See also below, p.145, n.42, and pp.179-80 on these terms.

[37] For the general use of heretics as synonymous with the Cathars in Languedoc, see J. Duvernoy, 'L'acception: 'haereticus' (iretge) = 'parfait cathare' en Languedoc au XIII^{e} siècle', in Lourdaux and Verhelst, *Concept*, 198-210.

and a former Master General of his order.[38] This is the only time in these councils that we see outlined in practical legal terms what is meant by the labels that are elsewhere used without definition, and as such we will use them as a guide to understand the broader ideas at work. What is of course immediately striking about the definitions of the different types of follower is the extent to which they are almost entirely based on specific actions.

To begin with the first sub-category, after the slightly ambiguous *credens* to which we will return, someone is 'suspectus de heresi' who has heard the preaching or reading of the heretics, prayed with or kissed them, or who believes them to be 'bonos homines'. Next are 'celatores' and 'occultatores', concealers and hiders; a distinction of intention is made between the former, those who see heretics and do not reveal them, and the latter, those who make a conscious choice before the fact not to reveal heretics. 'Receptatores', or receivers, are those who knowingly receive heretics into their house twice or more, and give them hospitality. 'Defensores', defenders, knowingly defend heretics by word or deed. A supporter of heretics, or 'fautor', is really a general term for those guilty of any or all of the above, or of providing any other help or advice. None of these lesser grades of heretical involvement are characterized by an error of belief, but are defined primarily by, and in terms, of physical actions and behaviour.

The partial exception to this rule are the 'credentes', who seem at times to occupy a sort of limbo between proper heretics, and the lesser grades. The council of Tarragona's definition of the 'believer' is even more cursory than that of the 'heretic': 'credentes vero dictis heresibus similiter heretici sunt dicendi'.[39] Yet, as seen above, *credentes* are not included in the penance assigned to heretics by the canons of this council. At Narbonne, in the following year, heretics and *credentes* are consistently equated in terms and in punishments. The general pattern though, before Tarragona, and indeed after the Narbonne council, is to place the *credentes* with the *fautores, defensores,* and *receptatores*, in a block separate from the heretics, as we saw in the first canon of the 1232 council of Béziers. The early council of Toulouse at times includes the *credentes* in the treatment of heretics, but there is no place for them in the provision for renunciation of error, and so no real

---

[38] Raymond was elected Master General in 1238, a post he resigned two years later, see Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (London and New York, 1995), pp. 222-3; *SOPMA* vol.3,p.283; *DdeS*, vol.13, cols.190-91.

[39] Selge, *Texte,* p.51; Tarragona, Mansi, vol.23, col.553-54.

equation on the grounds of belief.[40] As a general rule, heretics and supporters stand apart.

The Narbonne council of 1243 states that heretics or *credentes* who avoid their penance 'sic suam impoenitentiam, fictamque conversionem aperte ostendunt'.[41] Although the categorization of suspects depends on actions, statements such as the above would seem to suggest that these actions are seen to betray an inner allegiance or condition. The relationship between action and belief will be examined further in the next chapter, but there are two aspects of this idea that need to be noted here. First, and most important, is that though the inner condition of these groups is not ignored, neither is it prominent, nor connected to religious belief in any way, except again, occasionally in the case of *credentes*. Indeed the ultimate characteristic, and definition, of each of these lesser grades is that they are categorized not by their connection to heresy, but to heretics: they are defenders, supporters, receivers of heretics. Most tellingly, even *credentes* are believers of heretics, and not of heresy, not of the error itself.

The second point to be made in this regard is to do with the emphasis that is made continually in these councils on the individual's awareness of the heretic's status as a heretic. Punishment falls on those who have knowingly, *scienter*, defended, supported or believed in heretics, or made the conscious choice to hide them. In a broader way, the same idea is at work in the prominence of 'suspicion' in the councils, the rumour and local reputation that was the basis for the launch of an *inquisitio*, which similarly implies a degree of understanding. Again, in a small way, the interior lives of the suspects are significant, though again, this is not to do with belief, but with knowledge.

Such knowledge must come primarily from the public announcement of the names of heretics and supporters, at the reading of the ban of excommunication which is to be held every Sunday and feast day, according to the already quoted provision of the 1246 council at Béziers, as well as canon two of the same council: 'si quis autem de hoc [knowingly allowing heretics to live on land] convictus fuerit

---

[40] Toulouse, canons 17 and 10, Mansi, vol.23, cols.198, 196. For a useful treatment of this pattern, see Arnold, *Inquisition*, pp.37-47.

[41] Narbonne 43, canon 10, Mansi, vol.23, col.359; a similar thing in canon 11, for relapses. Tarragona's provision for the exhumation and cremation of dead heretics' bones perhaps also highlights the reliance on exterior signs to prove the guilt of someone whose interior condition is beyond recall, Selge, *Texte*, p.56.

vel confessus, tamdiu excommunicatus nominatim et publice nuncietur'.[42] Given that from the council of Toulouse onwards, everyone is required at the age of discretion formally to abjure heresy, at least in theory, there can be no legal grounds for not knowing that heresy is condemned by the church, whether the mechanics behind it are understood or not.[43]

Increasingly, though, provision is made for the general populace to be taught the articles of the Catholic faith. Education in correct doctrine first appears as an anti-heretical measure, along with public excommunication, in the second council at Béziers, where it is stated that priests are to teach the articles of faith on a Sunday, and that boys are to be instructed in the faith. The council of Albi in 1254 repeats this, and adds that the faith is also to be explained when people take their oath to abjure heresy and uphold the Catholic faith.[44] The formal record of an oath is a part of the shrewd use made by inquisitors of their written records as a weapon in the control of heresy, and undoubtedly there is a deterrent factor at work here, but there is also a concern to educate, and an idea perhaps that heresy is fostered by ignorance. There is, in a negative way reminiscent of the fourth Lateran council, a construction of heresy that is doctrinal in nature, though it is only hinted at here, and of lay understanding and subsequent recognition of heresy in terms of error and not merely as a list of names.

What this also serves to highlight, however, is again the fact that the focus of these regulations rests not on the heresy itself, but on the people involved in it, and that the canons of the provincial councils rarely, if ever, address heretical doctrine or belief in anything other than the most generic form. Though 'error' and 'heresy' are both mentioned, they are never described, nor their content or nature expounded.[45] They appear primarily as a condition of the heretic: it is 'haeretici vestiti' who 'haeresi sponte dimissa', or who are 'conversi ab heresis' or 'in

---

[42] 'haeretici et eorum credentes, fautores, eorum receptatores et defensores, singulis diebus Dominicis excommunicantur', quoted above p.111, n.32; Béziers 46, canon 2, Mansi, vol.23, col.692. Provision for public reading of excommunications by name is also made at Béziers 46, canon 8, Mansi, vol.23, col.693, and Albi 54, canon 19, Mansi, vol.23, col.837. Penances for heretics in first canon of Narbonne 43 are very public.

[43] Toulouse, canon 12, Mansi, vol.23, col.196. Repeated at Albi, Mansi, vol.23, canon 11, col.835.

[44] Béziers 46, canon 7, Mansi, vol.23, col.693 and Albi 54, canons 17, 12, 18, Mansi, vol.23, cols.835-37.

[45] Except on one occasion, in the Tarragona canons, where a very brief example of Waldensian error is given, Selge, *Texte,* p.51; Tarragona, Mansi, vol.23, col.554.

heresim recidisse'; 'ei qui super crimine haeresis impetuntur'.[46] Indeed, looking at the provisions described above, something that becomes clear is that all of these councils, with the exception of the council of Tarragona, deal either with the initial seeking of heretics by the local clergy or the lord of the area, or with their treatment after conviction.[47] The council of Toulouse, reiterating the provisions of the earlier council of Avignon, requires that each priest investigate heresy in his area, along with two or three laymen 'of good opinion', and that this inquiry be ongoing; it is joined by the provision that the secular lord of an area and his bailiffs are to also to inquire after heresy in their jurisdiction.[48] This first lay inquiry into heresy is reiterated in 1246 at Béziers, and both are repeated by the council of Albi in 1254.[49] Despite the importance of the laity in the initial stages of inquiry, and, post-conviction, in not supporting heretics once they have been labelled, the church is careful to reserve to itself the right to label heretics: 'ne aliquis ut credens vel haereticus puniatur, nisi per episcopum loci, vel aliquam personam ecclesiasticam, quae potestatem habeat, fuerit credens vel hereticus judicatus'.[50]

The councils assume an identification and trial process that is happening elsewhere, taking for granted the labelled individual, a characteristic of the conciliar representation of the heretic that we can see also to some degree in the ecumenical treatment. For the lesser grades of involvement, Tarragona's outlines provide the necessary information for conviction, but in the case of the heretic, so clearly demarcated by his error, there is no information here that would allow his identification, no description of error. Of course, in a regulation designed for general application such a generic type is necessary: the case-specific treatment lies in the emphasis placed on the discretion of the judge and inquisitor by those councils that speak more directly to its inquisitorial operatives, that is those of Tarragona and of Narbonne. Tarragona appeals to the discrimination of its judges in phrases such as 'discretus judex', and 'caveat tamen judex'. More explicitly, Narbonne outlines the importance of discretion and prudence to the Dominicans

---

[46] Narbonne 43, canon 4, Mansi, vol.23, col.357; canon 11, Mansi, vol.23, col.359; Béziers 46, canon 3, Mansi, vol.23, col.692. Note, a town can also be suspected of 'heresy', 'villa suspecta de haeresi habeatur', Toulouse, canon 10, Mansi, vol.23, col.196.
[47] Albi 1230 for example, canon 14, charges all Catholics 'ad hereticos fugandos', Pontal, *Les statuts synodaux*, vol.2, p.12.
[48] Avignon, 1209, canon 2, Mansi, vol.22, cols.785-86, repeated at Montpellier, 1224, canon 46, Mansi, vol.22, col.950; Toulouse, 1229, canons 1 and 3, Mansi, vol.23, col.194.
[49] Béziers 43, canon 1, Mansi, vol.23, col.691; Albi 54, canons 1 and 4, Mansi, vol.23, cols.832-33.
[50] Toulouse, canon 8, Mansi, vol.23, col.195.

that it addresses, telling them that they should impose penances 'secundum discretionem…caute et provide', so that the way of life of the guilty is corrected, or at least 'valeat apparere, quis in tenebris ambulet, quis in luce; quis vere sit poenitens, quis ficte conversus'. Perhaps most telling, the canons of this council admit that 'suppleatque discretio, quod scripto non posset facile comprehendi'.[51] The gap left by the councils here will be important later; what matters as far as the regional councils are concerned is that the representation of heresy that they contain consists of a variety of actions that are performed in relation to heretics, and which have only an oblique basis in doctrinal error.

III – Textbooks

i – *Concordia discordantium canonum* [52]

Gratian's *Concordia discordantium canonum*, better known as the *Decretum*, became the standard canon-law textbook of the high medieval law schools, and was so widely adopted in the decade or so after its compilation that its appearance is now generally taken to mark the beginning of the 'classical' era of canon law.[53] The exact dating of the *Decretum* is disputed; although it has in the past been placed somewhere in the region of 1140, as a result of the work of Anders Winroth, we now know that the *Decretum* was compiled in two stages. The first recension was put together probably in or just after 1138, and was less than half the size of the substantially larger second recension, which was produced by 'Gratian two' at some point before 1158 – for the sake of convenience, we will refer to the author or authors of this text simply as 'Gratian'. It was the longer, second recension that

---

[51] Selge, *Texte,* pp.53, 55; Tarragona, Mansi, vol.23, cols.555, 558. Narbonne 43, canons 5 and 16, Mansi, vol.23, cols.357, 361.

[52] E. Friedberg (ed.), *Corpus iuris canonici,* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1959), vol.1, *Decretum magistri Gratiani*; Lenherr's edition of C.24 q.1 has also been consulted for this study, in T. Lenherr, *Die exkommunikations- und depositionsgewalt der häretiker bei Gratian und den Dekretisten bis zur* Glossa Ordinaria *des Johannes Teutonicus,* Münchener theologische studien iii. Kanonistische abteilung 42 band (St. Ottilien, 1987), pp.18-56; references to the *Decretum* will follow the modern method of citation for the *Decretum*, as outlined in Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, appendix 1, pp.190-194.

[53] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, pp 48-9, and n.7, ref. G. Le Bras, C. Lefebvre, J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique, 1140-1378: Sources et théorie du droit* (Paris, 1965).

came to represent the standard version used in later centuries.[54] For this reason, it matters less for our study what differences there are between the original and later versions in their treatment of heresy, for by the thirteenth century, the longer version would have been the one that contemporaries would have known and used. It is interesting to note though, for illustration, that the third question of *causa* twenty-four, one of the two *causae* with which we are concerned here, has in the first recension only one third of its later number of canons.[55]

The *Decretum* was, of course, compiled a century before our period of study, but its continued primacy in the study of canon law in this and following centuries makes it crucial to the law of our period. Its influence can be seen throughout the constitutions of the fourth Lateran council, for example, and the specific influence of its provisions on heresy in particular is clear in the level to which later canon-legal texts on heresy continue to refer to the authority of these *causae* as their starting-point.[56] The *Summa de poenitentia* of Raymond of Peñafort relies heavily on the *Decretum* throughout its treatment of heresy, despite having been revised by Raymond in the same year that he completed the compilation of the *Liber extra*.[57] The *Decretum* also provided the main source for one of the most influential legal consultations on the subject of heresy, written in the 1250s by Gui Foulques, and its significance is by this time so entrenched that Gui is able to refer to sections of the *Decretum* by nothing other than the relevant number. Perhaps the most meaningful example that can be given here, though, is that in the mid-century gloss to the new collection, Gregory's *Liber extra*, the majority of the commentary for its section on heresy is given over to references to the *Decretum*.

As its title suggests, the *Concordia discordantium canonum* is constructed according to dialectical principles, a feature that made it very useful for teaching and which was therefore one of the main reasons that it was adopted so broadly. It is arranged over three parts: part one deals with specific topics, and is divided into

---

[54] Winroth uses 'Gratian two' to refer to the compiler of the second recension, while making it clear that this may not necessarily be a different individual from 'Gratian one'. A. Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum (Cambridge, 2000), p.122; pp.136-38; p.135.

[55] The first recension of C.24.3 omits canons 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13-25, 30-38, 40 – twenty seven, out of a total of forty; Winroth argues, in his chapter on this *causa*, that although the argument may become more coherent, the meaning remains the same. The canons added to *causa* twenty-four do not add anything qualitatively to the content, but they do affect the proportion of space given to obedience as a factor. Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum, Appendix, pp.218-20; p.34f.

[56] For the use of the *Decretum* in the constitutions of Lateran 4, see García, *Lateran 4*, pp.12-15.

[57] *SOPMA*, vol.3, p.285.

distinctiones; part two presents sample *causae* or cases, and then answers the various questions that they raise; the third part, the *Tractatus de consecratione*, is concerned with sacramental and liturgical law.[58] Accompanied by Gratian's own remarks, or *dicta,* it sets out within this framework a collection of various canons, drawn from conciliar and decretal material and especially from writers of the early church, in order to explore and resolve contradictions in the canon-legal corpus.

The principal treatment of heresy in the *Decretum* occurs in two of the *causae* that make up the second part of the work, *causa* twenty-four, and its immediate neighbour, *causa* twenty-three. As with the other *causae*, they begin with an outline of a hypothetical situation, from which all the questions that make up the *causa* are then derived.[59] For *causa* twenty-three, Gratian posits a situation in which several bishops have fallen into heresy, and are beginning to compel the Catholics around them to follow suit. When their heresy is discovered, military action is ordered against them. The majority of the questions that this situation raises are concerned with the legitimate use of force, and the fact that the bishops are heretical is not immediately important to the questions that follow except as a device to allow the discussion of the use of force against others. In *causa* twenty-three Gratian's questions centre around the church's status in relation to heretics; in this *causa*, question four, 'an vindicta sit inferenda' and question seven, 'an heretici suis et ecclesiae rebus sint expoliandi? Et qui possident hereticis ablata an dicantur possidere aliena' contain the most material on heretics specifically.[60]

Causa twenty-four opens with a complementary scenario: a bishop, having fallen into heresy, deprives others of their office, and marks them with the sentence of excommunication. After his death, he is convicted of heresy, and condemned, together with his followers and their households. The subsequent situation affords Gratian an opportunity to examine problems that arise with regard to the status of the accused, rather than his oppressors, that is, whether or not a heretic can deprive others of office, whether a sentence of excommunication can be passed after death, and how such a sentence should affect the rest of the individual's household. It is this last question that has the most to say about heresy as a subject in its own right.

---

[58] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, pp.47-48, and appendix, pp.190-94.
[59] Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum,p.34.
[60] C.23 q.4, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.899-928; C.23 q.7, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.95-53; summary of question four taken from the introduction to the whole *causa*, col.889.

What is immediately striking when looking at the sources that Gratian uses in answering these questions is, of course, their antiquity. Gratian on the whole used very little new material in the construction of his text, preferring instead to rely on more established sources, and our two *causae* are no exceptions.[61] A glance at the sources of the canons shows the overwhelming presence of the works of the Fathers, especially Jerome and, in *causa* twenty-three particularly, Augustine, as well as the writings of the early Popes, whose work makes up a good proportion of the material in *causa* twenty-four. Although the presence of heresy in the structure of the text suggests that the questions raised by such situations were not entirely without contemporary relevance, the use of so much early material of course affects the picture of heresy that is gained from reading these canons, a picture that was born out of a context very different to that of the *Decretum*.

As noted above, the questions that Gratian seeks to answer in these *causae* are often tangential or unconnected to heresy itself: discussion of heresy is not the aim of the argument. In the earlier parts of *causa* twenty-four, and also in most of the previous *causa*, heresy tends to become more a part of the background to the discussion of other issues. It is within the boundaries set up by the hypothetical cases that heresy appears in the *Decretum*, and the significance of the content of these sources is subject always to the progression of Gratian's dialectical argument. Some canons, though not referring to heresy in their content, are nonetheless framed as pertinent to it, while others that talk specifically about heresy are presented as proving something unconnected.[62] Nonetheless, heresy formed a significant part of the content of many of the sources used by Gratian, and their attitude to heresy is still conveyed to the reader.

Principally, the idea that underlies much of this early material is of heresies held and expounded by educated heretics, who are on more level terms with their Catholic counterparts than the heretics of Gratian's time. Some of the material taken from the works of Augustine is drawn from letters written to his heretical opponents. In an excerpt from a letter to the Donatist priest Petilianus, for example, Augustine presents the heretic with his arguments, all based in Scriptural

---

[61] Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum, p.139.
[62] For example, C.23 q.1 c.4; C.23 q.3 c.3 and 4, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.892, 897; as opposed to e.g. C.23 q.4 c.25, Friedberg, vol.1, col.910-11.

authorities, for the validity of the church's persecution of the Donatist sect.[63] Parts of Petilianus' letter are reproduced here, and are of the same character as Augustine's reply. While Augustine's arguments are perfect material for Gratian's discussion of the legitimate use of force, within which this excerpt falls, they present at the same time an educated and informed exchange between two opponents writing within the same tradition as each other.

Education is frequently associated with the heretics that these texts describe, whether in a straightforward remark, such as Ambrose's use of the term 'preceptor hereticus' in his commentary on Luke, or in a more developed description.[64] Jerome's definition of heresy states, for example, that it results from an understanding of the Scripture that is different from that which the Holy Spirit demands.[65] Heresy again appears in terms of academic enquiry in Leo I's claim that they are made masters of error when, on finding the way to truth difficult, they turn to their own selves, instead of the authority of the prophets, the apostles, or the evangelists – 'quid autem iniquius est quam inpia sapere, et sapientoribus doctoribusque non credere?'.[66] Augustine even seems to regard heretics as a stimulus to learning and good teaching, in the mode of Paul's teaching on the necessity of heresies: 'cum interrogant nos ea, que nescimus, sic discutiamus pigriciam, et divinas scripturas cupiamus...Hii autem Deo probati sunt, qui bene possunt docere'.[67] The heretics of antiquity are certainly capable of the exchange that Augustine's letter depicts, though a warning from Gelasius also advises caution on this same basis, that observers of the canons should not enter into disputes with heretics, a point reinforced by Jerome's description of heretics, who 'sophismatibus suis et arte dialectica sepe opprimant ecclesiasticos'.[68] Interestingly, the warnings not to dispute with heretics are extended, in a later gloss on the *Decretum*, to a ban on any discussion of faith.[69]

---

[63] C.23 q.1 c.4, Friedberg, vol.1, col.897; q.4 cc.7, 38, 40, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.900, 917-18, 920-21; q.5 c.3, Friedberg, vol.1, col.930.
[64] Lenherr, *Gratian,* p.25, C.24 q.1 c.26, Friedberg, vol.1, col.976.
[65] C.24 q.3 c.27, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.997-98.
[66] C.24 q.1 c.30, Friedberg, vol.1, col.998.
[67] C.24 q.3 c.40, Friedberg, vol.1, col.1006.
[68] C.24 q.3 cc.36, 33, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.1000, 999.
[69] *Decretum divi Gratiani, totius propemodum iuris canonici compendium, summorumque pontificum decreta atque praeiudicia, una cum variis scribentium Glossis et expositionibus* (Lyons, 1560) description 'e', p.1405.

It is worth noting, before going further, the tone taken by the *Decretum* toward repression. Much of *causa* twenty-three deals with the legitimacy of the use of force, and it is within this discussion that the repression of heresy falls, of which the overwhelming impression, from the sources chosen but also from Gratian's framing of them, is one that emphasizes correction and conversion over punishment.[70] The question which discusses repression is summed up by Gratian with the conclusion that 'vindicta est inferenda non amore ipsius vindictae, sed zelo iusticiae; non ut odium exerceatur, sed ut pravitas corrigatur'.[71]

The most important section of the *Decretum,* as far as heresy itself is concerned, is that made up by the last parts of *causa* twenty-four, where the nature of heresy becomes the primary focus and subject of Gratian's discussion. Several of the sources here are very important for subsequent treatments of heresy, and to some extent owe their influence to their inclusion in this collection. They are contained in the last two sections of question three: section four 'quia vero de hereticis sermo habetur, videndum est, quid intersit inter scisma at haeresim, et qui sint heretici, et quot sint hereticorum sectae?', and section five 'qui vero proprie dicantur heretici'.[72] These are the parts of the *Decretum* that deal specifically with heresy, and would therefore be the first port of call for anyone looking for a canon-legal treatment of that subject.

Section four consists of several texts that attempt a definition of heresy. Two of these extracts are from Jerome, the first of which outlines the difference between heresy and schism; the former is distinguished from the latter by the possession of 'perverse dogma', as a result of which the holders of such dogma recede from the church.[73] The second excerpt from Jerome is a definition of heresy, 'heresis grece ab electione dicitur', though one that quickly becomes a definition rather of the heretic: one who chooses a teaching, 'disciplinam', that seems better to him, 'quicumque igitur aliter scripturam intelligit, quam sensus Spiritus sancti flagitat'. More straightforwardly, from Augustine, comes another definition of the heretic:

---

[70] For example, one of the extracts taken from Augustine's work, that severe measures, or 'medicine' undertaken by the church are for correction, 'karitatis freneticum ligare, lethargicum stimulare, ambos amare. Ambo offenduntur, sed ambo diliguntur'. C.23 q.4 c.25, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.910-11. See also: C.23 q.4 c.37, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.916-17; C.23 q.5 c.1, Friedberg, vol.1, col.928; rather less tolerant in C.23 q.4 c.39, Friedberg, vol.1, col.919.

[71] C.23 q.4 dpc.54 (or 53, 54 is a *palea*), Friedberg, col.928.

[72] Friedberg, vol.1, cols.997-98.

[73] C.24 q.3 c.26, Friedberg, vol.1, col.997.

'hereticus est qui...falsas ac novas oppiniones gignit vel sequitur'.[74] It is the possession of dogma, or error that is the primary defining attribute of the heretics in this section, who are consistently and exclusively identified by the fact, if not often the content, of their error. Once these definitions are brought together in the *Decretum*, they appear frequently as a block in later writings, the most obvious example of which is Raymond of Peñafort's *Summa de poenitentia*. Raymond's *summa*, which was written in 1224-26, and revised in 1234, opens its section 'de haereticis et fautoribus eorum' with a summary of the above definitions by Augustine and Jerome, together with some others that Raymond has harvested from other parts of the *Decretum* that pertain to sacramental error.[75]

Having dealt with the nature of heresy on an abstract level, Gratian also provides his reader with a list of specific heresies, lifted from Isidore's *Etymologies*. An already widely circulated text, the inclusion here of this excerpt from Isidore's section on heresy extended its influence even further in a way that will be discussed in a later chapter. Here we need to note that the long canon that Gratian derives from this source gives the names of sixty-eight different heresies, and for each provides the derivation of the name, from either the author or the cause of the error, as well as one, or occasionally two lines that describe the principal error of the sect. The error given is nearly always doctrinal, occasionally behavioural, but remains, as it does in the formal definitions, the identifying characteristic of heretics.[76]

In addition to error, there is also in the definition of heresy an emphasis on obstinate belief. According to the twenty-ninth canon, those who, once corrected, return to the correct belief cannot be considered heretics.[77] The same theme of not only wrong but obstinate belief is developed in two following canons, where defence either of one's own error, or of the error of others is added to the requirements for heretical status: 'qui...dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensare persistunt, heretici sunt', and 'qui aliorum errorem defendit multo est dampnabilior illis...non tantum hereticus, sed etiam heresiarcha dicenda est'.[78] The two latter canons are among those that were added to the original by the second redaction, an

---

[74] C.24 q.3 cc.27, 28, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.997-98.
[75] *Summa Sti Raymundi de Peniafort Barcinonensis Ord. Praedicator De poenitentia, et matrimonio* (Rome, 1603, repub. Farnborough, 1967), pp.38-45. Dates from *SOPMA* 3407. vol.III, p.285. See also discussion of this text pp.220-21.)
[76] C.24 q.3 c.39, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.1001-1006.
[77] C.24 q.3 c.29, Friedberg, vol.1, col.998.
[78] C.24 q.3 cc.31, 32, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.998-99.

interesting textual parallel, perhaps, to the actual development of heretical movements between the dates of the two redactions. In our period, the gloss further develops the theme by emphasizing the role of obstinacy in the definition of heretic, and in the delineation of the boundary between heretic and non-heretic.[79]

The attitude of the *Decretum* toward heresy would perhaps be left behind to some extent, or at least, there were changes on the way, but the texts which made up the collection, and in particular those of the latter sections of *causa* twenty-four, continued to be central to the idea of heresy, carrying with them that double-edged definition of error and obstinacy that is so familiar.

ii – *Decretales Gregorii IX*

Partly as a result of the *Decretum*, which had the effect of highlighting lacunae and defects in the corpus, after the middle of the twelfth century, canon law developed at a greater rate and much new material was produced, mainly in the form of the papal letter. After the pontificate of Alexander III, these were collected systematically, until Gregory IX commissioned his confessor, Raymond of Peñafort, to gather all the relevant material produced since the *Decretum* into a new collection. The decretal collection known as the *Decretales Gregorii IX*, or the *Liber Extra*, was published in 1234, and soon took up a place next to the *Decretum* at the centre of legal education.[80] Its organization is more straightforward than that of the *Decretum*; the new material is collected, in chronological order, under descriptive titles that are arranged within five books. In the fifth book, title seven, *de hereticis,* contains the *Liber Extra*'s material on heresy, sandwiched between its titles on Jews and Saracens on the one hand, and Schismatics on the other, placing heretics among the confirmed enemies of the Catholic church.[81]

The majority of the texts that make up the *Liber extra*'s treatment of heresy were written against the wickedness of heresies which, as pope Lucius III has it, 'modernis coepit temporibus pullulare', and of course reflect a much more recent tradition of anti-heretical legislation than that represented in the *Decretum*,

---

[79] *Decretum divi Gratiani... cum variis scribentium Glossis*, description 'dixit apostolus', p.1403.
[80] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, pp.53-55.
[81] E. Friedberg (ed.), *Corpus iuris canonici,* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1959), vol.2 *Decretalium collectiones*, cols.778-790.

including the condemnation of Cathar heretics in canon twenty-seven of the third Lateran council, and the whole of the fourth Lateran's third canon. Significantly, next to the Lateran provisions, this title also includes two of the most important decretals to be issued against heresy. *Ad abolendam* was first promulgated in 1184 by Lucius III, in conjunction with Frederick I. Here were formally instituted both the practice of episcopal inquisitions into heresy, as well as the obligations of support for the process and penalty from the secular authorities, although the exact nature of the punishment was left unspecified.[82] The other of these two, Innocent III's decretal *Vergentis in senium* issued at Viterbo in 1199, for the first time formally identified heresy with the secular crime of treason. The introduction of this principle of Roman law into the ideas both of heresy and of papal power thus provided the justification for sentences of confiscation and death.[83] There are several other significant decretals here: some short contributions from Gregory himself, and two more from Innocent III, *Si adversus nos*, which removes notarial and legal support from heretics, and another that proscribes non-licensed preaching. These two, together with *Vergentis in senium*, and the fourth Lateran constitution, make Innocent the most represented authority in this title.[84] The texts that followed *Ad abolendam* and *Vergentis in senium* however, share and indeed borrow so much of their language from these two, that an examination of these two decretals can be considered representative of much of this material.

---

[82] Friedberg, vol.2, cols. 780-82. Maisonneuve, *Études*, pp.151-56, Arnold, *Inquisition*, p.31. The late Roman penalty of burning was first prescribed for heretics by Pedro II's Gerona ordinance of 1198, Nelson, 'Religion in "Histoire totale"', p.73. On *lèse majesté* in *Vergentis*, see W. Ullmann, 'The Significance of Innocent III's decretal "Vergentis"', *Études d'Histoire du Droit Canonique Dediées à Gabriel le Bras* (Paris, 1965). Frederick II also threw his weight behind the repression of heresy: the repression of heresy is central to the Constitutions of Melfi, or *Liber Augustalis* that he issued in Sicily in 1231, parts of which were later incorporated into a letter written to the authorities of northern Italy by Innocent IV. Frederick's text accepts the equation of heresy and treason established by Innocent III, and draws on all the language and imagery employed by the papal decretals, emphasising in particular the hidden nature of the heretics, and the poisonous truth that lies beneath. *The* Liber Augustalis, *or, Constitutions of Melfi promulgated by the Emperor Frederick II for the Kingdom of Sicily in 1231*, tr. J.M. Powell (Syracuse, New York, 1971); Mansi, vol.23, cols.586-89; A. Piazza, '"Affinché ... costituzioni di tal genere siano ovunque osservate". Gli statuti di Gregorio IX contra gli eretici d'Italia', in A. Degrandi et. al. (eds.), *Scritti in onore di Girolamo Arnaldi, offerti dalla Scuola nazionale di studi medioevali,* (Rome, 2001), 425-458, p.451-54.

[83] Friedberg, vol.2, cols.782-83. Arnold, *Inquisition*, p.31, Maisonneuve, *Études*, pp.156-58, 278; According to Maisonneuve, although the use of Roman law in canonical tradition was not new, starting with Gratian, and continuing through Huggucio, who likened heresy to theft, and Lucius III, in using it to prove this particular point, Innocent used it also to support ideas of pontifical theocracy. Lansing frames Innocent's redefinition of heresy as treason in terms of a response to Cathar presence in the papal states, C. Lansing, *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (Oxford, 1998), p.6

[84] Friedberg, vol.2, cols.783-87, caps.11, 12.

With one eye on the past, Lucius' decretal begins with a trope that would provide a minor theme for several later works on heresy; already quoted above, the heresies of modern times standing in contrast to those that had gone before was a small but recurring motif of anti-heretical writing that also appears to have set the tone for Innocent's slightly apocalyptic opening to *Vergentis*. A more developed idea, of heretics as deceptive and operating under a false appearance is then introduced into the text, through the use of a thesaurus of words to do with falsehood, but also by the invocation of Scriptural references: 'sub specie pietatis virtutum eius abnegantes'. Using the same citation, Innocent similarly describes heretics in terms of deception and pretence, 'habentes ...speciem pietatis' and spreading their poison 'dum palliata specie religionis et multos decipit simplices, et quosdam seducit astutos'.[85]

Innocent's decretal is generally much richer, rhetorically, than Lucius'. In its first third in particular, the language is full of words and images that convey ideas of pollution and corruption. There are several strands to this, and ideas of a ruined harvest, such as 'segetes in zizania pullulant, vel potius polluntur', or the wonderful 'triticum arescit, et evanescit in paleas', serve next to the vocabulary of disease and poison to characterize their subject: heresy is 'sicut cancer', which 'amplius serperet in occulto', or is the 'virus draconis in aureo calice', both of which images are used to reinforce the idea of false appearance inherent in the 'species pietatis' quoted above. Several animal forms are also employed by Innocent to characterize the heretics that are damaging the vine and the grain, some traditional, the wolves and the little foxes, some less so, such as moths.[86]

One further idea that needs some examination here, though it will be explored in greater detail at a later point, is the way in which these texts, our two decretals, but also most of the new material in this title, direct their condemnation and their prohibitions at a general and undifferentiated heresy. *Ad abolendam* defends the unity of the church against the falsehood of heretics, by the issue of a universal condemnation of 'omnem haeresim, quocunque nomine censeatur'. Although a selection of names follows this sentence, including the Cathars and the Poor of Lyons, the phrase, and the idea, became a standard refrain in later works.

---

[85] 2Tim.III.5. Friedberg, vol.2, col.780, cap.IX; falsehood: 'falso nomine', 'falsitatis', 'professio falsitatum'; Friedberg, vol.2, col.782, cap.X.
[86] Friedberg, vol.2, col.782, cap.X.

The idea is also hinted at in *Vergentis*, which paints heretics as united in their falsehood, but it is in the fourth Lateran constitution that it finds its fullest expression. The excommunication of canon three, as we have seen, defines its subject in reference to the creed of canon one, in what amounts to a universal condemnation of a heresy made uniform through exclusion.

One point of comparison that has been frequently made between the two collections is the difference in tone evident when the texts are placed in conjunction with each other. Gone is the corrective attitude dominant in the *Decretum*, and in its place there is an emphasis on punishment and eradication. The more coercive stance permeates the whole of title seven, including the other texts from Gregory and Innocent, and, though we have not considered them so far here, the older material that makes up the first six short chapters – not all the material collected here is new after all; there are also additions from the same writers of the early church that Gratian draws upon, Augustine, Gregory, other early popes. The extracts chosen from these early authors for the *Liber extra* however, all embody a similar, less forgiving position than the newer material. It is interesting to note on this point the difficulty that the decretists had with this shift. While Raymond of Peñafort seems to have taken the same line as Innocent, that heresy could be considered as treason, Maisonneuve demonstrates very clearly the ways in which other commentators on *Vergentis* took issue with the harsh nature of the disinheritance of herctics, and points to the comparison that they made with an equivalent but more even-handed article of Roman jurisprudence. Initially drawn by Johannes Teutonicus, the comparison was carried to a fuller conclusion by both Vincent of Spain and Tancred, who openly came out in favour of the latter, more lenient precedent.[87] The debate is also visible in occasional comments in the gloss on the *Decretum*. Augustine's quotation from the hundredth Psalm, 'detrahentem secreto proximo suo, hunc persequebar', is glossed 'manifeste vos possumus persequi, non latenter'. Further to this, when Augustine, in response to Petilianus, says 'cui tradidit

[87] Maisonneuve, *Études*, pp.277-86.

Apostolus hominem in interitum carnis', the gloss adds 'sicut nos tradimus hereticos principibus'.[88]

The treatment of heresy by the *Liber extra* presents another significant shift from that of the *Decretum*, however, a different approach not just to the repression of heresy but to the heresy itself. The texts of the earlier compilation always portray the heretic as the outsider, the non-Catholic element. In canons nine, ten and eleven of the first question of *causa* twenty-four, Gratian seeks to answer the question of whether or not a heretic (and this extends more broadly to the excommunicate in general) can deprive others of orders, a question more concerned with the status and authority of the clergy than with the heresy itself. The implications that the process of answering this question has for the heresy involved are primarily that heretics, being excommunicate, are characterized by an outsider status. They are something apart from, and outside of the Catholic Church, but it is made clear that this is through their own agency, 'quo a nobis separamini'.[89] The theme of the heretic as outsider in fact dominates the tone of this question as a whole.[90] In this much, the two collections are very similar, but where in the *Decretum* there is a sense that these individuals have removed themselves from the church by virtue of their error and through their own choice, the twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts that make up the *Liber extra* treatment, and the fourth Lateran constitution especially, are proactive in excluding heresy and its adherents on Catholic terms: heretics are now outside because the church has put them there.

A connected part of this shift is a greater emphasis on the figure of the heretic in the *Liber extra*, to the exclusion of heresy as error. The doctrinal nature of the heretic's status, and the choice of erroneous belief that was so strong in the earlier text is now largely absent, and a heretic in the texts of the *Liber extra* is defined by the judgement and sentence of the church, not the false doctrine and misapplied learning of Gratian's collection. Here the heretic is even more 'ready-made', no space is given to identification or definition, and the primary business is with the treatment of heretics. Part of this increased emphasis on the figure is a result of the extension of the range of the subject, which now also includes the various categories of followers. These latter are even more divorced from the error

---

[88] *Decretum divi Gratiani... cum variis scribentium Glossis*, 'h' and 'k', p.1302.
[89] C.24 q.1 c.38, Friedberg, vol.1, col.982; Lenherr, *Gratian*, pp.51-52; also Friedberg, vol.1, c.39, col.982; Lenherr, *Gratian*, pp.52-53.
[90] C.24 q.1 cc.9-11, Friedberg, vol.1, col.969; Lenherr, *Gratian*, pp.26-27.

than the heretics appear to be, described and condemned purely in terms of their affiliation to the heretics. Individual holders of a heterodox belief are no longer the location of the heresy discussed by these sources and collections, and the focus of the canon-legal treatment of heresy is now concentrated on a much wider range of involvement.

IV

To try to draw some of these threads together: the twelfth-century conciliar view progressed toward a representation of heresy that was increasingly general and abstracted, though it remained based on the actions of those involved. At an ecumenical level in particular, this meant that by our period, in the constitutions of the fourth Lateran council where heresy was defined by exclusion from Catholic doctrine, all heresies were now included under one, very general understanding of the term, though at the same time that shift also demanded that this understanding be based in articles of faith. A similar shift can be seen in the treatment of the heretic figure, always the real subject of conciliar action, but now increasingly undifferentiated. Heretics are also more numerous: a growing emphasis can be seen on the spread of heretics through different lands, in the council of Tours and in the third Lateran council, which becomes wider still at Verona, in the *Ad abolendam* decree that describes heretics in 'plerisque mundi partibus'.

As the heretic becomes more abstract, certainly more generic, there is a gradual accumulation of other types of figure.[91] The subject of the anti-heretical legislation becomes more diverse, including a range of other figures, defined by their actions toward, and relationship to heretics. In turn, the heretics themselves seem to take on the function of a focal point for the status of these categories, and in many places, especially in the regional councils, they are often not the main subject of the measures being put in place.

While the doctrinal definition of the fourth Lateran council is largely missing from the decretals of the *Liber extra*, there is nonetheless a great deal of

---

[91] Arnold sees the use of the term 'heretic' in these councils as more polemic than technical. Arnold, *Inquisition*, p.38.

similarity between the ecumenical council view and Gregory's collection, not least because the latter contains significant parts of the former, but also as a result of the inclusion of so much of Innocent III's work. It is perhaps important to note in this context that the individual decretals were not, as the ecumenical constitutions were, universally binding, but directed at particular groups or regions, a fact that some decretists, mentioned above, used to delimit the theoretical application of the confiscation laws.[92] The inclusion of these texts in the *Liber extra* however, meant that the ideas contained in them were widely diffused. One of the more significant of these ideas was the equation of heresy with public crime, in particular, that of treason.

Like the texts of the *Liber extra*, the regional councils pay almost no attention to doctrinal error. Arnold has described the very physical nature of the search for heresy in this period of legislation, which concentrates more on finding heretics than discovering error.[93] For all that, neither do these councils spend much of their time talking about heretics proper; they are concerned primarily with the practical process of finding them, and limiting their support. In common with that of the decretals and the ecumenical councils, the regional treatment of heretics seems based on a similar idea of a generalized heretic. Though here it is perhaps the focus on actions, and on dismantling their social and political network of support that produces this effect, the underlying idea must be the same. On another level, the punitive and increasingly harsh measures taken against heretics by these councils echo the more coercive attitude of the newer legislation.

Where does this leave the *Decretum*? It has already been made clear that this text continued to play a central role in canon-legal thought throughout our period. Much use was made of the constituent parts of its discussion of heresy, in particular the definitions, and the list of heresies from Isidore, but perhaps, at least in the majority of the anti-heretical legislation that we have looked at, the texts that make up the collection were not used with the same purpose for which Gratian included them. The predominantly doctrinal view of heresy is absent, though implicit in the fourth Lateran constitution. Certainly the tone of correction seems to have been left behind, except in the case of some commentators and canonists, who, as Maisonneuve suggests, generally struck a more reserved note than those at the

---

[92] Maisonneuve, *Études*, p.281-82.
[93] Arnold, *Inquisition*, p,36.

front line.[94] The canon-lawyer Gui Foulques, however, whom we will discuss in the next chapter, seems to have embodied this more nuanced approach in his consultation, very popular with inquisitors, which addressed the categories of guilt. With this in mind, let us now turn to look at the sharp end of this legislation, as manifested in the products of inquisition.

[94] Maisonneuve, *Études*, p.286.

Chapter 4 – Inquisition texts

altum est cor hominis et inscrutabile [1]

Until now, our focus has been directed toward texts that, with the possible exception of the *exempla* collections, were written within the bounds of well-established generic conventions. Those texts to which we now turn our attention, however, are drawn from a rather younger tradition, for which our period represents the early, formative years. Although the organized repression of heresy had its foundations in the legislation of the twelfth and early-thirteenth century, the formal practice of inquisition into heretical depravity was put in place during the pontificate of Gregory IX. Several of the regional councils, in particular those at Narbonne in 1227 and Toulouse in 1229, were central to this process, but the official beginnings of inquisition can be found in the bull *Ille humani generis*, first issued in 1231, and the decretal *Excommunicamus,* also of 1231.[2]

The procedure that formed the basis for the investigation of heresy was of course, *inquisitio*, introduced by Innocent III to be used next to the traditional *accusatio* and the newer form of *denunciatio*, on which *inquisitio* was based. Inquisition allowed a judge to act on his own authority, on the basis of *fama*, and though it was not originally intended for this purpose necessarily, it gradually became the normal form of procedure against heresy.[3] In the context of the repression of heresy, it came to carry a specialized meaning, and developed an impressive documentary tradition that was its ultimate source of power.[4]

Each stage of the process of an inquisition produced documentary records, from the initial abjurations and confessions, to records of the depositions, and the sentences and penances imposed. Together, these records produced a profile of the

---

[1] Foulques, *Consilium*, q.9, p.196.
[2] Dossat, *Crises*, pp.105-18.
[3] Dossat, *Crises*, pp.107; *DMA*, vol.6, pp.478-79.
[4] On this idea see Arnold, *Inquisition*, p.79ff, and J.B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, N.Y.; London, 1997).

levels of heresy in a region, and even if a deponent knew nothing, that fact was still recorded, and their statement could be used against them if it later turned out to be false.[5] The importance of these records was lost neither on their creators, nor on the people whose lives they detailed; staff with access to the inquisitors' archives were limited in number, and reports of attempted or successful theft of inquisition registers demonstrate an awareness of their significance among the populace. Though survival of these records is now patchy, some impression of the efficiency and thoroughness that inspired such consternation can be gained from the organization of one of the registers that we will look at here. The manuscript of the Carcassonne register contains a table of all the deponents before the inquisitor, arranged by location, a practice apparently quite common among inquisition notaries. Within the register itself, a marginal note corrects the record of one deponent who added to his confession: it is a working and accessible record of a population's involvement in heresy.[6]

Beside those texts stemming directly from the inquisition process, that is registers of depositions and of sentences, the business of inquisition also generated ancillary texts; it is at this time that we begin to see the appearance of the inquisitor's handbook, as well as new legal consultations on the subject of heresy. These latter two categories of texts, together with the registers of the inquisition process itself, constitute the majority of the written product of inquisition, and it is with these that this chapter is concerned.

As with the previous two chapters, the lines of division between one set of texts and another are not always rigid or easily discernible, and naturally there is a certain amount of overlap between some of our inquisition texts, and the legal material of the previous chapter; one good example of this overlap is the fact that the canons of several of the councils, especially Tarragona and Toulouse, were often included as legal consultations in document collections. This chapter is however concerned with only one specific and specialized aspect of the legal repression of heresy, and so a distinction has been made here between general legal texts containing articles on heresy on the one hand, and texts designed solely and specifically for the legal inquisition of heresy on the other. We will, though, turn

---

[5] For example Doat 25, fols. 9^{v}-10^{v}.
[6] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.244, n.1; p.273, n.4.

first to the texts that have the closest affinity to those of the previous chapter, the legal consultations on questions arising from inquisition.

I – Legal Consultations

The legal consultation, essentially a response by a lawyer or lawyers to questions asked on a given topic, was of course not a form exclusive to the practice of inquisition. Although requested by particular individuals, and occasionally referring to very particular cases, they were nonetheless copied and used by others, where their questions and answers were more widely applicable. As usual, we will begin with a brief outline of our texts.

Consultation of Jean de Bernin [7]

Sent in 1235, by Jean, then papal legate for the repression of heresy in the Narbonne area, to the Dominican prior for Provence, Romeo.

Consilium peritorum Avinionensium quo declaratur qui dicuntur credentes [8]

A short but significant text, this consultation was written in 1235 by the Dominican prior and four lawyers at Avignon, as a response to an enquiry from the Dominican William of Valence and two other men, who were seeking advice on the different types of guilt.

Consultation of Pierre Collemieu [9]

Written probably in 1246 by Pierre, who was bishop of Albano and cardinal legate between 1243 and 1246. It is distinct from another consultation by the same author to the inquisitors of Lombardy.

---

[7] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, fol.26^{ra-b}; see Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.142.
[8] Patschovsky and Selge, *Quellen*, edn. of text on pp.50-54. Text is also in BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, on fols.25ra-25va, see Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.141-42.
[9] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, fols.28^{vb}-29ra; see Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.143.

Consilium peritorum super quibusdam dubitabilibus propositis et solutis [10]

The *Consilium peritorum* is an anonymous consultation of the mid-thirteenth century, which Dondaine suggests may come from the same place as the Avignon opinion.

Consilium domini Guidonis Fulcodii [11]

This consultation, written around 1255-56 by the French lawyer and counsellor to Louis IX of France, Gui Foulques, was, according to Dondaine, the most frequently copied of all the great consultations of the thirteenth century, in part by virtue of the authority conferred upon it by its author's later elevation to the holy see, as pope Clement IV, in 1265. It exists in two versions, though of the same redaction, the shorter of which omits the prologue, the list of questions, and the responses to the first and third of those questions.[12] Gui also produced other, much smaller consultations, notably in 1259/60, while he was archbishop of Narbonne, as well as a letter to the Dominican provincial of France in 1267 on the subject of heresy.[13]

As lists of questions, asked of their superiors by those engaged in the repression of heresy, our consultations tell us some part of what it was that inquisitors wanted to know. To look generally at these consultations is to realize that they are of course for the most part concerned not with the heresy itself, but with inquisition; another of Gui Foulques's smaller consultations is entirely concerned with questions of inquisitorial authority.[14] Many of the questions asked are to do with the jurisdictional and procedural aspects of dealing with the office, and either have little to say on their ultimate subject of inquiry, or assume it to be an accomplished fact, and are concerned with issues to do with, for example, the legal status of convicted

---

[10] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, fols.25va-26ra; Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.142. A possible reference to torture here, 'minetur eis tormenta et eos duris questionibus submissuros'.

[11] *Consilium Guidonis Fulcodii de quibusdam dubitacionibus in negocio inquisicionis*, in 3978 ff.21^{rb}-25ra; ed. in F.L. Tognato (ed.), *L'eresia a Vicenza nel duecento. Dati, problemi e fonti* (Vicenza, 1988), pp.193-203. Dossat believes that the consultation was written just after the reinstatement of the Dominican inquisition in Languedoc, c.1256, Dossat, *Crises*, p.199. For biographical details of Foulques, see Dossat's article in Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 'Gui Foucois, enquêteur-réformateur, archevêque et pape (Clément IV)', *CF*, 7 (1972), 23-57.

[12] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.184-85.

[13] In BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978 ff.78ra-^{rb}; 78^{rb}-^{va}. See Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.151-52, no.15 (d) and (e).

[14] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.78^{rb-va}.

heretics. Where they do ask questions about heresy, they tend to be on technical points, and overwhelmingly concerned with the divisions between the different grades of guilt. These categories, which we looked at in the last chapter, are outlined in some detail in the councils of Tarragona in 1242 and Narbonne in 1243, which of course the two *Consilia peritorum*, and the consultation of Jean Bernin predate, but they seem still not to have provided enough detail, because the consultations of Collemieu and Foulques both continue to answer these same sort of questions. The predominance of such questions, and the legal construction of heresy that follows from dealing with it in this context, means first that heresy is presented in a very physical and external way, and that this in turn has implications for the manner in which the heretic himself is constructed.

Jean Bernin's consultation of 1235, early in the life of the papal inquisition, while very short, and concerned really with procedural issues, nevertheless perhaps provides us with a clue to the way in which the information on heresy in these texts should be understood. Bernin tells Romeo that he should require deponents to confess publicly, 'secundum qualitatem culpe'.[15] This phrase is echoed a decade later in Pierre Collemieu's longer text, which states that deponents should be punished 'secundum qualitatem delicti', and that 'iuxta quantitatem et qualitatem delicti pena relapsis debita puniantur'; there is a resonance here with the 'animadversione debita' model of the councils.[16] Where these texts do engage with heresy itself, the concern to establish the precise quality of guilt would seem to be the main principle of that engagement. In practical terms, it means that what descriptions and treatments of heresy these texts do present tend to revolve around the definition of different categories of involvement, and of the boundaries between them.

It is immediately noticeable when looking at these definitions that they rest almost exclusively on behavioural criteria, on measurable and perceivable actions, something reflected even in the names given to the different categories. The *Consilium peritorum Avinionensium quo declaratur qui dicuntur credentes*, as its title would suggest, answers really only one question: what is a *credens*? The first

[15] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, ff.26^{rb}; 29ra.
[16] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978. f.28^{vb}.

criterion for this status is, rather unsurprisingly, a demonstrable belief in the heretics, in this case, Waldensians. Here, and where other texts are concerned with the *credens*, we find the only occasion on which, apparently, something other than an action defines status, but we will return to this shortly. Apart from their belief, the Avignon lawyers define a *credens* in terms of their actions towards heretics, in some cases with actions such as *visitare* or *recipere* that elsewhere tend to warrant a different and lesser category: a *credens* will have confessed to heretics, eaten with them, been taught by them, visited them or heard their preaching, or received them or done them favours.[17]

At the other end of the scale, both in terms of chronology and of detail, the consultation of Gui Foulques, the fullest and most detailed of these consultations, nonetheless presents a similar picture. Foulques's consultation again devotes much of its space to answering questions on the authority of inquisitors, but there are also questions devoted to a variety of categories, *fautores, receptatores, defensores*. Each of these categories is defined in terms of actions. Like the Avignon text, the only exception to this pattern in Foulques' text is in his definition of a *credens*, which begins with belief in heretics, but then continues as a series of actions.[18]

The predominant position given to actions in the identification of the guilty is not something that has escaped Gui Foulques however, who spends several lines in justifying the use of exterior facts in the demonstration of interior condition:

> nam ex factis exterioribus presumitur de affectu ut ar. xxxii.q.v.cap. qui viderit .C. de dolo .l. dolum, nec enim refert utrum dictis an factis quis voluntatem suam insinuet .ff. de legibus et de se.9. de quibus, nam negare et confiteri possumus non solum ore sed etiam facto .xi.q.iii. extimant, et hoc dico de hiis factis in quibus error exprimitur sicut supra extra posui de hiis que ad ritum errantium pertinent.[19]

---

[17] Patschovsky and Selge, *Quellen*, pp.51-52.
[18] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.23r; Foulques, *Consilium*, pp.196-200.
[19] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.23ra; Foulques, *Consilium*, p.196. For the canon and Roman law cited here by Foulques, see P. Biller, '"Deep Is the Heart of Man, and Inscrutable": Signs of Heresy in Medieval Languedoc', in H. Barr and A.M. Hutchison (eds.), *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, Medieval Church Studies, 4 (Turnhout, 2005), 267-80, p. 278 n. 28.

In this way, evasion of penance can be considered a good sign of a false confession.[20] It is ultimately the interior condition that such signs indicate, and not the signs themselves, that Gui sees as the ultimate basis for a conviction. A cautionary note warns his reader that, contrary to what many have written, actions performed under the influence of some familial or monetary obligation do not a *credens* make.

The prevalence of actions in the inquisition view of heresy has been noted often in studies of this material. In the context of the regional councils' constitutions, a useful treatment of this point has been made recently by Arnold. He posits that contemporary ideas of literacy and understanding meant that, in the case of the unlettered, access to the individual's interior condition could be gained only through actions, and as a result 'inquisitorial discourse constructs a particular relationship between "action" and "belief": the former functioning solely as a sign of the latter'.[21] In the context of the material that we are dealing with here, Peter Biller has used the consultation of Gui Foulques in particular to illuminate the concentration on external matters that we find in the legal material generally, linking it to a wider debate in legal thought about the use of actions as proofs. He shows Gui Foulques once again taking a more measured line than contemporary legislation, in particular that of the council of Narbonne, which took actions as clear evidence of guilt. Foulques counsels instead that motive must also be taken into account.[22]

The latter point is perhaps a key to what is going on here. The analyses by Arnold and Biller mean that we can feel secure in understanding that the inquisitors' interest in actions was as signs of inner state, but if we look again at the quotation from Gui Foulques above, we see that it is not belief that is being sought, but intention. The consistent emphasis that we saw in the councils on these actions being done *scienter* would reinforce this, and the impression is strengthened further by the provisions of the Tarragona council. In answer to the question of whether suspects should be considered as believers, Raymond answers no, 'nisi adeo esset litteratus vel discretus, quod non posset ignorantiam praetendere'. Similarly, no one

---

[20] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.24^{rb}; Foulques, *Consilium*, p.200.
[21] Arnold, *Inquisition,* pp.44-47, 152. See also on this issue A. Cazenave, 'Aveu et contrition. Manuels de confesseurs et interrogatoires d'inquisition en Languedoc et en Catalogne (XIII^{e}-XIV^{e})', *Actes du 99e Congres National des Sociétés Savantes*, pt. 1 (1977), 333-352, esp. p.337.
[22] Biller, 'Deep Is the Heart of Man', pp.270-73; 277.

is to be judged a heretic or a *credens* 'nisi adeo litteratus sit et discretus quod nullatenus per simplicitatem vel ignorantiam valeat excusari'. In both cases, the ultimate decision is left to the discretion of the judge – 'quod arbitrio discreti judicis duximus reliquendum' – but the fact that a person has the capacity to understand the implications of their action, is either literate or discriminating, will tell against any denial of guilt.[23]

As noted above, the only point at which belief is an issue in the determination of categories is in the definition of the *credens*, and this at least would seem to grant the consultation picture of heresy an element of devotional existence, but the belief referred to here is not perhaps as straightforward as that. The *credens* is after all not a believer of heresy, but of heretics: in the same terminology as the church councils, both Gui Foulques and the anonymous author of the *Consilium peritorum super quibusdam dubitabilibus* refer to them as *credentes hereticorum*.[24] Even where they are believers of errors, then those errors are firmly attached to, and mediated by, heretics: they are *credentes hereticorum erroribus*. Belief in heretics, and belief in their errors, according to the *Consilium peritorum Avinionensium*, are one and the same: 'credere quippe Valdensibus vel credere ipsorum erroribus vel credere ipsos bonos homines, pro eodem dixerunt firmiter se habere'.[25] That equation has the effect of rendering the error of belief as a single article, the belief in the otherwise unspecified errors of unspecified heretics, and means that the nature of those errors is immaterial. Although, as Arnold demonstrates, the question of belief undoubtedly remained a problematic one for inquisitors, it was in this way at least made into a question that was universally applicable. The fault lies in the action of belief, not the error of it, and can therefore be answered in the single question, 'did you believe the heretics, or what they said?'. A distinction is being made here between a relationship to error, which defines the heretic, and a relationship to a person, which defines the *credens*, and indeed all the lesser grades of guilt. In fact, Foulques himself emphasizes the importance of exactly this distinction in the case of *defensores*, distinguishing

---

[23] Selge, *Texte*, pp.53, 57.
[24] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.25va, other grades also attached, 25^{vb}, Foulques, *Consilium*, p.196.
[25] Patschovsky and Selge, *Quellen*, p.51.

between those who defend error, that is heretics, and those who defend people.[26] In this way then, believing, or believing incorrectly, which is what we would usually understand heresy to be, and what Gui Foulques defines it as, is here transformed into one more verb in the list of culpable actions.

The other effect of the distinction that these texts draw between error and person is to separate the 'heretic' from the larger group. Indeed, while the heretic is the object of all the verbs that designate guilt, this is really the only place in which he appears as the focus of the actions of others, or as the model by which others will be condemned: 'velut hereticos condemnandos'.[27] Each of these texts deals almost exclusively with the categories of followers, from which heretics are distinct. Despite Collemieu's injunction that 'inquisitionem faciendam pro iuribus bona fide et ad investigandum hereticos perfectos', almost no provision is made for this eventuality.[28] There is some overlap with the *credentes*, with whom they are sometimes associated, in such statements as 'non sunt credentes nec heretici sed fautores', though it is for this reason that the ever cautious Gui Foulques emphasizes that the charge of *credens* is a serious one, and should not be made lightly.[29] Otherwise the heretic is an outside figure, with little real presence except as the axis for the actions of the followers, and as the locus of the error and ritual, distinguished from others by their relationship to error. Though occasionally differentiated by name, as the Waldensians sometimes are, and though we can probably assume the 'heretics' usually to indicate Cathars, in the southern French tradition, with error reduced to a label, heretics are doctrinally homogenous.

What we see here then, is heresy not as a series of beliefs, but as a series of actions, all revolving around an abstracted figure. The virtue of this, from a legal point of view at least, is that as such, heresy and all its characteristics become generic and, because dependent on actions and devoid of doctrinal content, universally applicable. This is not the idea of heresy that derives from a theological standpoint; where 'heresy' is used here, it has a general sense, which encompasses

---

[26] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, ff.23^{vb-ra}; Foulques, *Consilium*, p.199. A similar distinction is made by the Damasi gloss to the third canon of the fourth Lateran council: 'istud loquitur in receptoribus et defensoribus hereticorum, non de ipsis hereticis', García, *Lateran 4*, p.420.
[27] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.23r; Foulques, *Consilium* p.196.
[28] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.29ra.
[29] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.26ra, Foulques, *Consilium*, p.196. Gui Foulques is always careful to draw a line between heretics and others where there is a danger of confusion, and emphasises several times that the seriousness of a charge of heresy should mean that judgements ought always to err on the side of caution.

all the actions and levels of involvement relating to the heretics and their errors. Although Gui Foulques employs legal authorities as a theologian might use Scripture, heresy in these texts is a legal error, not a doctrinal one: it is a crime and is talked about in these terms, described here and elsewhere in terms of the equations made in canon law with secular crimes of treason and theft. The anonymous *Consilium peritorum super quibusdam dubitabilibus* describes 'omnes criminosi et infames in heresi crimine admittuntur etiam principes criminis sicut in crimine lese maiestatis'.[30]

II – The product of inquisition

We now leave behind our consultations, with their advice on the correct process of inquisition, and move to those texts generated by the process itself, the depositions of witnesses before the inquisitors, and the sentences and penances imposed upon them. For this period, though we have some records from northern Italy, much of what survives represents inquisitions that were carried out in the South of France, a survival that is due in large part to the mission of Doat in the seventeenth century. The selection of these documents that we examine is listed here:

Penances of Pierre Cellan [31]

The penances imposed on the deponents before Pierre Cellan's inquisition in the Quercy region in the years 1241-42 survive in volume twenty-one of the Doat collection. They are extremely short and abbreviated, though Duvernoy believes this to be their original form, given the length of the other documents reproduced in the same volume.

---

[30] BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.26[ra].

[31] J. Duvernoy (ed.), *L'inquisition en Quercy. Le registre des pénitences de Pierre Cellan 1241-1242* (Castelnaud-la-Chapelle, 2001).

Depositions before Carcassonne inquisitors [32]

The whole of volume twenty-three, as well as part of twenty-four of the Doat collection is taken up with the depositions made before the Carcassonne inquisitors Ferrier, Pons Garin, and Pierre Durand between 1243 and 1245.

Sentences of Bernard of Caux and Jean of St.-Pierre [33]

The sentences passed by 1244-48 in Toulouse by these two inquisitors, who were also responsible for writing the *Ordo processus narbonensis* that we will look at in the next section, are edited by Douais in the text volume of his *Documents*, along with the depositions given before them against one Pierre Garcias in 1247.

Register of a Carcassonne notary [34]

A collection of penances from 1250-58, and some interrogatories from 1250-67, again, edited by Douais.

Depositions before Toulouse inquisitors [35]

The twenty-fifth Doat volume reproduces the later depositions before Renous of Plassac and Pons of Parnac at Toulouse between 1272 and 1278

Tuscan records [36]

A selection of Florentine depositions, sentences and penances from the time of Dante were edited by Felice Tocco as an appendix to his work on the Divine comedy, the first nineteen of which, dated 1244-76, provide a useful Italian source of inquisition records.

---

[32] Doat 23.
[33] *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc* ed. C. Douais (2 vols., Paris, 1900), vol.2: Textes; pp.1-89 Register, from BnF MS Lat. 9992; pp.90-114 are depositions against Pierre Garcias, taken from Doat 24.
[34] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.115-301.
[35] Forthcoming ed. by Biller, Bruschi and Sneddon, with thanks.
[36] F. Tocco, *Quel che non c'è nella divina commedia. Dante e l'eresia, con documenti e con la ristampa delle questioni dantesche* (Bologna, 1899), edn. of documents pp.34-60 (pp.61-78 contain further documents too late for this study).

Tuscan formulary and Orvieto Register [37]

Two sets of documents are edited by Mariano d'Alatri here: the first is a formulary, used in Tuscany and Umbria. The date of its use is hard to ascertain; the manuscript is fourteenth-century, but the documents that comprise it, where they are dated, are from the 1240s and 1250s. Several of these documents find their way into the inquisitor's manual that we will look at the end of this chapter. The second group of texts is the *Liber inquisitionis* of Orvieto, a register of the sentences imposed by the inquisitors Ruggero Calcagni in 1239 and 1249, and brother Giordano, in 1263.[38] According to Lansing, the marginalia of the manuscript suggest that it was kept as a treasury document.[39]

Before looking at these texts in detail, it is important to note the difficulties that they present to the historian. These difficulties, which have been brought to light in a succession of studies, most notably by Herbert Grundmann and Grado Merlo, and more recently by Caterina Bruschi, relate principally to the processes by which these documents were produced. The stages of translation through which they passed, from vernacular to Latin, from oral to written, and from the first person to a third person narrative, mean that their apparently smooth texture is in fact composed of several layers. This multi-layered structure naturally poses a variety of problems when trying to reach the 'truth' that they contain about heresy, not least the danger of circularity, namely, that the information contained by the records is the information that the inquisitors asked for. It is important for our study to be aware in this context that what appears to be a spontaneous confession is usually in fact rendered as such from a list of closed questions and their answers.[40]

Further to this, it is also worth noting that, unlike the other sources that we have considered, these documents were not intended to be read in the same way, not

---

[37] M. d'Alatri, *L'inquisizione francescana* (Rome, 1996), ed. of documents pp.171-338.
[38] Parts of the formulary are also in BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, ff.32ra-32rb, 34vb-35ra, 50va-51rb, 53ra-54ra.
[39] C. Lansing, *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (Oxford, 1998), p.27.
[40] For a succinct and helpful summary of these problems and processes, see Biller, 'Deep Is the Heart of Man', pp.267-70. H. Grundmann, 'Ketzerverhöre des Spätmittelalters als quellenkritisches Problem', repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXV (1976), vol.1, 312-27. G.G. Merlo, *Eretici e inquisitori nella società piemontese del Trecento: con l'edizione dei processi tenuti a Giaveno dall'inquisitore Alberto De Castellario (1335) e nelle Valli di Lanzo dall'inquisitore Tommaso Di Casasco (1373)* (Turin, 1977). C. Bruschi, '"Magna diligentia est habenda per inquisitorem": Precautions before Reading Doat 21-26', in Bruschi and Biller, 81-110.

as a text, but as a record. Of course their interest in this context is still as a record, though of the ideas and constructs used by those involved in their creation, rather than an individual's involvement with heresy, but they are also to some degree being treated as 'texts' in the source-critical sense and, as Arnold suggests, examined for their language and the rhetoric to which that language is harnessed.[41]

One more point must be mentioned in the context of this chapter, with regard to the imbalance between the French and Italian material. Though there are variations in the content of the information between the documents of the two regions, in the names given to heretics, for example, or in the proportion of male to female heretics that appear, the type of information that is sought, the pattern of the questions, and the essential framework of the documents remain the same. Indeed, most of the variations in this genre would seem to result more from differences between inquisitors than any regional peculiarities.

Unsurprisingly, there are several similarities between the representation of heresy that we find in these inquisition documents, and that which emerges from the reading of the consultations and the regional council material. Perhaps the biggest similarity lies in the role played by the heretic in the scheme of guilt and involvement, although there is also a disparity here in that the inquisition documents present a much fuller and more immediate picture of the heretics themselves than do the legal and conciliar texts. Built around real, named individuals and the details of their networks and itineraries, we will look first at the picture of heretics that the inquisition material provides, before moving on to look at the role that they play more closely – the following paragraphs deliberately bypass the large number of historians, from the time of Jean Guiraud onwards, who have used these inquisition records as direct and unproblematic evidence for the history of heresy.

As with the other legal texts that we have looked at, there is in the inquisition material a layer of heretics proper, a level of involvement that is not only higher than the others, but somehow apart from them, a distinction achieved most obviously through the terminology used to describe them. The Orvieto register

---

[41] J. Arnold, 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', in Bruschi and Biller, 63-80, p.63.

stands out among these texts for the ornate and almost polemical language with which it describes heretics, employing a great deal of mostly fairly standard imagery, but for the most part, heretics are distinguished firstly by their name. Though all the deponents may be involved in 'heresy', only the élite and the obstinate become 'heretics'. The label is usually further refined, by the use of terms such as *heretica induta* or, occasionally, the Cathar term *boni homines*. The Italian records use *heretici consolati* with some frequency; the Tuscan register sometimes also makes this a noun, *consolati*, to stand for heretics proper, though interestingly, in this collection of texts, there seems occasionally to be a distinction drawn between heretics, and consoled heretics: 'quidam heretici, tres vel iiij, ex quibus erant duo consolati'.[42] The Italian sources also use the term 'patarene' interchangeably with 'heretic', in contrast to the southern French records, which use either 'heretic', or 'Waldensian'.[43] There is also, in the Tuscan records, one rogue use of 'Manichee'.[44]

The descriptions of these heretics and their lives given by the deponents, and, on occasion, the heretics themselves, though directed by the questions of the inquisitor, create a detailed picture in which several aspects remain constant. Not least of these is the pastoral activity of the heretics. Their preaching and their administration of sacrament and ritual to their followers is an omnipresent element in the depositions, apparent in the background of all the testimony here. Indeed, the southern French heretics are extremely mobile, moving frequently between houses, but also from time to time, back and forth to nearby Lombardy, where conditions seem to have been more favourable. Lombard connections are noticeable in the earlier Carcassonne records, of Bernard of Caux, and of the Carcassonne notary, but are far more prominent, perhaps unsurprisingly, in the registers of Renous of Plassac and Pons of Parnac, filled with depositions from a time when many of the Cathars had fled the south of France for the relative safety of Lombardy.[45] As has

---

[42] Vested heretic, for example: Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.28, Doat 23, f.48v; good men, for example: Doat 23, f.119r, d'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.202; 249, Tocco, pp.36, 50; pp.35, 43. For the use of term 'perfects', see note at end of chapter, pp.179-80.
[43] D'Alatri, Orvieto, e.g.: pp.228, 213. Tocco, e.g.: pp.36, 43.
[44] Tocco, p.58.
[45] Douais, *Documents*: *Textes*, interest in geographical movement p.265f; Lombard connection pp.33, 287. Doat 25: interest in movement e.g. ff.12r, 90rff; links with Lombardy ff.13v, 131v, 39v-40r, 91v, 44vf. Doat 23, Dyas goes to northern Spain to hear heretics, f.71r. Such movement was not limited to the heretics, one Arnold Richier of Narbonne also left for fear of the inquisition, Doat 23, testimony of Petrus Daide, f.140^{r}.

been made well-known by specialists on the theme of women and heresy, in several places there are female heretics amongst the active élite: they are not frequent, but they can be found in all our sources, especially perhaps in the Tuscan records.[46] Doat 23 contains one long deposition from Arnaude, who had been a Cathar 'perfect' for many years; even in Pierre Cellan's brief penances there is mention of female heretics preaching, and of a Waldensian sister expounding Scripture.[47]

Exposition itself is rarely mentioned, and equally rarely described, though the depositions against Pierre Garcias, which even include the supporting Scriptural authorities, are a marked exception to this. There is, however, a faint but fairly continuous presence of heretical books to be found in these documents. One deposition of Doat 25 records the possession by heretics of books not only in the vernacular, but also in Latin, of which they also seem to be making copies. The deponent who provides this information is supposedly guarding the books for the heretics, a situation that, apart from ritual, is the most common context in which we find books. Interestingly, the same deponent also claims also to have studied the books and formed his (heretical) belief on the basis of what he read in them, though this may simply be a more literary version of the 'nobody taught me; I thought it up myself' dodge.[48] What is never, or almost never, recorded is the content of the books mentioned, or for that matter, of the sermons that the deponents attend.[49] What does emerge is a picture of a highly mobile, and above all organized group, which has its own hierarchy, composed of the deacons and bishops who make appearances from time to time, and which is still strong in the south of France even mid-century: Pierre Cellan's register of penances records an occasion on which seventy heretics were present in one house, and by the time of the register surviving in Doat 25, Catharism still appears as a fully established church.[50]

Despite this apparent success, heretics are also shown as hidden, and many of their activities are undertaken in secret. The hiding place is of course a well-established topos in the Catholic representation of heresy; heretics or their meetings

---

[46] Tocco, e.g. 38; d'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.306, 318, 265. Also in Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.70.
[47] Tocco, p.38; Doat 23, ff.2v-49v; f.72v, female heretics administer medical aid. Cellan, pp.78, 214; 152, 246.
[48] Doat 25, f.197^{v} (vernacular) f.198^{r} (Latin), use of books f.199^{r}. Doat 23, Petrus Daide, ff.128^{r}, 129^{v}, 138^{r}. Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.281. D'Alatri, Orvieto, formulary, pp.186, 181.
[49] Doat 23: preaching, e.g. ff.73^{v}, 133^{v}, but everywhere; d'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.176, 215, 230, 231, Patschovsky and Selge, *Quellen*, p.57; Doat 25: Interest in words of Waldensian preaching, f.197^{r}.
[50] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.102; Doat 23, ff.2^{v}-49^{v}; Doat 25, deacon ff.12^{v}, 13^{r-v}; established church with rights f.132^{r-v}; Tocco, visible hierarchy pp.41, 51.

are often located underground, in a 'den' or 'lair', an image associated with ideas of heresy as an infection or pollution, and enshrined in anti-heretical legislation where edicts of the councils demand that the physical places of heresy be destroyed. In this way it is also present in the sentences of inquisition. An Orvieto sentence decrees that the house of the condemned is to be razed to the ground, as a 'receptaculum sordium que fuit latibulum perfidiorum'.[51] In a similar way the Orvieto formulary condemns a house as 'perpetuum receptaculum sordium, ubi fuit aliquando latibulum hereticorum'.[52]

The *latibulum* constructs a physically hidden heresy, in parallel to the hidden moral condition that we have seen emphasized elsewhere, but there is also a layer of hiddenness that is more straightforwardly to do with avoiding persecution. Indeed, for all its traditional resonance, the *latibulum* itself could nonetheless be a real enough place. The deposition of Austorge of Rosenges is largely taken up with descriptions of moving and hiding various heretics from the late 1220s onwards, but it contains one detail of particular interest, in which Austorge describes hiding two *hereticae* in her home. One heretic, already in residence, will not eat without her *socia*, and so Austorge finds the heretic's companion and leads her to her house, where she 'aperuit sibi hostiolum quoddam et intravit ad alia hereticam et reposuit ambas hereticas in quodam dolio'.[53] As extraordinary as that sounds, some further explanation can perhaps be found in the later deposition of her neighbour, Arnaud of Bonhac, whose wife sees heretics hiding in the cellar of the Rosenges's house, 'ubi est quoddam clusellum', testimony that seems to suggest a specialized heretic-hiding facility beneath Austorge's house.[54]

If the hiddenness is real, then, in the French material, a change is visible over time: Arnaude of Lamothe's descriptions of her early life as a Cathar include the presence of several, publicly maintained Cathar houses, something also found in Dyas of Deme's testimony; in both cases these date from the first decade of the thirteenth century. In the later phase of her heresy however, after a brief return to

---

[51] D'Alatri, Orvieto, p.213.
[52] Tocco, p.181.
[53] Doat 24, f.2^{v}.
[54] Bibliothèque municipale, Toulouse, MS 609, f.200^{r}. A similar small underground hiding-place can be seen in the deposition of Arnaude of Lamothe, where she describes hiding 'subtus terram in quadam domuncula per unum mensem', Doat 23, fol.22^{v}. The classic account of heretics' hiding-places in Languedoc is in J. Guiraud, *Histoire de l'inquisition* (2 vols., Paris, 1935-38), vol. 2, cap. 3.

the Catholic faith, Arnaude spends most of her time as a 'Good Woman' moving covertly between different hiding places, often located in woods.[55]

Despite the covert nature of southern French heresy toward the middle of the century, it is nonetheless also possible to find disputations in this region. Undoubtedly one of the most entertaining of Douais' *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'inquisition* are those depositions before Bernard of Caux and Jean of St.-Pierre of a group of Franciscan friars, who appear to have taken it in turns to hide in the rafters of their house, in order to eavesdrop on a dispute between one of their number and a local *credens*.[56] That dispute is conducted in private, but there are also many witnesses to public debate in Cellan's register, not only between heretics and Catholics, but between different heretical groups as well.[57] Even in the late 1270s disputes between heretics and the local mendicants could be witnessed in the south of France.[58] A similar picture emerges from the Italian sources: one witness before the Orvieto inquisition testifies that he 'vidit patarenos in Crimona (sic) loquentes et disputantes'.[59] Another Tuscan deponent claims to have witnessed 'Gherardum hereticum in quodam culto apud Caregium disputantem de heresi cum Guilielmo notario' – the latter situation, a northern Italian layman engaged in dispute with heretics, of course recalls those polemics written by our own Salvo Burci and George.[60]

There is coming through these depositions a picture of an active and organized heretical group, but as noted, the content of the depositions must of course be determined by the questions that produce them. So, although there are suggestions of heretical learning, for example, in the presence and use of books, and of the heretics' apparently disputative nature, there is little information that would give a fuller picture, and very rarely is there any detail of the errors behind this learning. The level of detail that the depositions provide about the movements of heretics and connections between them and their followers is a result of the interest

---

[55] Doat 23, public Cathar houses, ff.3^{v}, 13^{r}; wood-dwelling in later phase of life, e.g. f.22^{v}f. Public houses in Dyas, f.71^{r}. Petrus Daide's deposition also often shows heretics in the woods, e.g. f.131^{r}. Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.252. In Bernard of Caux and John of St.-Pierre's register, condemned heretics are on several occasions visible through the deposition of their followers, roaming around, still at large despite their conviction. Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.61, 72.
[56] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.90-114.
[57] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, for example pp.56, 64, 68, 78, 96,102, 112.
[58] Doat 25, f.42^{r}.
[59] D'Alatri, Orvieto, p.231.
[60] Tocco, p.51; see also discussion of debate above, pp.51-52.

of the inquisitors in obtaining information about the local network that can be used to control and dismantle it – a large part of inquisition is indeed about police work, and it is information of this sort that makes up the vast proportion of the content of these sources.[61] The names of those who were present at rituals are sought and noted, and details of the ritual itself are included in as much as they determine the level of adherence – if you were at the adoration did you also bend your knee, did you say bless?[62] Attendance of heretical sermons and debates are a mark of guilt, but the contents of those sermons are not. Petrus Daide is asked not about the subject of the sermons he heard, only about the fact of his, and others' attendance.[63]

Only some parts of heretical activity are therefore recorded here, that is, the actions that determine involvement. While a picture of heretics does emerge from these sources, in some ways in spite of the direction of the questioning, the actual construct of the heretic is similar to that of the consultation material: heretics remain in some ways in the background, and although they are more common in some registers than in others, they are only occasionally the deponent before the inquisition. Mostly heretics are a constant but more or less distant presence, as the axis around which activities and guilt revolve, including, for many deponents, belief: there is only one penance amongst those in Cellan's register that includes any reference to error, a condensed and abbreviated version of Cathar doctrine, which contains very little else above the usual belief in the salvific abilities of sect and heretics.[64] Heretics are most often the object of those verbs that the consultations and councils use to define guilt, and which separate heretics from the raft of their supporters and believers.[65]

In light of this, we can now turn to look more closely at the representation of heresy in the inquisition texts, and what relationship this representation has with that of the consultations in particular. At a broad level, one similarity has already been highlighted, that which lies in the role played by the heretic in relation to the wider group. There is, as noted, a technical distinction between the heretics and the

---

[61] Biller, 'Deep Is the Heart of Man', pp.268-70.
[62] Cellan details of ritual, Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p. 124. Doat 25, details of ritual, ff.50^{v}; 162^{r}. Tocco, p.59.
[63] Doat 23, e.g. f.133^{v}.
[64] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.108.
[65] Doat 23, f.133^{v}; Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.6, 250; d'Alatri, Orvieto, p.249.

followers who make up the majority of the depositions, a distinction that is made in two main places, the first and most obvious of which has been described: the terminology used to describe them. The position of these heretics relative to the other deponents, and more importantly, to error, sets them further apart from the rest. As in our other legal sources, believers are never believers of error, but of heretics and the error of heretics.[66] Heretics are once again the medium between error and believer, and once again, the only blurring of this line is the overlap of *credens* with heretic. They are equated again in the abjuration given by the Tuscan formulary, 'quod hereticos et credentes eorum tot posse meo persequar et tam eos quam eorum fautores', etc.[67] The year before Tarragona states that *credentes* of heretics' errors are themselves to be considered as heretics, Cellan's penances also presents them as a group, 'fugerunt heretici et credentes qui ibi erant'.[68]

The distinction that is drawn in the legal material though, and in the language of the inquisition documents is not always maintained in the treatment received by the few heretics that are brought before the inquisitors. What sentences we have for 'vested' or full heretics record a penance or punishment that seems remarkably similar to that imposed on the lesser grades. Huga, and Bernarda of Rou, for example, two 'hereticae perfectae', are given penances by Pierre Cellan that are hardly different from, and in some cases rather less severe than those received by followers. His lenience is perhaps in part because of their gender: Pierre never sends women to the Holy Land, though he does send them to other parts of Europe. In contrast, Tocco's collection includes a sentence for a female heretic, Bona, who is condemned to the stake.[69] Nevertheless, in the Carcassonne register, we find a 'vested' heretic, in amongst a list of believers and followers,

---

[66] For example: Tocco, pp.51, 58; d'Alatri, Orvieto, p.212; Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.12, 21; Carcassonne Notary, p.192.
[67] D'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.177, 275, 296.
[68] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.94. There are two occasions in Duvernoy's edition of the Quercy penances, in which it appears as though *credentes* are being adored: 'et recepit eas bis et credens adoravit in domo sua et audierit predicationem earum'. Here Duvernoy corrects 'credens' to 'eos'. A little further on, we are told that after receiving heretics, the witness 'adoravit eos ibi et credens adoravit in domo sua hereticos', which Duvernoy again corrects, this time changing the verb 'adoravit' to 'recepit', pp.72, 90.
[69] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, Huga p.260; Bernada of Ro p.262. An equivalent penance is given, for example, to Raimunda, wife of Bosolens, p.180: Puy, St.-Gilles, Santiago de Compostela, St.-Denis, and the shrine of St. Thomas in Canterbury. The heretics though, are also given crosses, one for life, the other for five years, but some followers are sent to Constantinople for years on end. Also Tocco, pp.38-39.

given the same sentence without apparent distinction.[70] Similarly, the Orvieto book gives a sentence for a 'hereticam consolatam', which imposes the same, albeit harsh punishment on her as on many others who are not so labelled.[71]

More interestingly, while the sentences are inconsistent in their discrimination between heretic and follower, one of the few depositions that we have of a 'vested' heretic betrays no difference in approach or interest in the inquisitors' interrogation. The long deposition of Arnaude of Lamothe, a heretic for over thirty years in the south of France, contains no detail of error at all. Arnaude is not questioned about belief, and the questions she is asked are precisely those that are asked of everyone else, the only difference being that she is the object, rather than the subject, of the normal questions: not did you adore any heretics, but did anyone adore you? At the same time, someone like the knight hospitaller Faure of Birac, who seems to have had no involvement with heretics at all, is still asked the same questions.[72] Although there is a distinct layer of heretics that are nominally separate from the other deponents, what that seems to mean, principally, is someone who has undergone the ritual of initiation, who has *fecit se haereticam*.[73] The name is also to be applied to those who have relapsed, or refused to do their penance, in which case they can be sentenced 'as a heretic'. The term 'heretic' is understood, in other words, as a made thing, either through the actions of ritual, or the action of inquisition, and so in the context of inquisition documents, even heretical status can be signalled in terms of a tangible action. That differentiation between heretic and *credens* is borne out by Vincent of Spain's gloss to the fourth Lateran constitutions, which explains *credentes* as those 'qui nondum profitentur sectam aliquam'.[74] So it is that Pierre Garcias, who appears, in his dispute with the Franciscan brothers, to hold full heretical beliefs, and even to be living a semi-heretical, ascetic lifestyle, cut off from his wife, can still be called a *credens*.[75]

The main agenda of the interrogations visible in these depositions, as we have noted, seems to be directed at the acquisition of information that will allow the removal of material support from the heretical networks, that is, names, dates and contacts. That agenda is visible quite clearly in the penalties that the registers

---

[70] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.28.
[71] D'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.245, 256.
[72] Doat 23, ff.2^{v}-49^{v}; 118^{v}-120^{v}.
[73] Doat 23, f.129^{v}. Similarly, 'fecit se Valdensem', f.139^{r}.
[74] García, *Lateran 4*, p.291.
[75] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.90ff., esp. p.109, p.95.

record: it is noticeable in Pierre Cellan's penances for example, that those who receive the harshest penalties are those who have provided property or land for the heretics' use. Gaubert Sicard of Courande, who allowed the Cathars to keep a 'hereticata domus' on his land, for which the heretics paid him, seems to have had little more to do with them other than to bring them their groceries; nonetheless he is sent to exile in Constantinople, it would seem indefinitely.[76] Similarly, the Orvieto sentences are almost entirely material in their nature, dealing out confiscation and disinheritance, but very little in the way of crosses and pilgrimage.[77] If we look ahead to one of our inquisitor's manuals, the *Ordo processus narbonensis* regards deprivation of goods is the most effective remedy against heresy: 'bona hereticorum tam dampnatorum quam immuratorum publicare facimus et compellimus ut debemus, et per hoc est quod specialiter confundit hereticos et credentes'.[78]

All of which is not to say however, that inquisitors were not interested in error; we can see that there are a few occasions on which they do use question lists that are built around known heretical errors to interrogate a deponent, though the deposition of one heretic in Tocco's collection, for example, seems to be little more than a checklist of standard errors.[79] Although for the most part, heretical errors do not have much more presence than as a label in these depositions, as something attached to heretics, and any 'belief' on the part of the follower is either mediated by heretics, or is little more than a statement of spiritual belief in salvific qualities of the sect, occasionally we are given depositions that contain nothing but error. The case of the Franciscan depositions against Pierre Garcias, which provide the content of his argument and the ensuing debates in great detail, are the best example of such depositions. Aside from the Garcias case, of the collections that we have looked at here, some of most error-based interrogations can be seen in depositions contained in the twenty-fifth Doat volume. Several of these are unusual in being given not by Cathar believers or followers of a known sect, but by individuals who seem to have held, so Wakefield suggests, independently unorthodox ideas, 'materialistic or rationalistic explanations of natural phenomena', that the corn

---

[76] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.126.
[77] D'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.223, 226; Douais, *Documents: Textes*, pp.6, 250; d'Alatri, Orvieto, p.249.
[78] Selge, *Texte*, p.76.
[79] Tocco, pp.35-36.

grows because of the earth and not the power of God.[80] The structure of the questions here, for example: 'interrogatus si dixerat unquam quod si corpus Christi esset ita magnum sicut unus mons clerici comedissent illud diu est', make it clear that they have been drawn from other witness testimony, though it is also worth noting that the usual questions of when, how often, and who else was there, still follow each article.[81] The consequent depositions record a great deal more information than usual on the precise nature of belief, in contrast to the regulated documentation of external markers, and the reason for this no doubt lies in the irregularity of these ideas, the deviance from the normal range of systematic belief that inquisitors knew, or expected, those markers to convey.[82]

If we look in the same volume at the deposition by and against Fabrissa of Limoux, we can see a similar thing happening: again, unusually, there is a level of detail in the report of error, and even more unusually, the depositions of her neighbours against her are preserved in the same register. It is these depositions that form the starting point for the inquisitors' interrogation. Fabrissa clearly has a firm grasp of at least the principal errors of the Cathar sect, and like the deponents above is asked about several very specific statements, drawn from the other depositions that she has made, many pertaining to matters of childbirth. The inquisitors do not, however, ask her to give further details of these errors, but rather to say whether or not she did actually say or think them.[83]

The pattern of these depositions suggests that where error does have some presence in these depositions, however exceptional, the inquisitors' interest in it is not investigative: where any detail of error appears, it is as part of an interrogation based on *fama*, and not as part of a theological examination. Even the Garcias depositions follow the same pattern of using witness statements to build a question list that will establish guilt, and the detailed nature of these statements is perhaps attributable to the equally unusual fact that the deponents are mendicant friars. The reported error is used as marker and the usual auxiliary questions are added. Perhaps the non-standard errors of the 'materialists' are afforded more space than usual, but interrogations based on unusual errors are not seeking an explanation of

---

[80] W.L. Wakefield, 'Some unorthodox popular ideas of the thirteenth century', *Medievalia et humanistica*, n.s.4 (1973), 23-35, pp.25-26. Doat 25, f.22^{v}.
[81] Doat 25, f.21^{r-v}.
[82] Doat 25, ff.20^{v}-25^{v}; ff.226^{v}-228^{v}.
[83] Doat 25, ff.37^{v}-53^{r}.

the errors from the deponent any more than question lists that repeat established articles of error, only assent or denial to a series of articles. Error is a present and integral part, but is not what inquisitors are looking for in these interrogations.

A focus on actions, and on information, which sees even heretical status defined in terms of measurable actions, makes the picture of heresy that we find in the depositions overwhelmingly a thing of ritual and of presence. Arnaude's deposition is filled with details of where she went, what rituals she performed, what others did for her, and in each case, who was there at the time. For the heretics, as well as for the supporting cast, heresy is a fuller version of that list of verbs that constitute the culpable actions outlined in the consultations, and deponents are charged with *crimen hereseos,* or *crimen heresis*, which the Tuscan formulary glosses as including 'sive credendo hereticorum erroribus, sive ipsos receptando, sive quodlibet auxilium, consilium et favorem prestando, sive quoviscumque modo circa crimen huiusmodi delinquendo'.[84]

All the examples of error that we have looked at so far have been taken from documents that were not intended for public reading. Sentences, on the other hand, were pronounced and carried out publicly, 'lecta lata et publicata fuit dicta sententia ... in pleno populo marum et mulierum dicte civitatis ad hec convocato'.[85] It is worth noting that, between the documents produced by those two processes, there was a significant gap in the information included. The case of Austorge of Rosenges, mentioned above, is one of those relatively unusual occasions on which there are both a confession and a sentence surviving for the same deponent. Her sentence, which is a group sentence that includes many other deponents, is brief and to the point. She and the others saw, adored and believed the errors of heretics, and, after having abjured heresy, then did all those things again. They all receive a penance of perpetual incarceration. Behind this short condemnation are various depositions, including one of her own – the Rosenges family were, according to Douais, notorious for their involvement in the affairs of heretics, and Austorge seems to have been caught out at least three times – all of which provide a detailed and complex picture of involvement. None of that detail or complexity is

---

[84] D'Alatri, Orvieto, p.172.
[85] D'Alatri, Orvieto, p.213.

transmitted to the public sentence.[86] The collections of sentences are really the main public face of the inquisition process that we have access to.

Both Italian registers contain a single sentence that lists the specific errors of the deponent. The Orvieto register contains sentences imposed during a period lasting from March 1268 to January 1269, though the majority of these are from the earlier half of this period. The one sentence that contains details of error is the only one dating from April of 1268, the first of the sentences, at least as preserved by this register, that would have been read publicly.[87] Of the documents that Felice Tocco includes in his collection, the sentence containing descriptions of error is again the earliest in date, though as a collection, the relationship between the documents gathered together here is unclear.[88]

The sentence collection of Bernard of Caux and Jean of St.-Pierre also contains one sentence that describes, though in no great doctrinal or theoretical detail, the errors in question. In this case it is neither the earliest, nor in any other way significantly different.[89] The inclusion of such details in one or two sentences seems odd, especially when they are hardly prominent in the depositions themselves, but they can perhaps be explained as public safety announcements. Whether or not an action was undertaken 'knowingly' is, as we have seen, a recurrent concern in the legal texts that we have looked at, and it appears to have been equally important for those interrogating deponents.[90] Sure enough, the Tuscan records cite the public reading of sentences as a good reason to disregard any attempt to claim ignorance of heretical status on the part of the deponent.[91] A knowledge of what inquisitors meant by heresy can be seen in the case of the deponent who, on meeting some heretics, apparently questioned them about their dualist doctrine. The heretics promptly denied this, and ascribed it instead to vicious rumours started by the Catholics. Such a denial perhaps suggests the

---

[86] Sentence in Douais, *Documents: Textes*, no.II, pp.3-5, p.4 n.2; see also p.97 n.1. Deposition by Austorge in Doat 24, ff.1^{r}-7^{v}. See also depositions by Arnaud of Bonhac, Toulouse, MS 609, f.200^{r}, Petrus Fogasset of Caraman, Doat 23, f.325^{v}, Aymersens of Cambiac, Doat 22, f.239^{v}, ref. in Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.98, n.1. Her deposition before Ferrier and Peter Durand in Doat 24 comes two years before her sentencing by Bernard of Caux and John of St.-Pierre in 1246, but already she admits here to having been caught and abjured once before, by the inquisitors of Toulouse some years earlier. At that point she claims to have been a *credens* for sixteen years. The events described by Arnaud of Bonhac must have occurred only months after her 1244 deposition.
[87] D'Alatri, Orvieto, pp.318-20.
[88] Tocco, pp.35-37.
[89] Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.71.
[90] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, e.g. p.54; Douais, *Documents: Textes*, p.4; d'Alatri, Orvieto, p.222.
[91] Tocco, p.53.

restriction of secret knowledge that Raniero describes, but it also points to an uninitiated member being able to put his finger on what it was that made the heretics doctrinally wrong or different. One man can even be seen in the Quercy register to want to compare the two sects; having visited the Waldensians, he then 'ivit ad hereticos, volens temptare qui essent meliores, Valdenses vel heretici'.[92] Though it is equally probable that the origin of either man's knowledge would be someone like Fabrissa, a source of local and neighbourly knowledge, perhaps the seeming use of inquisition vocabulary by deponents is not only a result of rewriting by the agents of the Catholic church. There are even places in which a counter-tradition can be discerned; an awareness of how to avoid difficult answers, a tradition that we know from other sources to have existed, and which can perhaps be seen behind the illustrations of heretical sophistry under interrogation that are presented by Stephen of Bourbon and the Pseudo-David of Augsburg.

It is clear then that the list of actions that define heresy in the councils, and in the consultations, also define the picture of heresy that the inquisition material presents; the same ideas determine what questions are asked, and what information recorded. Overall there is little concern with heresy as doctrinal error. Further, the scheme of actions in the registers also includes heretics, who are also now indicated by actions that function as markers of guilt. Little distinction is made in these documents between the treatment of heretics and lesser categories, or indeed between members of different heretical groups, with the exception of the élite: depositions usually begin with the question did you see heretics *or* Waldensians, and certainly people appear to have been able to distinguish. The same vocabulary though, the same list of actions, is applied to almost everyone else, and the same actions seem to result in the same label for followers of both groups. Heresy here is a crime, or at least is in the process of becoming one. We can see in the consultations especially that actions are considered at least to some extent as shorthand for an interior condition, although in the registers the weight given to details of actions and physical presence by the inquisitors' questions can perhaps also be seen to rest on a desire to remove the material basis, as the conciliar legislation instructs. The process behind these records nevertheless turns an error of belief into an error of action.

---

[92] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.146. *Meliores* is Duvernoy's correction of *milieres*. See also above, p.52, n.34.

III – Inquisitor's handbooks

que scripto facile non possent comprehendi

In 1947, Father Antoine Dondaine published a seminal article in which he argued that the legislative development of the papal inquisition could not be properly understood in isolation from the 'secondary' material that surrounded it. To this end, he turned his attention, and ours, to a previously under-used group of these secondary texts: that of the inquisitor's manual.[93] Dondaine identified several stages in the development of the manual form, though the difficulty of the material means that the distinctions between his different stages are not always clear. Early manuals were unstructured compilations, found in collections of materials put together for the use of inquisitors that also contained official texts, consultations, formularies of procedure, and treatises on the doctrines and practice of heretics. Later the manual became a fully formed and independent treatise, which finds its most sophisticated expression in the *De auctoritate et forma inquisitionis*, and especially, in the following century, in the *Practica inquisitionis* of Bernard Gui.[94]

In our period, the manual is still at an early stage of development, according to Dondaine's scheme, and the majority of this chapter will be concerned partly with those treatises included in inquisitor's collections that describe heretical doctrine and practice, and partly with manuals that also include formulae. The former group will include the *Summa* of Raniero Sacconi, the most frequently copied of its kind, as well as the Anonymous of Passau, the *De inquisitione hereticorum,* and the *Tractatus de hereticis* of Anselm of Alessandria. The second category is represented by one *manuel sans formulaire*, the *Ordo Processus Narbonensis*, though Dondaine also suggested that the *De inquisitione hereticorum*, which contains some procedural material, could also be partly understood as an embryonic example of this form. We will turn, at the end, to look at a *manuel avec*

---

[93] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.85-86.
[94] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.88-125. On the appearance of the inquisitor's manual as a part of the wider trend for handbooks, see Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, p.44.

formulaire. Given that the boundaries between the different types are so fluid, we will use the term 'manual' here in a general sense to refer to all our texts.

Ordo processus Narbonensis [95]

Written in 1248/49, by the inquisitors Bernard of Caux and John of St.-Pierre, this is one of the earliest examples of the inquisitor's manual.[96] It is extant in only one manuscript, in Madrid, but is referred to by several later authors.[97]

Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno [98]

The *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno,* which the explicit dates to 1250, details the beliefs of the Cathars, their various churches, and the writings of John of Lugio; information on the *Pauperi de Lugduno* is relegated to a short section at the end of the work.[99] Its author, Raniero Sacconi, born in Piacenza near the beginning of the thirteenth century, reverted to Catholicism after seventeen years as a Cathar. In 1245, under the influence of Peter of Verona, he became a Dominican friar, and later, between 1254-59, inquisitor for his native Lombardy. He describes himself as a former 'heresiarcha', and though it is unclear whether by this he means that he was one of the higher orders of his church, the fact that he seems privy to the higher levels of knowledge that he describes as restricted, and that he also uses the term heresiarch of John of Lugio, elder son and bishop of the Albanenses, might suggest that this was the case.[100]

According to Šanjek, the *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno* is still extant in over fifty manuscripts.[101] The *Summa* survives in two forms: in its original, discrete state, and as a part of another treatise into which it was imported around 1260, that of the Anonymous of Passau. The opening of the text suggests a

---

[95] Selge, *Texte*, pp.70-77; Eng. transl. in W.L. Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France 1100-1250* (London, 1974), pp.250-258. See also Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.97-101.
[96] Dondaine attributed this text to William Raymond and Peter Durand, but this has been superseded by Dossat's ascription to the two named above, Dossat, *Crises*, p.167. See also Arnold, *Inquisition*, p.243 n.2, and in 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', p.65 n.10, and Wakefield, *Heresy Crusade and Inquisition*, p.250.
[97] See Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.101.
[98] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa de catharis*, ed. F. Šanjek, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 44 (1974) 31-60; Wakefield and Evans transl. pp.329-346; also printed in *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIIe siècle. Le* Liber de duobus *principiis suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare*, ed. A. Dondaine (Rome, 1939) (reprint of the Martène and Durand edition). See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.64-66.
[99] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.132, 149, 166. The authenticity of the Waldensian section has been questioned by Geiseler, according to Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen*, p.59 n.32.
[100] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, pp.44, 52, 59, 57.
[101] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, pp.39-41.

descriptive or discursive work of the opinions of the Cathar and Waldensian sects, and to some extent that is what is presented, but Raniero seems unable to contain his text within the framework he sets out. Instead, the text ranges out of the description of beliefs and into rather unfamiliar territory, providing also descriptions of way of life and behaviour, as well as accounts of the history and development of the churches of the sort that we start to see appearing in later inquisitor's manuals. Raniero also shows concern to make clear the different geographical distinctions of the heretical churches and the corresponding doctrinal peculiarities.

Anonymous of Passau [102]

The compilation known as the Anonymous of Passau is a large and composite work that is directed at various enemies of the church, mainly the Jews, but also the antichrist and heretics, and which incorporates a version of Raniero Sacconi's *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno* so completely, that it can also be considered an extension of the *Summa*'s manuscript survival.[103] Patschovsky's study of self-references within the compilation suggests that the compiler was a Dominican who had been an inquisitor in the diocese of Passau during the 1260s.[104] The large numbers of manuscripts that survive of this text show that it quickly became popular, but have also made a definitive version of the work very hard to establish. The Anonymous of Passau has a complex manuscript tradition, and is extant in at least two recensions, if not more – Patschovsky shows that the earlier version in fact exists in many different forms. Moreover, Nickson argues that one later version, also known as the Pseudo-Reinerius is in fact a shortened version of the anti-heretical sections of the original, and itself exists in two versions, having been further abbreviated in a second redaction.[105] The later recensions cannot really be dated more securely than 1270-1300, but ultimately reproduce the earlier text. The text has, unsurprisingly, never been edited in its entirety; a selection was published by Gretser originally in the seventeenth century, and reprinted several

---

[102] Anonymous of Passau, *<Tractatus>*, ed. J. Gretser, *Lucae Tudensis episcopi, scriptores aliquot succedanei contra sectam Waldensium* (Ingolstadt, 1613), 262-75.
[103] Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.173.
[104] A. Patschovsky, *Der Passauer Anonymus. Ein Sammelwerk über Ketzer, Juden, Antichrist aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts,* Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXII (1968), pp.78-89.
[105] M.A.E. Nickson, 'The "Pseudo-Reinerius" Treatise, The Final Stage of a Thirteenth Century Work on Heresy from the Diocese of Passau', *AHDLMA*, 62 (1967), 255-314, pp.256-60.

times since, and some parts have also been edited by Patschovsky and by Nickson. In the light of the complex and fragmentary nature of what has been edited, and the consequent difficulty of identifying which version is represented by each edition, in the following the work is cited without distinguishing between the different recensions.

De inquisitione hereticorum [106]

Attributed by Preger, rather precariously, to the German Franciscan David of Augsburg, but certainly written by an inquisitor or by someone working closely with inquisitors, this text is a manual dealing with the Waldensian heresy and its inquisition, from the second half of the thirteenth century. It is extant in at least two recensions, identified by Dondaine, of which the order of precedence is uncertain. Dondaine believes that the Short recension is the earlier text, and it is generally thought that the short text is of French origin, and the longer German, but there are also arguments for a German origin. The Short recension is reproduced entirely in the Long, with the exception of the initial and final three chapters, which seem to have been added, and the Long recension includes additional chapters, and reorganizes the shorter text to some degree. According to Dondaine, it is only the shorter of the two that appears in the collections designed for inquisitors.[107] A precise dating of this text is very difficult, but there are signs that point some of the way. Two definite facts present themselves: first is a reference to the conflict between Emperor and Pope, in which Frederick (II) is described as 'late'; Frederick died in 1250. Secondly, there is a reference to 'St. Peter OFP', who was killed in 1252, and canonized in 1253. This gives then a solid *terminus post quem* of 1253.[108] What may also be possibly helpful is that the added chapter at the beginning of the short recension is a highly condensed version of the account of Waldensian origins given by Stephen of Bourbon in the *De septem donis de Spiritus Sancti.* The

---

[106] Short recension: Thesaurus novus anecdotorum ed. E. Martène and U. Durand (5 vols., Paris, 1717) vol.5, cols.1777 C-1794 B. Long recension ed. by W. Preger, 'Der Tractat des David von Augsburg über die Waldesier', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 14 no.2 (1879), 204–35.

[107] Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.93.

[108] A very, very tentative suggestion might be made further on the reference to Frederick, which runs in full: 'tempore dissentionis quae fuit inter Dominum Innocentium papam IV. & Fredericum quondam imperatorem'. The author does not refer to any other dead people using *quondam*, and it may indicate that the emperor is recently deceased. Possibly it might distinguish between the dead emperor, and the living Pope, Innocent IV having died in 1254.

preface is missing however at least from the Dublin manuscript of this recension, and though Esposito, following Quetif and Echard, suggests that the following twenty-four sections of the *De inquisitione* are in part adapted from Stephen's work, the only apparent similarities lie in two parallel pieces of the sample interrogation. If there were a dependence on Stephen's text, this would put the date of the *De inquisitione* post-1261.[109]

Tractatus de hereticis [110]

Although the surviving copy of this work is anonymous, we know it to have been written by the Lombard inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria through the work of Father Dondaine. It was begun by Anselm around 1267, and he continued to add to it through his career until 1279; it survives in only one manuscript, in the National museum of Hungary, in Budapest. The manuscript also contains a copy of the *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno* of Anselm's fellow inquisitor, Raniero Sacconi, inserted incongruously into Anselm's text in a way that leads Dondaine to believe that it is accidental. Dondaine sees Anselm's handbook as complementary to Sacconi's text, providing as it does information on the Concorezzensan schism, much as Raniero does for the Albanensan church.[111]

Unlike the conciliar and consultation material, the handbooks represent a body of knowledge passed from inquisitor to inquisitor, and the principal concern of these

---

[109] M.M. Esposito, 'Sur quelques écrits concernant les hérésies et les hérétiques aux xii^{e} et xiii^{e} siècles', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, v.36 (1940) 143-62; p.159; *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis*, ed. J. Quétif and J. Echard (2 vols., orig. Paris, 1719-21, repr. New York, 1959), vol.1 pp.191.ii-192.ii. The similarity appears limited. Stephen's account of Waldensian errors is very limited and brief, and is followed by an account of his experience, and then of Cathar errors. The sample interrogation contains two pieces that are similar; one question: 'Credis Christum de Virgine natum, passum, resurrexisse et ascendisse in coelum? Respondit alacriter, Credo' is in Stephen given as: 'cum queritur: "Credis Christum natum, passum, etc.?" Respondent: "Bene credo" vel "firmiter credo", id est firmam vel bonam habeo credenciam', here referring to plural speakers, and not specifically Waldensians but heretics generally. A similar response also, where the *De inquisitione* heretic says '"Simplex homo sum et illiteratus, nolite me capere in verbis meis"', Stephen's claims '"Ego sum homo simplex, talis et talis, et nescio istas questiones"'. Both of these look like an expression of the same ideas, but in independent expressions. Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1790; Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.313.

[110] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus de hereticis*, ed. A. Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II and III', *AFP*, XX (1950), 234-324, pp.308-324. Eng. transl. of much of this text in Wakefield and Evans, pp.167-70, 361-73. See Rottenwöhrer, vol.1.i, pp.98-99

[111] Dondaine, 'Hierarchy II, III', pp.239-40.

texts is the communication of information: information about heretics on the one hand, and about the repression of heresy, that is inquisition, on the other. Ultimately, when the manual form reached its fullest expression in the early fourteenth century, these two types of information were both integral parts of its composition, along with formularies and question lists. These earlier manuals do present something similar to that model, though the balance is less even between information and formula, with more emphasis on the former. The manuals containing formulae, such as the *Ordo processus Narbonensis*, though also written by and for inquisitors, contain only information about the process of inquisition, but we will look first at what the more informative handbooks tell us about the representation of heresy in these texts, before moving on to look at that put forward by the procedural aspects.

Raniero opens his short text with a simple comparison: 'cum secte hereticorum olim fuerint multe, que omnino fere destructe sunt per gratiam Ihesu Christi, tamen due principales modo inueniuntur'.[112] With these few lines, Raniero places his subject in an historical frame; it is very brief, but the other texts take up where Raniero left off. If these handbooks seek to convey information, then each is also concerned, in its own way, to provide the same *types* of information for its reader, and the first thing that they do is to attempt to describe in some way a historical background for the sect in question. Like Raniero, the Anonymous of Passau draws a comparison between the relative numbers of heresies old and new. The Passau text in fact opens with three theoretical chapters on the difference between the Catholic church and heretical sects, and on the causes of heresy, before it begins its actual description of heretics, but the first of these, that is the fourth chapter, does something very similar to Raniero's opening lines, albeit in a little more detail. 'De sectis antiquorum hereticorum' deals with ancient heretics very briefly, and only to say that the many, he gives the number at seventy, have now been reduced to four, of which 'non est pernicior Ecclesie quam Leonistarum'. It is on this latter sect that the next chapter, on modern heretics, is focussed. The Anonymous of Passau now

[112] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.42.

goes further, and presents a small section that outlines the origins of the Waldensian sect, though it does not name Valdes himself.[113]

The pattern is repeated in the other two texts, and at the beginning of each of there is a section which gives a potted history of the sect in question. Anselm prefaces his account of the Cathar churches of Italy by tracing their historical and geographical spread, from the ancient Manicheans, and from Bulgaria, via the North of France to the south and Italy – as Barber points out, this section makes Anselm one of the few western writers to attempt to investigate the history of the Cathars himself.[114] The Pseudo-David similarly begins with an account of Waldensian origins, though it is important to note that the first paragraph, which gives a more recognizable version, was a later addition by a different author, perhaps because the original account, now the second section, seems to be lacking some of the salient points of the sect's history, for example, its founder Valdes. The Pseudo-David though also has echoes of the contrast between old and new that Raniero and the Anonymous of Passau draw. These heretics, he tells us, 'antiquorum hereticorum errores suis adinventionibus miscuerunt'. Much further on, we learn that the heretics of modern times hide their errors.[115]

Raniero's treatment of the historical context is extremely cursory, and though he later describes some recent events in Cathar history as a background to the schism in the Albanensan church, it is a pity that he did not choose to expand the historical opening as the other authors did, as his inside view of the sect's idea of its history would have been very interesting. All the texts open with a historical perspective, however, in some form. There are two devices at work here, the most straightforward of which is the provision of some account of the origins of the sect in question at or near the beginning of the text. Alongside this there is the comparison between heresies of the ancient world, and those of modern times and their relative numbers. The ancient component of this parallel appears to be taken from an Isidorean model of heresy, which we have looked at already in the *Decretum*, and which names a large number of sects. The influence of this model can be seen working in the Anonymous of Passau's later description of other sects,

---

[113] Anonymous of Passau, p.264.
[114] Dondaine, *Hierarchy II, III*, pp.308-309; M. Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2000), p.27. On the wider significance of the history given by Anselm see Biller 'Northern Cathars', *passim*.
[115] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1777-78, 1779; col.1788.

in which he uses the model to derive their names, from their author or their cause.[116] Perhaps this is also why the Pseudo-David's original account of the birth of the Waldensian movement contains no mention of Valdes, and focuses instead on the place of origin, that is, Lyon; like the Anonymous of Passau, this text only ever calls this sect the *pauperes de lugduno*.[117] Even Anselm tacks an abbreviated version of Isidore's list onto the end of his treatise. We will come back to this idea in more detail in a later chapter.

The principal concern of all four texts, and the focus of the majority of their material, is with two elements of the sects' make-up: the errors of the heretics, and their behaviour and customs. For Raniero, this is the whole of his subject. He begins with a brief outline of the main Cathar errors, before moving on to a detailed description of their sacraments and their ecclesiastical structure, and of the doctrine that lies behind each of these. Raniero then breaks the structure down into individual churches, and not just roughly divided along types of dualism, but sixteen distinct groups, each with separate names that he tends to use instead of 'Cathars', and each with separate, though overlapping doctrines. Raniero's text presents us with a picture of Catharism as a highly structured and hierarchical organization, an organization that applies to all the Cathar groups, and though Raniero points out where certain groups, usually the Albanenses, differ from the rest, this also serves to highlight that otherwise these structures are shared.[118] Raniero's treatment of the Waldensian sect is very brief, but, like his account of the Cathars, is nevertheless based on the principal divisions in the sect, with one chapter devoted to the Poor of Lyons, and one to the Lombard branch. The three segments on the Waldensians that were sometimes copied into manuscripts directly after Raniero's text, presumably to remedy the deficiency of his text on this subject, continue in the same vein, providing information on the errors, with some attention to differences, and details of Waldensian customs and sacraments.[119]

In a way very similar to the *summa* of his colleague, the doctrinal differences between the Cathar groups, including the schism in the church of Concorezzo, provide the framework for Anselm's description of Cathar errors,

---

[116] Anonymous of Passau, p.272.
[117] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1777-78.
[118] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, pp.43-49.
[119] BnF MS Lat.14983, ff.46-54. They also follow Raniero's text in BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, ff.58va-59^{rb}.

which comprises much of his first section. They are also the basis for his treatment of the Waldensians, which is more extensive than in the previous text. Like Sacconi, Anselm imparts his information without judgement or comment, and makes no attempt to engage with the error, but merely to describe it, and his reserved approach continues in his treatment of heretical custom, which preserves one of the most detailed records that we have of the Cathar ritual of *consolamentum*. There is an emphasis on ritual and formalized behaviour in this text, and alongside the *consolamentum*, Anselm describes in similar detail the disposition of penance, Cathar behaviour at table, even the secret question that they use to determine whether they are amongst friends: 'est hoc lignum tortum?'.[120] An explanation of ritual and of the doctrine behind it is shown to be necessary by the addition of some practical advice: 'bene facerent consolamentum etiam si paries vel murus vel fluvius esset in medio; et ideo diligenter cavendum est quando habemus aliquos suspectos ne cathari infirmantibus appropinquent, vel etiam domibus in quibus detinentur'.[121] It is possible that Anselm used Raniero's *summa* as a model for his own, at least in part; we certainly know that he made use of it.[122]

The Anonymous of Passau is similar again; it also devotes a lot of space to error, not least because of its inclusion of Raniero's text, though this is also the only material that it has on heretical custom or hierarchy. The chapter on modern sects, which, as we have noted, is really only about the Waldensians, includes a long descriptive list of their errors. The chapter that follows, on the names of sects, again describes different groups in terms of their error, but again there is no polemic or invective, merely report. The *De inquisitione* on the other hand, though it launches into a description of errors in the first chapter, and directly after the historical account, as the Passau text does, then goes on to spend most of this part of the text describing the characteristics and character flaws of the heretics in a fairly uncomplimentary way. The middle parts of this text are in fact given over to a description of behaviour that is perhaps more polemically directed than the other handbooks, describing their methods of learning and preaching, and associations with rich women, in order to condemn them; the Pseudo-David does make some

---

[120] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, pp.313-17. The Anonymous of Passau also describes the use of the 'crooked stick' code, used to determine if they are among friends, though note that the words are not the same, and the use of German in this account, which would suggest an equivalent usage, and not a borrowing from Anselm, Anonymous of Passau, p.264.
[121] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, pp.313-14.
[122] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, p.315.

attempt at even-handedness in clearing the Waldensians of any sexual misconduct, though the charge is then laid at the feet of the Cathars.[123] There is none of the ritual and formalized behaviour of the other three texts.

In describing the structural composition of these texts the contrast in style between the texts of the Pseudo-David and the Anonymous of Passau on the one hand, and the detached work of the two Italian inquisitors on the other will already have become apparent. More than this though, the more rhetorical address of the former two texts, and particularly the Pseudo-David, employs some of the now familiar anti-heretical topoi in a way that sets up several oppositions between the different representations of heresy in the handbooks.

The *De inquisitione* places a consistent and indeed predominant emphasis on the difference that lies between the appearance of the Waldensians and the inner reality, a device that we have seen in several of the texts that we have looked at so far, and one which we have highlighted already in this one, in the Pseudo-David's juxtaposition of the modern heretic, who does not declare his heresy openly, and his ancient counterpart.[124] The theme is partly developed through the repeated use of terms related to disguise and deception: the image of a cloak is used often.[125] It is stated several times that the Waldensians claim to be the true successors of the apostles and early saints, and that they presume to take on the role of the church through pride, an idea that is taken up and expanded on in the Long recension, where, 'sicut enim symea', the heretics think themselves to be the successors of the apostles.[126] The holiness of the heretic is affected however; it is a 'cloak of sanctity'. Twice heretics are compared to wolves in sheep's clothing, though more obliquely on the second occasion, and this is reinforced with oppositions such as 'continentiam laudant, sed urente libidine'.[127] Indeed, the sample interrogation that we will look at shortly is given over in its entirety to the demonstration of the

---

[123] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1782-85.
[124] The juxtaposition occurs as part of the chapter on examining heretics in the Short recension, Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1788, but is elevated to the introduction of the Long recension, and expanded on, Preger, Pseudo-David, p.204.
[125] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1779, 1782, 1783, 1788, 1790.
[126] Preger, Pseudo-David, p.211; The heretics as monkeys imitating the true church comes from Cyprian, Guillaume d'Auxerre also uses it, *Summa aurea*, ed J. Ribailler, Spicilegium Bonaventuriarum, XVI-XIX (4 vols. in 6, Paris & Grottaferrata, 1980-87), lib.IV, tract.XVI, cap.iv, vol.4, p.376.
[127] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1782, 1792; cols.1779f.; 'Continentiam laudant, sed urente libidine, concedunt ei satisfieri debere quocumque modo turpi, exponentes illud apostolicum melius est nubere quam uri, quod melius sit quolibet actu turpi libidini satisfacere, quam intus in corde tentari: Sed hoc valde tenent occultum, ne vilescant'.

deceptive nature of heretics. It would seem that the main objection that the author has to this secrecy is that it results in the deception of the simple, although he also has something to say about lack of church presence and the effect of ignorance.[128] Ultimately, though, it is the fact that the heretics of modern times hide their errors so effectively that makes them so difficult to find and to defeat, and which means that for this author at least, the secrecy of heretics is the justification for the presence of inquisitors.

The device of false appearance is also used in the Anonymous of Passau, for example in the first description of the sect of the 'Leonistarum', which 'magnam habet speciem pietatis', but it forms less of a theme than it does in the *De inquisitione*.[129] The false appearance of the Waldensians manifests itself in several places, such as their fictitious attendance of church and participation in Catholic ritual: 'ficte vadunt, offerunt, confitentur, communicant, sed totum ficte'.[130] Similarly a demonstration of their verbal evasion and misdirection is included in a list of signs by which heretics can be recognized, but false appearance is only partly a rhetorical device here, and also suggests a genuine concern for concealment.[131]

The Anonymous of Passau is in some ways closer to the view of heretical deception that we find in the Italian texts. In the latter, although glimpses of a former openness can be seen in Anselm's account of their historical existence, his portrayal of heretics shows a similarly hidden group, but this hiddenness appears less as a function of their deceptive nature and more as a practical consequence of their persecution by the church. Like the Anonymous of Passau, heretics, in this case Cathars, attend Catholic feasts only to avoid scandal, and as noted have a coded way of inquiring whether they are among friends, which points to a covert existence. They also have ways to disguise the truth of their words, 'quando vult cooperire errorem suum', though Anselm gives this none of the polemical value that the *De inquisitione* ascribes to such characteristics. The heretics' vision of themselves in this world, as seen through Anselm's account of their ritual, is, ironically, as sheep among wolves; 'a modo eris inter nos et penitus in hoc mundo sicut ovis in medio luporum'.[132]

---

[128] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1780, 1781, 1782, 1783, 1785, 1786, 1788, 1790.
[129] Anonymous of Passau, p.264.
[130] Anonymous of Passau, p.266, repeated later, p.272.
[131] Anonymous of Passau, pp.272-74.
[132] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, pp.313; 316-17; 312; 314.

Raniero also has something to say about the practicality of the Cathars' maintenance of an outward pretence, here not so much of holiness, but of Catholic ritual, once again to avoid 'scandalum uicinorum suorum'. Interestingly, what Raniero adds to this picture is deception and concealment of error within the sect itself. The errors of John of Lugio, which are recalled here in detail, are kept secret, according to Raniero: 'dictus Iohannes et eius complices non audent revelare doctos errores credentibus suis, ne ipsi credentes discedant ab eis propter hos novos errores'. More generally than this, a wider distinction is drawn across the sect by this former Cathar leader between the initiated and the lower levels of adherents, who are characterized in fact as 'simple'. 'Predicta opiniones tenebant omnes Albanenses', Raniero tells us, 'exceptis simplicioribus quibus singula non revelabantur'. Again, if any Cathars deny the above errors, then the inquisitor can safely consider 'quod ipse in ypocrisi mendacium loquitur, quod est proprium Catharorum...nisi forte fuerit homo simplex vel novicius inter eos, talibus enim multis illorum secreta minime reuelantur'.[133]

The distinction that Raniero makes between the initiated and the simple highlights a stronger and more pointed contrast between the picture that the two Italian inquisitors put forward and that of the other two texts. In the course of Raniero's account of his errors, John of Lugio emerges as an educated and literate man. He makes use not only of Scriptural proofs, but also arguments that are redolent of natural philosophy, and he even shows some familiarity with Roman Law.[134] Raniero's source for his discussion is the book written by John of Lugio himself, 'quoddam volumen magnum X quaternorum, cuius exemplarium habeo et perlegi et ex illo errores supradictos extraxi'.[135] Anselm too is in possession of a heretical book, which he calls the 'Secret' of the Concorezzenses, the text that we know as the Secret supper, or *Interrogatio Iohannis*. Anselm seems unimpressed by the heretics' Latinity, quoting from the text '"Hoc est secretum hereticorum de Concorezzo portatum de Bulgaria plenum erroribus"' and adding drily 'et etiam

---

[133] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa* pp.47, 57, 52, 59.
[134] *Disputatio*, p.4.xi, and n.6; Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, Moneta, p.23.i, also possible use of Aristotle 83.i; Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*: Lugio using whole bible, pp.53, 56; perhaps natural philosophy, p.54; Roman Law p.54.
[135] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.57.

falsis latinis'.[136] Nonetheless, a book is a book, and the description by both Raniero and Anselm of a Catharism that can distinguish between its different groups on a doctrinal basis would also seem to presuppose a reasonably educated group of people, at least in the higher levels of the hierarchy. If further proof of heretical literacy were needed, Raniero himself was of course a heresiarch only five years before writing his *summa*.

That straightforward and detailed picture of an educated group of heretics stands in direct contrast to the picture that we find in the Pseudo-David and the Anonymous of Passau. The old topos of the heretic as illiterate and stupid runs through these two texts, especially in the *De inquisitione*. Heretics are referred to or described in similar terms to the uneducated masses, as 'laïci', or 'simplices', and their error as 'illecta' and 'stulta'. 'Idiotae' also occurs once, with 'laïci'. Such descriptions do not however fit with the picture that emerges from the descriptions we are given of heretics that are often in some way either literate or educated: their masters are still referred to in the same terms as those of the orthodox church, *doctores, magistri*; there is some suggestion that they use rational arguments, and are accused of interpolating Augustine texts with their own rites and heresies; they own or use books, and there seems some reference to debate, and to some conflict via text, and even if they are not literate, they are also said to know parts of the Scripture by heart, though in a vernacular form.[137] Though described as illiterate, the heretics that the Pseudo-David attacks seem educated and well equipped. What is interesting in this text, though, is that we also see the heretics constructing themselves in the same way: in the dialogue between heretic and examiner, the heretic says 'si omnia quae dico vultis aliter interpretari quam sane & simpliciter, tunc nescio quid debeam respondere. Simplex homo sum & illiteratus, nolite me capere in verbis meis'.[138] Here the simplicity becomes another part of the deceptive and artificial exterior of the heretic, and reinforces the idea that the heretic disguises himself as the wolf among the sheep. To this end, the lengthy dialogue that is reproduced as an example of pitfalls in interrogation is more an elaborate game of

---

[136] A very similar quotation is also found on a copy of the original text, and would presumably have been added by someone connected with inquisition, Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, p.319, see also Wakefield and Evans, p.465 and n.79, p.776.
[137] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1787, 1789; cols.1780 ,1784; cols.1788, 1780; col.1781.
[138] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1790.

verbal logic than an attempt to disprove theological errors, and there is little discussion of points of belief, except where they serve to illustrate avoidance.

A similar tension between the use of a topos of illiterate heretics and the picture that can be seen in the background can be found in the Anonymous of Passau, though to a lesser degree. Of the seven causes of heresy that this text lists, the first three are connected with learning; the last four are causes located within the Catholic church. The first seems to indicate that heretics are learned people: heresy results from seeking after the glory of the church Fathers. The second two however portray the heretics as foolish, teaching and learning without proper study, and more pointedly, using vernacular texts and expounding the Scripture wrongly because 'sunt laici idiotae'. At the same time, the author says later on that he has counted up the schools of the heretics, from various inquisitions that he has attended (though he does not say in what capacity), of which schools he then provides a reasonably long list.[139] As in the *De inquisitione* though, the heretic once again seems to purposely construct his own simplicity: 'simulat se simplicem . . . vel simulat se stultum'.[140]

For the Anonymous of Passau, the differentiation of the heretics' sect is one of the markers of their error: despite the claim shortly afterwards that modern heretics have been reduced to only four groups, the tenth sign of the church's superiority 'est integritas fidei. Non enim est divisa, sed una. Sed hereticorum plus quam LXX sectae sunt', the same number that he later gives for the ancient sects.[141] Some of the ideas expressed in this extract will be discussed in more detail in a later chapter. It is still worth noting in this context that here is another example of the pattern explored above, in which the rhetorical images and ideas of the Anonymous of Passau and the Pseudo-David find a more practical echo in the Italian treatises. The Pseudo-David seems not to see much distinction at all between heretical groups, and even cites the death of Peter Martyr of Verona as evidence against the Waldensians, but the division that the Anonymous of Passau uses as a polemical tool also provides most of the structure of Anselm and Raniero's texts.[142]

A tension appears to exist amongst our texts, between the use of rhetorical devices on the one hand, and the reporting of information about heresy on the other,

---

[139] Anonymous of Passau, pp.263-64.
[140] Anonymous of Passau, p.266.
[141] Anonymous of Passau, p.263.
[142] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1785.

which can perhaps in part be explained by the fact that they were written within different currents of the anti-heretical tradition. In the case of the topos of the illiterate heretic at least, this was a stereotype that had a longer life in the German speaking regions of Europe than in France and Italy, and which tended to be used against the Waldensians where it did survive in the south.[143] The rather matter-of-fact impression of heresy that the Italian texts present, on the other hand, resembles that which appeared as a background image in the inquisition registers.

Our handbooks, two Italian, one certainly German, the other possibly, nonetheless seem to build their description of their subject from a set of common elements, in a way that would become the standard pattern for a later treatise like Bernard Gui's *Practica*. Though of course the content varies, and their respective approaches can range from the highly polemical attitude of the *De inquisitione* author, to the reticent tone of Anselm and Sacconi, they all follow, basically, a generic pattern in their description, beginning with a historical sketch, followed by characteristics of the sect, error, and custom or behaviour, though not necessarily in that order. Something else that is perhaps worth noting here is the way that the information about the sect is presented as the attributes and characteristics of heretics. Where the polemical texts, which also to some degree present their reader with information on the doctrinal nature of the heresy, tend to anchor this in a rather abstract, rhetorical 'heretic' figure, these handbooks, particularly the Italian ones, ground all their description firmly in much more concrete figures.

The other type of information that these texts provide is of a procedural sort, to do with the actual exercise of the office of inquisition, but the balance of this across the texts is far less even, and is only present in any quantity in the work of the Pseudo-David. The *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno* indeed has no material of this sort, and in the texts by the Anonymous of Passau and Anselm of Alessandria, this information is certainly not the majority part of their work, comprising really only a few short sections at or near the end of the text. The compiler of the Anonymous of Passau text includes some pieces that tell his readers how to recognize sects from outward signs, the way to examine a heretic, and how

---

[143] On this, see P. Biller, 'The *topos* and Reality of the Heretic as *illiteratus*', in Biller, *Waldenses*, 169-90.

to punish them, but little else.[144] Anselm's text also contains only a few items on procedure, a brief interrogatory and two formulae, though it does also have a section, later borrowed by Bernard Gui, on the office of inquisition itself. The Pseudo-David's text is the only one that presents an even balance between this type of information and the descriptions of heretics that we have been discussing until now.

As the title of the *De inquisitione hereticorum* indicates, this text is more firmly directed at the inquisition of heretics. In providing sections on topics such as how to proceed against heretics, how to recognize supporters, how to use prison and fear as a coercive method, how to interrogate heretics, and how to avoid bad judges, the Pseudo-David focuses much more clearly on the practical business of inquisition and the difficulties that come with it. There is also though an apparent connection between the information provided in the first part of the treatise, and the treatment detailed in this second section. The *De inquisitione*'s provision of a sample interrogation is prefixed by a warning to inquisitors: 'iste tamen pro parte solet esse mos eorum'. The interrogation itself, presented as a dialogue between a heretic and examiner, revolves around the wiles and devices that the heretic will use to deceive his interrogator, and here knowledge of heretical behaviour seems at least as important in practical terms as the error being examined.[145] The construction of the heretic as secret and hidden that the *De inquisitione* builds throughout its earlier sections here supports, or defines, the construction of inquisition. It is precisely that secret nature that justifies, even necessitates the existence of the inquisitor, whose role it is to see through the affected piety. Further, the Pseudo-David advocates in several places the use of secrecy and deception in their apprehension: 'vulpes enim astutae sunt subtili astutia capiendae'.[146] However, despite the provision of detail about the lives and errors of the modern heretic, true penance and a successful inquisition lies not in the admission or discovery of these, but in the full revelation of the extent of the involvement of themselves and of others: revelation, but not of error, equals redemption for the Pseudo-David.[147]

---

[144] Anonymous of Passau, pp.272-74.
[145] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1789-92. Gui Foulques also advises the use of prison to extract confessions, BAV MS Vat. Lat. 3978, f.78^{rb}.
[146] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1784; col.1787f, 1788.
[147] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1792.

We can now at last look a little at the *Ordo processus narbonensis*. This text is unlike the others that we have looked at in this group, and is a 'manual' proper, that is, it resembles more closely a formulary than a treatise. It provides instructions for new inquisitors on how to conduct an inquisition from beginning to end, by means of a set of examples and instructions of how to proceed, technically: nearly all of the forms given are for those procedures that require a publicly given announcement. There is an interrogatory, but it is noticeably different from the instructions given for interrogation by the Anonymous of Passau, the Pseudo-David, which focus on method, and by Anselm, which is built from a list of errors. It is a list of the verbs that we saw in the consultation material, that build a profile of guilt: did you see heretics; when, and where; how many and who with; did you hear their preaching, or receive them; lead them; eat or drink with them; give them anything; perform administrative tasks for them; keep anything for them; accept the peace from them; adore them, or bow your head, bend your knee, say bless; were you present at their rituals; did you confess to or accept penance from Waldensians, or have any other association with them; make any agreement to hide the truth, or know of anyone who did; and, finally, do you believe in them or their errors?

The *Ordo* differs from the handbook representation here, not least in its concentration on actions, but also in its focus on the follower. Most of the advice of the *De inquisitione* pertains to the inquisition of heretics specifically. Little attention is shown to the lesser grades, other than how to pick them out of a crowd, and even though these indications, the author warns us, 'vehementem faciunt presumptionem contra illos de heresi, etsi non plenam probationem ad condemnationem, nisi et alia concurrant argumenta, ex quibus liquido constaret predicta eos in favorem heresis fecisse'. The only place in which the lesser grades appear to be catered for is in the Pseudo-David's awareness that a *credens hereticorum* is to be judged as a heretic in law.[148] The Anonymous of Passau similarly concentrates on heretics as the subject of interrogation, though the sample interrogation is less concerned with verbal wrangling than the Pseudo-David.

Anselm's procedural sections are different in form to the other two handbooks, taking a shape rather more like that of the *Ordo*, of sample documents or formulae, an example of a question list, of an order to local clergy, of a

[148] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1787-88.

condemnation, they also include details of the errors described in the earlier parts of the text. Anselm, and the others, seem to direct inquisition, or rather the usefulness of their handbooks, very specifically against heretics. The handbooks on the whole seem removed from the formularies and documents that we looked at earlier in this chapter, which tend to revolve around the lesser grades, and to see the heretic as a background figure.

It is to these other, legal texts, though, that the *Ordo processus* bears the closest resemblance. Where the tone of the procedural sections of the *De inquisitione* is more like advice on the best approach to these areas of inquisition, the *Ordo* outlines precise instructions and forms. It is noticeable that its question list positions the deponent consistently as a follower of heretics, all the questions try to establish the relationship of the deponent to heretics, and the text as a whole appears to focus less on the heretics proper, as the other texts do, and more on the lesser categories of involvement. Where belief in error is mentioned, in the condemnation or at the end of the question list, it is, as with our legal consultations, one of list of active markers of guilt, and again attached to a somewhat disembodied heretic: the sentence condemns its subject as a heretic 'quia hereticorum erroribus credidit'.[149] This is not to say that it does not provide for real heretics, but that the use of the term seems to reflect the abstracted idea of otherness that the other legal texts employ. In contrast to this, the handbooks not only focus on the errors and rituals of the heretics, but also differentiate very clearly between different sects, and usually between different groups within those sects as well.

IV – MS Vat Lat 3978

By way of conclusion, we now turn, finally, to look at one of Dondaine's *manuels avec formulaire*, contained, along with various other anti-heretical materials, in Vatican Latin manuscript 3978. 3978 is a late fourteenth-century manuscript, which looks very much like an example of what Dondaine calls a collection for inquisitors. It has all the requisite parts: official texts, formularies, and treatises,

[149] Selge, *Texte*, pp.71-72; p.75.

including extracts from Moneta, Raniero, the Pseudo-David of Augsburg and the *Disputatio* – in fact, a large proportion of the texts that we have looked at, though of course there is no way of knowing if this was its original form. The manual itself as a compilation of texts and documents is French in origin, though it also exists in an Italian version.[150] Dondaine dates the manual to shortly after 1265, given the propensity of collections generally to include the most recent material, and the date of the newest document in the collection, the reissue of Frederick II's anti-heretical legislation by Clement IV in 1265. Dossat follows Dondaine, dating the manual to 1266 and placing it firmly in the context of the southern French inquisitions, but Dondaine also raises the possibility that the 1265 document may have been added later – it is missing from another version of the manual – and this suggestion is seconded by Riccardo Parmeggiani.[151] Parmeggiani, who sees this example as a key work in the development of the manual, believes that, in its original format, it probably did not contain the 1265 bull, and instead argues that the inclusion of decretal material was a later Italian development from the two part French style of manual, that included consultations and formularies. Following the same logic as Dondaine, he therefore dates the manual to the next latest item that it contains, the consultation of Gui Foulques, of c.1255.[152] Apart from its pivotal role in the manual form's evolution, this is also probably the earliest surviving example of its kind.[153]

The 3978 manual seems to represent good and sound copies of the texts it contains, and it is well organized and very easy to use. Each section is numbered in the list of contents provided at the beginning of the text, and the numbers continue throughout the manual, marked clearly in the margin next to each chapter. A (modestly) decorated title indicates the beginning of each chapter, and, within the texts themselves, differently coloured rubrics alternate between the different sections: all the reference tools introduced in the late-twelfth and thirteenth

---

[150] Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, MS Vat. Lat. 2648, see Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.106-107; 154-67.
[151] Dondaine, 'Manuel', p.107, n.68, the Constitutions of Frederick are missing from Vat. Lat. 4265. Dossat, *Crises*, pp.196-99.
[152] Dossat, *Crises*, pp.196-99, and 'Gui Foucois, enquêteur-réformateur, archevêque et pape (Clément IV)', *CF*, 7 (1972), 23-57, pp.33-34; R. Parmeggiani, 'Un secolo di manualistica inquisitoriale (1230-1330): intertestualita e circolazione del diritto', *Rivista Internazionale di Diritto Comune*, 13 (2002), 229-70, pp.257-58; p.237ff.
[153] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.106-107; 140-54; one possible earlier manuscript was happened upon by Peter Biller, for sale on the internet in 2003 – see Biller, 'Deep Is the Heart of Man', p. 279.

centuries to render a text searchable and turn it into a work for reference.[154] The texts that this manual contains, apart from the initial bull from Clement IV already mentioned, fall into two parts: consultations, and formulary. The consultations include all those that we looked at in the first part of this chapter, by Gui Foulques, Pierre Collemieu, Jean Bernin, and by the two sets of lawyers. They are joined by the canons of the councils of Narbonne and Béziers, from 1243 and 1246. The formulary itself is made up of sample documents drawn from real inquisition registers – it is here that the evidence for a French origin is strongest, as all the personal names are French, and the places named are all in the south of France. It is important to note that many of these documents are also used in the Tuscan formulary edited by d'Alatri. It is this re-use by Italian manuals that leads Parmeggiani to suggest the existence of an archetype, based on this French model, which was then successively added to according to local reality, either with the addition of legislation relevant to a local province, or the adjustment of the names used.[155]

The reproduction of material from different countries obviously has important implications for history of the office, but several points can also be made here about the texts themselves. The fact that depositions from different inquisitions, and indeed different regions could be copied and adapted as formulae by other inquisitors means firstly that, though they were the product of the inquisition of a particular individual in a particular place, they could as easily be applied to any other deponent who fitted the same criteria, and that the ideas of heresy they contained were not isolated but general and transferable. It also reinforces the impression given by reading the legal material that the lists of actions, and the questions that derive from them, were intended to fit deponents into a predetermined structure of guilt, and that the idea of heresy they were based on was of a series of actions that stood at a remove from the interior state that they represented. All of which is a rather long-winded way of saying that these ideas were self-perpetuating, and the inquisition texts reflexive.

The interaction is not only between inquisition documents. We have seen already that the sentences and depositions reflect the ideas of the consultations, and

---

[154] M.A. Rouse and R.H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses. Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, 1991), pp.193f, 221-22.
[155] Parmeggiani, 'Un secolo di manualistica inquisitoriale', p.243.

here is another level of reflexivity in the inquisitor's manual, which contains both. The manual is an example of what Petrucci calls a coherent collection of texts: it was written, copied and used as a connected and coherent whole, its 'value and function result from its completeness and reciprocity'.[156] This means, rather obviously, but nonetheless importantly, that the consultations and the depositions are part of the same coherent idea, that the depositions feed off each other, and off the consultations, and the collection as a whole reflects a legal idea of heresy.

The manual perhaps tells us more about the inquisitors' ideas of inquisition than of heresy. As Dondaine points out, the texts that make up the formulary are neatly and helpfully arranged in order of the inquisition process, from the general sermon, to the exhumation of dead heretics. These are the things that an inquisitor needed to know: the legal process, and the legal definitions of both his office and the subject of his enquiry. It is noticeable, and has already been pointed out, that much of the information in the consultations that is not to do with office is to do with finer grades of guilt, the complicated legal definitions that the inquisitors found difficult. Heresy is after all a thing already identified as a religious error. They clearly wanted all their legal information in one place, a 'library without a library'.[157] Unlike the more treatise-like handbooks, there is little information on heresy, and lots on inquisition. The first two groups of inquisition texts, the consultations and the depositions, are represented by the 3978 manual, but the handbooks and their information are neither included, nor apparently relevant. Again the reflexive nature of the depositions and consultations is significant here. If the legal ideas of the consultations shape and are shaped by the questions that govern the depositions, and therefore by the information that these questions elicit, then the material that makes up the handbooks is not drawn from this source.

The authors of the handbooks seem in part to have used other texts as source material, whether that was other Catholic texts, or books written by the heretics themselves. We have seen that Raniero uses a book by John of Lugio, and that Anselm had a copy of the *Secretum*.[158] Interestingly, they also appear to gather information from the heretics at first-hand, not from interrogation, but from post-conversion heretics, perhaps in a prison setting. Although the only real hint that the

---

[156] A. Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy. Studies in the History of Written Culture*, ed. and tr. C.M. Radding (New Haven and London, 1995), pp.14-18.
[157] Dondaine, 'Manuel', pp.106-08; Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*, p.8.
[158] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, p.318; p.319.

Anonymous of Passau gives of his sources is the reference, mentioned above, to his presence at various inquisitions and examinations of heretics, the author of the Pseudo-David tells us quite clearly that 'audivi etiam ab illis hereticis qui postea sunt conversi'.[159] One of the later sections of Anselm's work is apparently comprised of material gleaned from 'illis duabus que steterunt longo tempore inter valdenses ... et post converse fuerunt et faciebant penitenciam in reclusorio apud Albam'. Raniero is, of course, his own post-conversion source. On the margins of this manual literature, the *De heresi* section of Stephen of Bourbon's *Tractatus*, written in a similar style by another inquisitor, also draws its information from the same place. Though Stephen still uses witness testimony as a source for the his description of Waldensian beliefs, 'errores...sicut ego cognovi et inveni per multas inquisiciones et confessiones eorum in jure, tam perfectorum quam credencium, ab ore eorum conscriptas, et per multos testes contra eos receptos', for the Cathars he cites a direct, post-conversion source. Stephen has his detailed exposition of Cathar errors from 'quodam litterato qui et diu fuerat de secta eorum'.[160] Very little of this sort of detail is present in the registers of the inquisitors that we have looked at, but perhaps it was simply not recorded. The *Ordo processus narbonensis* tells us after all, in the brief but pregnant phrase, that: 'plura quidem et alia facimus in processu et aliis, que scripto facile non possent comprehendi'.[161]

If the formulae for examination and interrogation make no provision for a detailed investigation of error, or at least for records that might contain that type of information, why are these handbooks written by inquisitors for one another, and in what way do they support the inquisition of heretical depravity? Perhaps it is to supply those parts of inquisition that are hard to describe in writing, or perhaps it is more to do with information, for the inquisitors to know, as the Pseudo-David suggests, how to identify and treat heretics and their followers – 'malum non vitatur nisi cognitum'. That both types of information came eventually to be incorporated

---

[159] Anonymous of Passau, p.264; Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1790.
[160] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.293-94. An external view of that process can be found in Doat 25, where Guilelma of Toulouse reports this speech from Pons Gameville: 'Gordona, pro nihilo loquimini, quia de cetero in terra ista non erit aliquis – ipsa testis intelligens de hereticis – quia conversi ab heresi interfecerunt terram et gentes, quia revelaverunt, quare non amodo invenirent quod eos reciperet', Doat 25, fol.48^{v}. As Jacques Berlioz neatly points out, Stephen's other source of information for this section, Augustine, was himself a converted heretic, J. Berlioz, '"Les erreurs de cette doctrine pervertie...". Les croyances des Cathares selon le Dominicain et inquisiteur Étienne de Bourbon (mort. v.1261)', *Heresis*, 32 (2000), 53-67, p.64.
[161] Selge, *Texte*, p.75.

into the mature manual form suggests that both types were used. What is clear, though, is that the first type of legal material is based on a rather different idea of heresy, and a different set of sources, than the second, doctrinal type, and that the material that inquisitors need from legal and official sources does not appear to be the same as what they want to tell each other.

Appendix to Chapter 4

Although Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's chronicle famously referred to the Cathar élite as *perfecti* at the opening of the Albigensian Crusade, the use of the term *heretici perfecti* is in fact extremely rare in the records of inquisitions. The Tuscan formulary very occasionally uses 'perfect'. Pierre Cellan also uses it, but rarely – only for female full Cathars, and then only in a minority of cases. A 1256 deposition by William Fournier of Toulouse, quoted by Belhomme, gives another example: 'ipse testis fuit et stetit hereticus indutus et perfectus'. However, Fournier's testimony is one of only a few examples that Arno Borst is able to give in his own footnote on this term, despite his extensive knowledge of inquisition material.[162] In fact, two very large collections of depositions, the depositions before Renous of Plassac and Pons of Parnac in 1272-78 in Doat volumes 25 and 26, and the register of Toulouse MS 609, which between them cover a wide span of the mid-thirteenth century, and contain references to a huge number of *heretici*, offer not a single instance in which those heretics are described as *perfecti*.[163]

Further, where the term *heretici perfecti* is used in other texts, it can mean nothing more specific than 'full' or 'complete' heretics, that is the heresiarchs, teaching *magistri* or full initiate of any sect, without the narrow sense of 'Cathar heretics' with which it is used by most modern historians. In that sense of initiation, it corresponds more clearly with the more commonly used 'vested' or 'consoled' heretics. The clearest example of this non-sect specific usage comes later, in the fourth part of Bernard Gui's *Practica*, where with customary clarity he distinguishes *perfecti* and *imperfecti* along these lines – the *imperfecti* here are the *credentes*.[164] In our period, something similar can be seen in the Pseudo-David's use of *perfecti* to describe the Waldensian élite: 'Quidam dicuntur perfecti, et hi

---

[162] Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, *Hystoria albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon (3 vols., Paris, 1926-39), vol.1, p.13. Tocco, p.180; for examples of Cellan's use of this term, see above, p.150, n.69. A. Borst, *Les cathares*, tr. C. Roy (Paris, 1974, orig. Stuttgart, 1953), p.175, n.3; M. Belhomme, 'Documents inédits sur l'hérésie des Albigeois', *Mémoires de la Société archéologique du Midi de la France*, 6 (1852), 101-146, p.144, ref. in Borst, pp.175, n.3 and p.268.

[163] For Doat see above, p.142, n.35; for 609 see M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels. The Great Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, 2001), p.18.

[164] Bernard Gui, *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1886), p. 218.

proprie vocantur, *Poure Valdenses de Lyon*'. Tarragona again appears to use the term to describe Waldensian heretics, glossing *perfecti heretici* as 'vel Insabbatati vel dogmatisantes eorum errores vel credentes relapsi in credentiam post abjurantam heresim vel renunciatam', as does Stephen of Bourbon in the quotation given on the previous page. Humbert de Romans also refers to 'heretici perfecti' in an apparently non-specific way.[165]

[165] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1781; Selge, *Texte*, p.52; Humbert, *Opera*, vol.2, p.471.

Chapter 5 – *De heresi*

Quid faciat hereticum et quid sit hereticus [1]

So far then, we have looked at the texts that form the bulk of the mid-thirteenth century treatment of heresy, and at the constructions that they present, within more or less broadly defined generic groups. Now we must try to understand the way that the different constructions develop and move across the genres of texts. It will have been obvious in the course of the preceding chapters, and will become increasingly obvious in the course of this one, that the boundaries between the different groups of material are in places quite fluid. The overlaps and exchanges between the groups will form part of our examination, though there will not be an attempt at a corresponding definition of the nature of textual genre in itself.

The themes that we will look at here are themselves in many ways interconnected, but for the sake of clarity the general construction of heresy has been divided here into three main areas. At the end of the chapter, we will consider the most basic level of the construct, the meanings of the terms 'heresy' and 'heretic'; before that, there will be an examination of the role played by ideas of number in the representation of heresy. First though, we will look at the figurative construction of heresy, that is the way that our authors use the various commonplaces and rhetorical devices of the anti-heretical tradition – in this context, 'rhetorical' is used as a broad synonym for figurative.

---

[1] Lombard, *Sententiae*, 4.13.2, vol.II, p.314.

I – Figurative construction

To stand back from the material that until now we have treated generically and see the wider view, we must look first to the rhetorical patterns that we can see stretching across and through the different sources. Though widely influential, it is in this area in particular that the work of Herbert Grundmann has been especially significant. His analysis of what he labelled the 'topos' of the heretic outlined several elements in an idea that he saw stretching from the eleventh century to well into the fifteenth. Beginning with pride, he said, heretics were further characterized by their secrecy, their wolf-like hiddenness and deceptive appearance. While these elements applied to all heretics regardless of differences between them, diversity was nonetheless introduced through one of the most important parts of the topos, that of the little foxes.[2] Though this is a massively and deceptively reduced version of that analysis, we will return to it in more detail as the chapter progresses.

Since Grundmann, most historians of heresy have written with an awareness of the operation of these elements within the texts, and several have addressed the different commonplaces in their own way. Grundmann's pupil, Alexander Patschovsky, also sees a broad idea of heresy that encompassed all heretics, characterized by metaphors of idolatry, monstrosity and poison.[3] Beverly Kienzle, as part of her work on the Cistercians, has in a similar way to Grundmann outlined four rhetorical patterns in the anti-heretical tradition of the twelfth century: demonization, pollution, threat to social order, apocalypticism, which all converge to portray heretics in general. Within these patterns are a series of polarities and recurrent images, again: the foxes, serpents, dogs, wolves, and tares, all of which combine to create a thesaurus of hostile rhetoric.[4]

With all this in mind, we turn to look at the patterns and commonplaces of figurative construction in our own material. Any analysis of topoi and rhetoric will of course involve some of our texts more than others. The inquisition records and

---

[2] Grundmann, 'Typus', esp. pp.98-100.
[3] A. Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society. On the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World', in Bruschi and Biller, 23-41, p.39.
[4] B.M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229. Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (York, 2001), p.215.

the canons of the regional church councils will not compete well here with the rich language of the *exempla* or the treatises, or even of the larger councils and decretals, but within these latter texts, there are several themes that are so widely spread that they warrant examination. The anti-heretical tradition contains within it many stock phrases that recur with varying frequency; the image of the dog returning to eat its own vomit, which so 'preoccupied medieval commentators', is employed often in the context of relapse, for example.[5] Our focus in this section however, will be less on those stand-alone phrases, and more on the most prominent and most coherent of those elements employed in the construction of heresy, which form deliberately structured schemes of representation, namely, false appearance, corruption, and of course, the little foxes.

i – Foxes

Widespread, though relatively infrequent, in our texts, the association between heretics and foxes as a topos provides a good place in which to begin an examination of the commonplaces at work in the description of heresy, thanks to its clearly defined nature and imagery, and to the fact that something quite definite can be said about its history. After the lion, the fox was the second most popular animal in exemplar literature – in large part because of Reynard. It was of course renowned for its cunning, though for some writers it was also a dirty creature.[6] Grundmann saw the fox as one of the most prominent images used to describe heretics in medieval Biblical exegesis, more prominent indeed than the perhaps more obvious Pauline passage on the necessity of heretics amongst the faithful.[7] Certainly, in anti-heretical writing of the twelfth century, the fox in the vineyard was the leitmotiv of the Cistercian tradition that dominated the church's response to the newly emergent heresy.[8] The image rests on the verse in the Song of Songs, in

---

[5] J.E. Salisbury, 'Human Animals of Medieval Fables', in N.C. Flores (ed.), *Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York and London, 1996), 49-66, p.56.
[6] Salisbury, 'Human Animals', pp.53-54, 61.
[7] 1Cor.XI.19: 'Nam oportet et haereses esse, ut et qui probati sunt manifesti fiant in vobis'; H. Grundmann, 'Oportet et haereses esse. Das Problem der Ketzerei im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Bibelexegese', in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XLV (1963), 129-64, Italian translation by O. Capitani, in *L'eresia medievale*, ed. O. Capitani (Bologna, 1971), 23-60.
[8] As described by Biget, '"Les Albigeois": remarques sur une dénomination', in *Inventer*, 219-55, p.236, and especially by B.M. Kienzle, 'Tending the Lord's Vineyard: Cistercians, Rhetoric and

which the spouse says to her beloved 'capite nobis vulpes parvulas quae demoliuntur vineas', where the little foxes are interpreted as the heretics, the vine the Catholic Church.[9] The association was given particular emphasis and impetus by St. Bernard's sixty-fifth and sixty-sixth sermons on the Song of Songs, written after his anti-heretical mission of 1143.[10]

Such an interpretation was attached to this verse long before Bernard's time, not least by Augustine, and by Irenaeus of Lyon in his treatise against heretics.[11] The twelfth-century gloss on the Bible, begun by Anselm of Laon, however, made it contemporary, and direct; although it is not extensive, the Ordinary Gloss for this passage clearly indicates how it is to be understood. The interlinear reads for *capite*, 'vox Christi adversus haereses', that is the *vulpes*, 'schismaticos et haereticos qui callidi sunt, et se humiles fingunt', *parvulas* because 'in ipso initio fraudis, ne maiores effectae amplius noceant'. The marginal gloss reinforces this, promoting not only preaching and example, but active defence, 'non sufficit ... nisi etiam errantes corrigamus'.[12] At various other points in the *Glossa ordinaria*, where other biblical foxes are interpreted to mean heretics, it is almost always in direct reference to this passage – foxes elsewhere in the Bible are heretics because of the interpretation of the verse in the Song of Songs. Another, slightly later commentary on the same book, by Alain de Lille, is equally explicit about this connection: 'per vulpes, quae sunt fraudulenta animalia et in speluncis terrae habitantia, intelliguntur haeretici; per vineas, Ecclesiae intelliguntur...capite nobis, id est destruite ad nostram utilitatem, vulpes, id est haereticos, parvulas, propter imbecillitatem'.[13]

Despite the longevity of the tradition however, it was undoubtedly Bernard's use of the passage and the weight that he put on it in his condemnation of heretics that led to the general adoption of the fox imagery in the years that followed. 'Quid faciemus his malignissimis vulpibus, ut capi queant, quae nocere quam vincere

---

Heresy, 1143-1229. Part 1: Bernard of Clairvaux, the 1143 Sermons and the 1145 Preaching Mission', *Heresis*, 25 (1995), 26-61.

[9] Cant.II.15.

[10] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Opera*, ed. J. Leclerq, C.H. Talbot, H.M. Rochais (8 vols., Rome, 1957-77), vol.1, p.xvi.

[11] This according to Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, Eng. tr., p.127, n.20.

[12] *Biblia sacra, cum glossis ... Nicolai Lyrani postilla & moralitatibus, Burgensis additionibus & Thoringi replicis*, (6 vols., Lyons, 1545), vol.2.

[13] Alain de Lille, *Compendiosa in cantica canticorum ad laudem deiparae virginis mariae elucidato*, *PL*, vol. 210, cols.51-110, col.71A.

malunt...? Et quidem recens vastatio vineae vulpem indicat affuisse'.[14] His sermons on the Song of Songs enjoyed an extremely wide diffusion: there are over one hundred manuscripts extant from the twelfth and early-thirteenth century.[15] After these sermons were written, the frequency with which the little foxes appear in anti-heretical literature increases dramatically, not least because it was the Cistercians who provided much of the twelfth-century material on heresy.

The tradition of fox imagery then, Cistercian in the principal form in which it is inherited by the thirteenth century, is continued in our period and extended, in one specific way, to which we will return shortly, and also to a more general association between heretics and foxes. There are still occasions on which the whole quotation is used; the Pseudo-David text still speaks of heresy in these terms: 'ex altera parte nocumentum fidei, si evadunt vulpes astutae vineam Domini demolientes'.[16] A 1257 letter to Raniero Sacconi from pope Alexander IV describes the purpose of the inquisitorial office as that 'radix iniquitatis haeretice succidatur, et vinea Domini, exterminatis vulpeculis, que perversis morsibus demoliuntur eandem, fructus afferat Catholice puritatis', a sentiment echoed almost verbatim by a later sentence from the Orvieto register.[17] The added prologue to the *Brevis summula* enrols this tradition to explain the preventative purpose of the following compilation by quoting the Song of Songs passage directly, and even glosses the foxes as 'hereticas pravitates ecclesiam devastantes'.[18]

However, while these examples are all very unambiguous in their reference, the association between the activity of heretics and this Biblical passage is by this time so ingrained, that we can also see several places in which the 'vine' is used almost as a shorthand. The etymology of St. Dominic's name provided by the Ferrandi *legenda* and by the Golden Legend plays on the idea of the saint as 'custos Domini' of various things, including 'vinee Domini Sabaoth', an association made

---

[14] *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol.2, lxv, pp.173, 175.
[15] *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vol.1, pp.xxiii-xxxi. See also P. Biller, 'William of Newburgh and the Cathar Mission to England', in D. Wood (ed.), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c.1100-c.1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross*, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 12 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999), 11-30, pp.14-15.
[16] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1791; also col.1788 'vulpes enim astutae sunt subtili astutia capiendae'.
[17] *Bullarium ordinis ff. praedicatorum*, ed. T. Ripolli (8 vols., Rome 1729-40), vol.1.427 no.24, 16/01/1257. D'Alatri, Orvieto, *L'inquisizione francescana* 227-28: 30/05/1268: 'Ex commisso nobis inquisitionis officio letiferam pestem pravitatis heretice radicitus extirpare de medio populi christiani et exterminare vulpeculas de vinea Domini Sabaoth que perversis moribus demoliuntur eandem'.
[18] Douais, *La somme,* p.114.

more explicit by Ferrandi's later description of the heretics in Languedoc that they 'vineam Domini Sabaoth demolirentur'.[19] Here, the allusion is to a tradition now so fully absorbed by anti-heretical rhetoric that a reference to the 'vine' is alone enough to conjure the necessary associations, even in the canons of a church council: 'haeretici eorumque credentes atque fautores nituntur vineam Domini Sabaoth demoliri'.[20]

If the vine has become generalized, so too have the foxes. If 'heretics' can be, as in the above cases, used in place of 'foxes', the reverse is also true, and several of our texts use *vulpes* synonymously with *heretici*. Jacques de Vitry uses *vulpeculae* in this way on more than one occasion.[21] It is noticeable here how far echoes of the Song of Songs terminology remain, through the diminutive *vulpeculae*. The foxes in the vine represent, in our texts, a general inheritance of imagery from the twelfth-century work of the Cistercians and the glossators.

To this generalized use of the fox imagery, a new layer is added for our period at the turn of the century by Innocent III's 1199 decretal *Vergentis in senium.* Next to a continued and undiluted use of the Song of Songs imagery, in phrases such as 'in flore tinea et vulpes in fructu demoliri vineam Domini moliuntur', and 'capere vulpes demolientes vineam Domini', the rich rhetoric of Innocent's prose introduces this device: 'licet autem contra vulpes huiusmodi parvulas, species quidem habentes diversas, sed caudas ad invicem colligatas'. The source for this new element is ultimately the passage in Judges, in which Samson 'perrexitque et cepit trecentas vulpes, caudasque earum iunxit ad caudas, et faces ligavit in medio'.[22] Unlike the Song of Songs foxes, the Judges verse has no interpretation in the Ordinary Gloss that connects these verses to heretics or heresy in any way. The gloss for the eightieth Psalm, however, does just that: 'ideo Samson caudas vulpium colligavit ... Vulpes sunt insidiosi, maxime haeretici', an interpretation which is echoed in other commentaries that draw on the same source as the Gloss, that is,

---

[19] *Iacopo da Varazze, Legenda Aurea*, ed. G.P. Maggioni (2nd edn., 2 vols., Florence, 1998), vol.2, p.718, Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI, p.219; p.222.
[20] Narbonne 1243, can.16, Mansi vol.23, col.361.
[21] Hinnebusch, *Historia occidentalis*, p.146; Vitry, Crane, p.9, no.xxvi. Humbert de Romans also uses foxes to label heretics at least once: 'vulpium Samsonis', Humbert, *Opera*, vol.2, p.452; the author of the second life of Anthony of Padua also frequently uses fox imagery in reference to heretics, *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae quarum altera huosque inedita*, ed. L. de Kerval (Paris, 1904), pp.219-221.
[22] Iu.XV.4-5

Augustine.[23] In several places, Augustine interprets Samson's foxes in Judges as heretics, often connecting this explicitly to the foxes of Solomon.[24]

As St. Bernard's commentary made a previous tradition current for his period, so Innocent's *Vergentis* takes a precedented association and places it firmly in the contemporary frame of reference for the discussion of heresy, especially through the direct juxtaposition with the theme of the previous century, a construction further reinforced by the decretal's later inclusion in the treatment of heresy in the 1234 *Liber extra.* Like the vine, because heretics were so generally synonymous with foxes, the two types of fox are easily interchangeable. Thomas Agni, in his life of Peter Martyr, says that he 'Simpsonis vulpeculas perquirebat & dissipabat' in the context of his inquisitorial office, here neatly combining shorthand references to both traditions.[25] The conjoined tails also become absorbed as a discreet element in their own right, in legal language especially. So we see the anti-heretical third canon of the fourth Lateran council in 1215 using the image without specific reference to the foxes: 'haereticos universos, quibuscunque nominibus censeatur (here combining this tag-line from *Ad abolendam* with the *Vergentis* rhetoric), facies quidem diversas habentes, sed caudas ad invicem colligatas'. A similar sublimated usage is employed again by Gregory IX, in a statement that also reinforces the combination of the inherited vocabulary of Lucius III and Innocent, and which was itself reproduced by Gregory's successor, in a general letter 'ad omnes fideles': 'Excommunicamus ... universos haereticos ... quibuscunque nominibus censeantur, facies quidem habentes diversas, sed caudas adinvicem colligatas'.[26] The topos of foxes, or rather of heretics, joined at the tail seems to be very firmly implanted in legal terminology by middle of the thirteenth century.[27]

Used in the previous examples to indicate the essential sameness of different types of heretics, the Judges imagery is adopted in a similar way by two

---

[23] Remigius, *Enarrationes in psalmos*, *PL*, vol.131, col.575.
[24] For example: Augustine, *De Samsone*, *Sermones ad populum, V, sermones dubii*, CCCLXIV, *PL* vol.39, cols. 1639-43, col.1641.
[25] *Acta sanctorum*, April III, 29, cols.686-719, *vita Scripta per Thomam de Lentino coævum*, col.695F; like the Orvieto register, here using foxes to refer to the object of inquisition.
[26] Note though, that though this is directed against all heretics, like Lucius III's decretal, Gregory takes the precaution of providing a selection of names: 'universos haereticos, Catharos, Patarenos, Pauperes de Lugduno, Passaginos, Iosephinos, Arnaldistas, Speronistas, et alios, quibuscunque' etc. Friedberg vol.2: Lateran 4, cap.xiii col.787; Gregory IX, cap.xv col.789; Mansi, vol.23, Innocent IV *Ad omnes fideles*, col.583.
[27] Though note that Gregory IX still uses the original vines and foxes in *Ille humani generis*.

inquisitors in our period. The *De heresi* section of the fourth book of Stephen of Bourbon's collection of *exempla*, perhaps not coincidentally that part which bears a close resemblance to an inquisitor's manual, uses the image of Sampson's foxes in the same way; the heretics are 'colligati ex parte posteriori in caudis quia omnis tendunt ad unum quia intendunt impugnare ecclesiam ut vulpes sampsonis'.[28] An even fuller version of this prefixes Stephen's account of a heretical meeting, in which none of the parties can agree on correct doctrine: 'sunt similes vulpibus Samsonis, de quibus Judicum, qui habebant caudas colligatas et facies divisas, quia intenciones habent conjunctas ad impugnandum fidem Ecclesie, facies sentenciarum et sectarum divisas: inter se dissident, et contra nos omnes conveniunt'.[29] There is a further extension of this idea in the Anonymous of Passau, which uses the other side of this implication, to characterize the subject as essentially divided. We will return to this theme later in the chapter; what is interesting here, and what further underlines the level to which this has been assimilated into the anti-heretical canon, is the fact that in the latter example, and indeed also in the previous example from Stephen of Bourbon, though it purports to be the Judges passage, the text quoted by the Anonymous of Passau is in fact that of Innocent's decretal, and of its later extension in subsequent legislation: 'sicut in Iudicum libro legitur: quod vulpes Sampsonis facies diversas habebant, sed caudas sibi invicem colligatas: sic haeretici in sectis sunt divisi in se, sed in impugnatione Ecclesiae, sunt uniti'.[30]

To the threat embodied in and expressed through the earlier Song of Songs foxes, is now added another layer, the unified nature of that apparently plural threat, represented by the Judges foxes. The older strand remains, and is indeed so ingrained, as to be almost incidental in places, and to allow the easy and natural assimilation of the newer layer, though the function of the latter is more active, and perhaps more pointed than the vine imagery. Though the Orvieto register and the council of Narbonne, as we have seen, continue to employ Solomon's foxes, rather than Samson's, in the legal material and the inquisitors manuals, Innocent's foxes

---

[28] BnF MS Lat. 14599 f.234[ra]

[29] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.278.

[30] Compare this to the biblical passage: 'perrexitque et cepit trecentas vulpes, caudasque earum iunxit ad caudas, et faces ligavit in medio', to which it bears little relation, and to *Vergentis*, and later legislation: 'licet autem contra vulpes huiusmodi parvulas, species quidem habentes diversas, sed caudas ad invicem colligatas', and 'facies quidem diversas habentes'. Anonymous of Passau, p.264.

have been adopted as a motif and a device. What has perhaps already been noticeable here, in comparison with the trend of the previous century or so, is that, as a motif, foxes are almost completely absent from the polemic of the thirteenth century.

ii – False appearance

Our polemical sources in fact do not, as a whole, deal as much as one might expect in 'rhetorical' attacks on heretics, especially if one thinks of the aloof scholarship of Moneta of Cremona. Their main method, where there is one, is to employ a sort of adjectival invective, attached usually to the direct address, and accompanying the refutation, rather than comprising it. Nonetheless, where there is a level of rhetorical construction in the polemics, it is most likely to rest upon the topos of the false appearance of the heretic. That idea is in fact the most common across the whole of our corpus of texts, in its frequency and certainly in its distribution, a frequency matched only by the running theme of corruption, but far more concentrated and sharply drawn than the latter, in places drawing this older theme into some sort of superstructure. While the foxes are largely absent from the polemical material, the more complex set of imagery that surrounds the idea of false appearance can be found there if one looks. Indeed, across our range of material, one of the richest expressions of the idea can be found in one of these latter texts, that of the Pseudo-James Capelli, which provides a useful way in to the exploration of this idea.

The Pseudo-James' chapter on heretics' abstinence from meat and eggs opens with these pointed words:

> Quum nulla veritas hereticorum perniciosas traditiones subsequatur ideo eas quodam simulatarum virtutum sapore condiunt ut per dulcedinem mellis quem placet, minus sentiatur venenum quod latet; habent quidem speciem pietatis sed sub ovina pelle luporum rapacitatem gestantes sanctitatis virtutem non habent...huius vana est religio. Illorum quippe religio falsa esse ostenditur dum ex pestilenti corde venenosa verba effreni lingua locuntur...Nam ipsi ut bonorum operum palliatione falsam doctrinam commendent.[31]

[31] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.clxxxvi.

Present here are most of the principal images and terms associated with this idea of a pretended outward form, which we can look at before we move to consider the wider aspects of this theme. Much of the general vocabulary used to convey false appearance can be found here: the cloaking of a real agenda, usually with words, here with good deeds; the simulation, whether of piety or of religion. Noticeable as well here is the underlying venom of the heretics' true nature.[32]

The Pseudo-James' striking phrase, which draws a contrast between the outer pretended piety and the inner reality of heretics as wolves in sheep's clothing, combines two of the main Scriptural images that form part of the basis of the topos. The ravening of wolves is of course from the warning of Matthew's gospel to beware false prophets: 'attendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces. A fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos'.[33] False prophets, both here in the Matthew verse, and in the gospel of Mark where they also appear, and the ravening wolves, are all understood to refer 'specialiter de hereticis' by the Ordinary Gloss.[34] The Gloss further explains that those wolves and pseudo-prophets are 'quaedam pietatis veste tecti', an oblique reference to the other Scriptural image that underlies the Pseudo-James' construction. The *species pietatis* that the sheep's clothing affords the wolves in the above extract is drawn from that passage of the second letter to Timothy, often invoked in the description of heretics, which describes the coming of evil men in the last days, who lead others astray through false holiness or virtue, 'habentes speciem quidem pietatis virtutem autem eius abnegantes'.[35]

If we turn to our other polemics, we can find elements of that same rhetoric employed by the Pseudo-James Capelli. The author of the *Disputatio* describes his opponent in terms of the contradictory realities of his inner and outer conditions, though in more idiosyncratic language than that used by the Pseudo-James: 'tristes ypocrite, qui exterminatas habetis facies, ut videamini ieiunantes et honesti, et

---

[32] On the history and use of this theme as a whole see Arnold, *Inquisition*, pp.63-65.
[33] Mt.VII.15.
[34] Mk.XIII.22: 'pseudochristi et pseudopropheti'; gloss for Mark passage runs: 'unde melius de haereticis accipendum, que contra ecclesiam venientes, se Christos esse mentiuntur'; for Matthew, as noted before, 'specialiter de hereticis'. More made of the 'spine et tribuli' in this passage; pseudo-prophets and pseudo-christs are also in MtXXIV.24.
[35] 2Tim.III.5.

sodomiticum potius scelus eligitis, masculorum concubitores!'.[36] George is paraphrasing the words of Matthew's gospel here, to characterize the hypocrisy of his opponent as the Scriptural hypocrisy condemned by Christ, a usage that we will see again in the work of Stephen of Bourbon, and of Peter Ferrandi. Those occasions on which the more standard vocabulary of cloak and wolves occur in the *Disputatio* are in fact placed in the mouth of the heretical opponent, who accuses the Catholic speaker of using 'palliato sermone', and the Catholic church of having 'maculam et rugam, quia sunt ibi adulteri,... lupi rapaces'.[37] In another example, the polemical treatise attributed by Kaeppeli to Peter Martyr states that the heretics refrain from meat and eggs because they say that it leads to sin, but 'istam non credunt, tamen allegant ipsam coram illis quos simplices existimant esse'. Like George, here is a picture of feigned appearance that does not necessarily depend on the received imagery in the way that the foxes do, and one that adds another layer of pretence, directed specifically at the ascetic pretensions of heretics.[38] Moneta's text however, more an academic refutation than an attack, does not use this, or any of the other topoi to construct or attack his opponent. Even Salvo Burci, whose prose is the precise opposite of Moneta's in precision and in colour, refers only rarely to this motif, though in a typical mode: 'omnis errecticorum pravitas, qui sub habitu et specie religionis dicunt'.[39] However, as far as the polemical texts employ more complex rhetorical constructions like this, that of false appearance, though not very frequent, is probably the most common.

In contrast to those texts, it is important to note at this point the incidence of this motif in the church legislation, and subsequently the legal textbook of Gregory IX. Aside from a commentary on the princes of Judea by Jerome, which connects heretics to sophistry and the dialectic arts, there is little of this imagery to be found in the *Decretum*, constituted, as it is, almost entirely from the writings of the Fathers and the early church. Gregory IX's *Liber extra*, on the other hand, is replete with the imagery and language that characterize this strand of rhetoric; not, it has to be observed, in the additions that it makes from the texts of antiquity and the church Fathers, but in its inclusion of the work of recent and contemporary popes. The

---

[36] *Disputatio*, p.18.
[37] *Disputatio*, pp.56, 77.
[38] T. Kaeppeli, 'Une somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?)', *AFP*, XVII (1947), 295-335, edn. of text on pp.320-335; p.331.
[39] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.252, and p.249, same.

new material in the *Liber extra* reflects a shift, in which false appearance is now a very prominent part of the canon-legal idea of heretics.

Several of the twelfth-century church councils contain references to false appearance in their treatment of heretics. As early as the 1119 council of Toulouse, heretics were condemned as 'eos qui religionis speciem simulantes'. The canons of the council of Rheims in 1157 similarly describe 'Manicheans' operating 'sub specie religionis', deceiving the simple, in particular the *mulierculae* of 2 Timothy. The danger to the 'simple' stands in direct relation to the level of secrecy in the heretic's behaviour again at Tours: 'quanto serpit occultis tanto gravius Dominicam vineam in simplicibus demolitur'.[40] Noticeable is the prominence of the *species* image from Timothy discussed above; here it is a 'species religionis', and not 'pietatis', though in fact the gloss for this verse gives 'religionis' as an explanation of 'pietatis'. With Lucius III's *Ad abolendam*, however, the use of that verse to describe the nature of heretics is made explicit in direct quotation: those who preach without a mission do so 'sub specie pietatis virtutum eius, iuxta quod ait Apostolus, denegantes'.

While that image is entrenched by the beginning of the thirteenth century, the broad theme of false appearance of heretics is really brought to the fore though by the output of Innocent III, in particular, again, by *Vergentis in senium*. The following quotation makes clear how strongly that decretal emphasizes false appearance, framed in the language of Timothy:

> Hi sunt caupones, qui aquam vino commiscent, et virus draconis in aureo calice Babylonis propinant, habentes, secundum Apostolum, speciem pietatis, virtutum autem eius penitus abnegantes ... sicut cancer, amplius serperet in occulto, et iam in aperto suae virus iniquitatis effundat, dum palliata specie religionis et multos decepit simplices.[41]

The emphasis on hiddenness, poison, and disguise is continued in similar terms in the other documents by Innocent included in the *Liber extra*; in his letter to the king of Aragon: 'ponitis lucem tenebras et tenebras lucem', and 'non enim vino compunctionis, sed felle draconis', once again held in the 'aureo calice Babylonis'.[42] On the usurpation of the preaching office by heretics: 'quum vitia sub

---

[40] Fredericq, vol.1, pp.29, 35-36, 39.
[41] Friedberg, vol.2, col.782.
[42] Friedberg, vol.2, cols.783-84, cap.XI.

specie virtutum occulte subintrant, et angelus Satanae se in angelum lucis simulat et transformat', and again 'ne sub praetextu veritatis in foveam decidatis erroris et sub specie virtutum in laqueam vitiorum universitatem vestram rogamus attentius'.[43] Innocent places false appearance at the centre of his construction of heretics, tied firmly to the Scriptural vocabulary of Timothy and Corinthians, and it is an attitude continued by his later successor, Gregory IX, not only in the document which forms chapter fourteen of this title, also on the usurpation of preaching, which repeats verbatim Innocent's language of chapter twelve, but in the decretal *Ille humani generis* of 1231, in which Gregory reprises most of the themes and images of *Vergentis in senium*.[44]

We can see this language enter also the great ecumenical council of Innocent's reign; though the seduction of the simple and the infirm had characterized heretics in the previous Lateran council, the third canon of the 1215 meeting quotes directly from Timothy in its portrayal of its subject: 'nonnulli sub specie pietatis virtutem eius (iuxta quod ait Apostolus) abnegantes'. The inserted words may even indicate a quotation from *Ad abolendam*.[45] By the 1230s, not only has the language of Innocent's anti-heretical legislation become the standard mode for papal output in Gregory's decretals, it is reflected also in the secular law of the Emperor, in the *Liber Augustalis*, which uses a much the same vocabulary, as well as many wolves and lots of snakes, making false appearance one of the foremost traits of heretics in anti-heretical legislation.

False appearance is also probably the most common of all the figurative ideas of heresy that occur across the whole range of our other sources, amongst the *exempla* collections, especially. We can find in them constructs that follow the same lines as those in the legislation; Caesarius of Heisterbach makes several references to heretics as wolves, not least in that section which is quoted below at the beginning of the next section, in which the same echoes of Scripture can be heard. He tells us too, that the words of Matthew XXIV.24, with regard to the pseudo-prophets, were fulfilled in the Amalricians.[46] There is also a broader construction on this theme, stemming ultimately from the same source, but at times

---

[43] Friedberg, vol.2, cols.784-87, cap.XII

[44] Friedberg, vol.2, col.789, cap.XIV: 'ne vitia sub specie virtutum occulte subintrent' – repetition of Innocent in cap XII; *Ille humani generis* repeats most of the rhetoric of *Vergentis*, dominated by theme of deception and false appearance.

[45] García, *Lateran 4*, p.50.

[46] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.305. Also, vol.2, p.207: 'sub scemate religionis'.

almost incidental, the principal example of which would be the way in which the wolves, like the foxes, have become absorbed into the anti-heretical vocabulary in a fairly broad way. That incidental sort of use is at work in Jacques de Vitry's equation of heretics with *lupi* in his *exempla* which has no specific development to false appearance.[47] Here the association with heretics interacts with a wider tradition of the Scriptural wolf imagery, which is used generally to signify those who cannot be trusted with the fate of the simple.[48] While false appearance occurs with some frequency in the *exempla* of Caesarius and Jacques, in the two Dominican collections the theme is predominant. Though this predominance is less meaningful for the collection of Thomas of Cantimpré – it is hard to make a general survey of an author's ideas on heresy from only two *exempla*, though it is possible to see that both of these involve a feigned or false outward form – in the *Tractatus de diversis materiis* it is unavoidable.

The basic tenor of Stephen of Bourbon's treatment of heretics, and this is something that functions at both a background and a foreground level, is a criticism of their deception of the simple, Stephen's ultimate audience. Consequently, the pretence of the heretics' outward persona runs as a prominent image through much of what Stephen has to say about them. A Waldensian heretic, while literally disguised, 'transfiguratus', is at the same time deceptive in his 'verba sophistica'. Heretics approach the simple 'cupientes pervertere eum, dissimulato habitu'.[49] Stephen's own opinion, expressed elsewhere, seems to be that heretics argue with 'sophismatibus' and 'verborum duplicitatibus', because they are unable to prevail by reason.[50] His concern with the sophisms of heretics is such that, as we have seen, it occupies a large part of his 'how to spot a heretic' section, and seems here to extend his concern with deception, elsewhere focussed on the simple, to the deception also of the learned, a parallel concern that can also be found in *Vergentis in senium*: 'multos decepit simplices, et quosdam seducit astutos, factus magister erroris'. Indeed, the sophistry of heretics forms another layer of the false appearance topos. As mentioned, it even appears in the *Decretum*, which otherwise has little to say on this topic, but includes a warning from Jerome about heretics

---

[47] Vitry, Greven, p. 57.
[48] The wolf that eats the sheep it should be guarding is used by Odo of Cheriton for example, to signify corrupt priests, Salisbury, 'Human Animals', p.56.
[49] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.280; 277.
[50] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.288.

'quod sophismatibus suis et arte dialectica sepe opprimant ecclesiasticos'.[51] The motif is prominent in the inquisitor's manuals, particularly in the Anonymous of Passau, and even more so in the Pseudo-David of Augsburg. In the latter text, as in Stephen's text, it is employed primarily in the context of the seduction of the simple by heretics, alongside the wolf imagery of Matthew. Once their deception has succeeded in perverting their audience, then, as in Stephen's story of the birdcatcher heretic with which we began, their errors can be introduced or revealed.

If we turn again to the extract that we looked at from the Pseudo-James at the beginning of this section, we can notice that the context in which this diatribe occurs, and it is by far one of the most extended attacks in this text as a whole, is that of the Cathars' ascetic diet. A similar level of self-denial is described by the Pseudo-David for the Waldensians, with a similar level of contempt: 'quidam tamen haeretici affligunt se jejuniis & vigiliis & hujusmodi, quia sine talibus non possunt apud simplices nomen sibi sanctitatis acquirere, nec decipere simulationis figmento'.[52] The connection here between false appearance, and elements of an apostolic lifestyle, is something that we have seen before, in the Dominican edifying texts, and one which perhaps forms its own little sub-tradition within the wider topos of deception. We have seen that this is often employed in Dominican texts in connection with preaching, or fasting, aspects of apostolicity where Mendicant friars, and indeed the preaching church generally, would be in direct competition with the heretics in the public perception of the two groups. St. Dominic competes explicitly on this level for the allegiance of a noble household, by fasting more convincingly than the Cathar 'Good Men' who are staying there.[53] The abstinence of the heretics in this story is characterized by Dominic's hagiographer Ferrandi, in the same words used by the author of the *Disputatio*, as the false piety of the hypocrites described by Christ during the sermon on the mount: the heretics 'exterminant quippe facies suas, ut videatur hominibus ieiunantes'. In contrast to this excess, Dominic practices abstinence not to gain the praise of others, but to lead the faithless away from error, and back to the love of the Catholic church.[54]

---

[51] Friedberg, vol.1, col.999.
[52] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1780.
[53] Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI, pp.225-26; 228.
[54] Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI p.226. See above, p.93.

The theme of false appearance is prominent in Dominican literature, apparently as a foil to the Friars Preacher, to emphasize their true example and preaching, and in part an element of the construction of their identity. We can look to this perhaps as one of the motives behind the strong presence of this element in Stephen's writing, who also uses a version of the Matthew verse, 'excoriant facies suas, ut videantur ab hominibus jejunantes', to illustrate their hiddenness, the third of his four signs by which 'heretici maxime denotantur'.[55] The false sanctity of one of his more realistic heretics, Alberea, is indeed connected explicitly to her abstinence from meat and animal products.[56] There are echoes in this last point of Grundmann's observation, in his analysis of the false appearance motif, that saintliness had to some degree become in itself a mark of heresy. Supported by Paul's words in 2 Corinthians, the same transfiguration of evil into an angel of light, as used by Innocent in his letter, quoted above, the author of the Anonymous of Passau was able to suggest asceticism as a method by which heretics could be recognized.[57]

However, it is perhaps also possible to see behind this construction a background and mundane reality to these concerns. In the course of their description of the Cistercian legates that Diego met on his mission in the Languedoc, Stephen, as well as the accounts of the story in Peter les Vaux-de-Cernay and the various *legendae* of St. Dominic, all also relate that the heretics use the opulent life of the churchmen against them in their perversion of the Catholic faithful.[58] Stephen makes this into a criticism of the heretics, directed towards the subversion of simple, again pointing to a lack of real substance in their beliefs: 'non habent forcius argumentum ad defensionem erroris sui et subversionem simplicium quam exempla mala catholicorum et maxime prelatorum'. As Diego understood however, the ability to exhibit and control the appearance of piety was the arena in which the church and the heretics were competing, what Arnold refers to as 'semiotic warfare', and it recurs as a concern in the Dominican literature.[59] Ferrandi, in his life of St. Dominic, complains of the heretics' appearance 'quis vel sapiens in prima fronte non deciperetur a talibus? Qui eos non sanctissimos

---

[55] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.311, 307.
[56] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, 149.
[57] Grundmann, 'Typus', pp.101-102; Anonymous of Passau, p.272.
[58] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus* pp.213-14.
[59] Arnold, *Inquisition,*, p.65. Arnold points out that even the habits of the Order were perceived as an imitation of Cathar dress.

reputaret?'.[60] The nobles' reaction to the superior display of fasting and prayer of Dominic and his companion is 'vere isti homines boni sunt', as they begin to return to the Catholic faith.

Outside the hagiographical traditions of the Order, it is clear that this is indeed a major problem facing the Dominicans. The manual written for his brother preachers by the master general Humbert de Romans highlights that problem, complaining of heretics who will travel widely to visit their followers, and who collect alms to support the poor and lure people to their faith. Peraldus similarly claims that the illiterate cannot believe that the dignity of the church resides in men of evil life, and make easy targets for heretics' accusations.[61] That heretical asceticism was indeed making a strong impact on the 'simple', as these sources seem to fear, might be confirmed by the words of one deponent before the inquisition, who believed that the heretics were good on account of their continued fasting.[62]

The idea of false appearance therefore had, perhaps, a larger existence than its purely rhetorical expressions. Further, the more informative of our texts present a layer of deception in the appearance of heretics that is unconnected to any outward show of piety, and is rather to do with the practical reality of heretics' lives. While Stephen of Bourbon's story of the sophistical Waldensian revolves around the deception exercised by the heretic, the man nonetheless also walks 'transfiguratus', in disguise, a fact that might remind us of the account given by both Anselm of Alessandria and the Anonymous of Passau of the 'crooked stick' code used by the Cathars to determine whether or not they were among friends. There is also a degree of deception in the exposition of their beliefs. Raniero tells us that there are some beliefs that are not taught to the lesser grades, and this seems to be borne out by the author of the Peter Martyr treatise, who is insistent on the 'secrets' of the heretics: 'hoc est unum de suis secretis et hanc pestilentiam subriperunt a Saracenis qui ita blasphemant. In quem errorem pestiferum...', or

---

[60] Ferrandi, *MOPH* XVI, p.225

[61] Humbert, *Opera*, vol.2, p.471. Peraldus's text is cited from the website maintained by Siegfried Wenzel, who is one of a team preparing a new edition of the *Summa se vitiis*: William Peraldus, *Summa de vitiis*, bk.8, *Superbia*, cap.32, ‹http://www.english.upenn.edu/~swenzel/peraldus.html› (05/05/2004).

[62] Duvernoy, *Quercy*, p.234. In contrast, Duvernoy, while discussing abstinence, as distinct from fasting, talks of the relish taken by Cathars in 'delectable foods', and points to many occasions observed by followers of their being given fine salmon, fine trout, fish pasties etc., J. Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: La religion des cathares* (Toulouse, 1976), pp. 177-8 and 177, n. 52.

'hunc autem errorem traxerunt ab heresi manicheorum et est illud unum de suis secretis archanis'. He also reports this speech as the opinion of the heretics on the subject of transmigration of souls: 'comprehensus ergo a tuis obiectionibus manifestabo tibi secretam secretissimam nostram, quam pauci etiam ex nostris consolatis sciunt'.[63] The *Vitae fratrum* story of the Tuscan youth Florimund, who discovered the dualist nature of the Cathar sect only after several years of membership, will be remembered here.

Whatever the reality of their religiosity, then, there is certainly a level below the rhetoric in which heretics, rather than being deceptive, are simply hidden. If we look back to the twenty-seventh canon of the third Lateran council, we can find a comparison of Cathars to other heretics in terms of their hiddenness:

> haereticorum, quos alii Catharos, alii Patarinos, alii Publicanos, alii aliis nominibus vocant, invaluit damnata perversitas, ut iam non in occulto sicut aliqui nequitiam suam exerceant, sed suum errorem publice manifestent et ad suum consensum simplices attrahunt et infirmos.[64]

Two things are significant here, the first of which is the ongoing concern for the deception of the simple that runs through the whole of this topos of appearance. The other point that needs to be noted is that there is an idea of multiple heretical groups, of which secrecy is apparently the normal condition. The Cathars, on the other hand, are able to preach openly because they are strong, presumably as a result of the support of the nobles, given that this canon is addressed primarily against abuse of secular power in the region of Southern France.

If that picture is then compared to the legislation that grows out of the regional councils around the process of inquisition, which maintains a constant emphasis on the hiding places and *latibula* of heretics, we can perhaps suppose that the increasing prevalence of the false appearance topos in our period is connected to the increasing necessity for heretics to be hidden, as well as to the need for the Catholic Church to gain the upper hand in the continuing competition over the contested rhetoric of ascetic piety.

---

[63] Kaeppeli, 'Une somme contre les hérétiques', pp.324, 330, 331.
[64] *DEC*, vol.1, p.224.

iii – Corruption

The last aspect of the rhetorical construction that we will consider here is that of corruption, which here includes ideas both of infection and disease, and of poison and pollution. These had been long-standing elements of the anti-heretical tradition already by the time our texts were written, as a quick glace at the patristic texts that make up the twenty-fourth *causa* of the *Decretum* easily demonstrates. Heretics here are a contaminant 'qui pollutam habent conmunionem'. One extract from Augustine sets up an opposition between health and correct belief on the one hand, and 'pestifera et mortifera dogmata' on the other. Another, from Jerome, draws a different medical parallel, which likens heresy to a putrid limb that must be removed to restore the health of the body, and pointing to the example of Arius, 'una scintilla fuit, sed quoniam non statim oppressus est, totum orbem eius flamma populata est'.[65]

Before going further, it is worth taking a closer look at the specifically medical aspect of this theme which appears in the patristic literature included by the *Decretum*. The treatment of heresy as disease, and the corresponding role of the Catholic church as medic together formed a concept which understood the Church's relationship to sin in general in terms of the physician-patient relationship, where sin was disease, the sinner patient, and the church stood in imitation of Christ as *medicus*.[66] Originally borrowed by the Fathers from the pagan philosophers, in the writing of our period the idea remained current: in the prologue to his *Summa contra gentiles*, Aquinas draws a parallel between himself, or the wise man, promoting truth and refuting error, and the medic, promoting health and defeating illness.[67]

According to several scholars of earlier heresy, in fact, disease was the most prominent characterization of heresy in the pre-inquisition period. Lobrichon sees two standard commonplaces in eleventh-century representations of heresy: as a

---

[65] Friedberg, vol.1, cols.998, 995, 1000.
[66] See for example R. Arbesmann, 'The concept of "Christus medicus" in St Augustine', *Traditio*, 10 (1954), 1-28; D.W. Amundsen, 'Medicine and Faith in Early Christianity', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 56 (1982), 326-50.
[67] J. Ziegler, *Medicine and Religion c.1300. The Case of Arnau de Vilanova* (Oxford, 1998), pp.179-82. Aquinas, *SCG*, lib.1, cap.2, p.61.

putrid limb, with echoes of Jerome, and as a plague from elsewhere.[68] Moore takes this further, and suggests a deliberate parallel between the representations of heresy and leprosy in the twelfth-century material, though incidence of direct comparison seems uncommon. Ziegler's analysis of the relationship between ideas of medicine and religion in this period would suggest, rather, that the 'medicalization' of religious language only really began in general at a later date, in the latter half of the thirteenth century, and *specialized* medical vocabulary became attached to erroneous belief and heresy even later.[69] Certainly in our material, there are general terms of disease, to do with plague and infection, such as 'pestiferam scilicet haereticorum progeniem et falsas eorum doctrinas', and it is perhaps this underlying assumption, of heresy as infection, that to some extent informs the concern shown by the regional legislation on heresy to eradicate all physical locations in which heretics or heretical rites have been present or carried out. Reference to more explicitly medical terms however, such as Salvo's warning to his 'fratres karissimi, cavete vobis ab istis leprosis', is rare, and not developed.[70]

In our sources, notions of corruption, medical or otherwise, are for the most part used in a far more generic way, in terms of the general vocabulary used to describe heresy, rather than in more complex constructions. A generalized vocabulary of corruption and infection is employed in the description of heresy in what at times seems to be an almost incidental, inadvertent manner. 'Foeda haeresis', the 'zizania' which 'in omnibus fidem corrumpunt', corrupts or infects wherever its action is described: 'terram albigensium ... terram infectum'.[71] The *Liber inquisitionis* of Orvieto, which has perhaps the richest language of all the inquisition records considered here, makes quite frequent use of that general connection in its sentences. Here again, heresy is depicted as 'letiferam pestem', while the accused refuse the cure of penance, 'tanquam proprie vite hostes medicum et medelam'.[72] Jacques de Vitry draws this pollution out into an extended

---

[68] G. Lobrichon, 'Arras, 1025, ou le vrai procès d'un fausse accusation', in *Inventer*, 67-85, p.67.
[69] R.I. Moore, 'Heresy as Disease', in Lourdaux and Verhelst, *Concept*, 1-11, pp.2-4, 5ff., 9. Ziegler, *Medicine and Religion*, p.275.
[70] *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae*, ed. Kerval, pp.219-220. Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.16. Note also Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.cxii: 'pestilencia verba...qui in sordibus est sordescat adhuc'.
[71] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, pp.300, 301; 'monachus: in tantum enim Albiensium error invaluit, ut brevi intervallo temporis infecerit usque ad mille civitates'. *Disputatio*, p.4, l.2, and p.66, l.3. Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.79. Also, a priest is 'perversus ab hereticis, ita exemplo suo infecit parrochiam suam', p.215.
[72] D'Alatri, Orvieto, e.g.: pp.221, 227.

connection between heretics and foulness, who remain unaware of their own 'fetores', while they see the small faults of others as great. Jacques manages nicely to combine our various elements in one *exemplum* about a family of women 'heretica pestis corruptis', one of whom tries to 'corrumpere' her daughter 'veneno perfidie sue', and who appears after her death as a 'vetula maledicta fetida et turpissima'.[73] If we turn to look at an extract from Caesarius's *Dialogus*, we will see this theme at work, here once again in the context of false appearance:

> Duo homines, non mente, sed habitu simplices, non oves, sed lupi rapaces ... summam simulantes religiositatem. Erant autem pallidi et macilenti, nudis pedibus incedentes, et quotidie ieiunantes; matutinis sollemnibus ecclesiae maioris nulla nocte defuerunt, nec aliquid ab aliquo praeter victum tenuem receperunt. Cumque tali hypocrisi totius populi in se provocassent affectum, tunc primum coeperunt latens virus emovere.[74]

Caesarius's words here are reminiscent of Stephen of Bourbon's heretic who used Scripture to lure converts as a bird catcher would use a whistle, and of the extract from the Pseudo-James, quoted at the beginning of the last section, where the sweetness of honey disguises the taste of the poison beneath. If the falseness of the heretics' apparent piety is the most prominent topos at work in our texts, then the broad idea of corruption and venom to some extent functions in this context as the underlying nature that that façade conceals.

As with all our themes, corruption has its own attendant animal image. The connection between the deception of heretics and the venom underlying their outward form is reiterated, and developed further by their portrayal as snakes, and the frequency with which heretics' words or presence are characterized by either venom or poison is related to the similarly frequent invocation of their snake-like nature. The snake is the only animal imagery that features with any real frequency in the polemics, though even then it is only in two of the four texts. The *Disputatio* and the *Summa* of Moneta of Cremona maintain their general avoidance of this type of construction throughout. The author of the Pseudo-James text, though, makes use of this imagery in his descriptions of the heretics as they 'pravae heresis

---

[73] Vitry, Greven, p.57, no.96; p.58, no.98. Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*/ Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1, p.25/114, fetid smell of burning heretic, 'abhominabilis fetor', and 'quam fetidus ipse esset et horror eius'. Also, the smelly cat, 'posteriorum turpitudinem', p.35/165.
[74] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, vol.1, p.296.

letiferum virus diffundant', or 'venenata lingua delatrat'.[75] They are, the author tells us in language that echoes once again that of *Vergentis*, 'calidi serpentes caupones aquam vino miscentes, ut in provisis auditoribus poculum mortis quasi sub simplicitate propinent'.[76]

If the Pseudo-James makes much of this motif, then this is an image that the author of the *Liber suprastella* takes to its highest expression. Comparing the heretics to the ancient serpent who 'cum ingeniosis verbis seduxit cor innocentic', Salvo tells us that it is 'a quo serpente isti serpentini, scilicet herretici, habent istam doctrinam'. In case either his reader or the heretic he addresses were unsure of his meaning, he clarifies, 'vultis videre manifeste si doctrina istorum herreticorum [sic] est a Sathane'.[77] The heretic as snake image is one that he re-uses from time to time in address, 'O erretici serpentini', but the idea of heretics as venomous generally, 'o erretici veneno pleni', is also one that he develops, 'sunt tanquam scorpio, quia scorpio blanditur lingua et postea ponit venenum cauda ... venenunt scilicet falsam doctrinam'.[78] It is perhaps worth noting that Salvo's heretical opponent also levels a similar charge at the feet of the Catholics, calling the Roman church 'meretricem et nidum serpentium et bestiam', and 'nidus serpentis, videlicet Romani'.[79]

The Pseudo-James, as well as a straightforward equation between snakes and heretics, also sees a serpentine source and quality for the heresy they maintain, 'ex serpentinis pectoribus ... eorum vipereas oppiniones'.[80] The serpent is also cited as a source of error by the normally reticent Raniero Sacconi during his discussion of Cathar sacraments, in a phrase made all the more unsavoury by the aridity of Raniero's usual style: 'falsa est et vana, deceptoria et venenosa ... Erroris namque venenum, quod ex ore antiqui serpentis biberunt'.[81] Again, heresy is venom, and the ultimate source serpentine, the snake in the last two instances standing as a figure for the devil. The connection that our authors make at times

---

[75] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.cxi, cxxxvi; p.civ, again, corruption of Scriptures: 'congruentes intellectibus ex scripturis venenatis excerpunt morsibus et locustarum more subitum habentes volatum et deciduum virencia quoque sanae intelligencia corrudunt et se atque fautores suos ad eternae dampnationis ariditatem perducunt'.

[76] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.clxxxvi.

[77] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, p.64.

[78] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.88, 144, 64. Also, p.64, l.15 'isti sunt illi heretici quos dixit Apostolus ad Thimotheum attendentes spiritibus erroris et doctrinum demoniorum'.

[79] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.70, 15.

[80] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, p.xlii.

[81] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, p.44. A similar view of heresy as the suggestions of the devil can be seen with some frequency in the inquisition register of Orvieto.

between heretics and the devil often occurs in the context of this snake imagery, though it is really only in Caesarius's collection that the devil features consistently in the characterization of heretics.

For Grundmann, the topos of the heretic was a largely static motif, already established by the eleventh century, and remaining largely unchanged until the fifteenth, with only a small variation between different authors. Indeed, the various elements that constitute that topos are common to most of our texts, and seem to operate equally in generic groups as different as the canons of church councils and the *exempla* collections, though of course, not always to the same effect. However, in our material, a layering and accumulation can be seen to have taken place over time, particularly in contrast with the period immediately preceding ours, most obviously perhaps in the image of the foxes that had dominated the Cistercian anti-heretical tradition. Derived as we saw from the Ordinary Gloss on the Song of Songs, and promoted by the work of Bernard of Clairvaux, by the time our texts are being written, the little foxes among the vines have become ingrained to the point where the individual elements of the idea can stand independently and still represent the whole. To this tradition, *Vergentis in senium* introduces the foxes of Judges by association, and introduces a duality of division and unity, that we will address more fully in the next section.

While the imagery of heretics as foxes is modified, there are more significant changes at work here. Where the foxes had provided the leitmotiv of the Cistercian-led polemic of the previous century, in thirteenth-century polemic it is a minor presence where it is present at all. The polemical sources are in fact curiously reticent about their use of this type of construction. Although it is not absent, and though it appears more strongly in the Pseudo-James and the *Liber suprastella*, for the most part any invective that these texts direct towards heretics is restricted to incidental remarks. By contrast, in the case of the foxes, it is the papal output that leads the way in the development and formation of the anti-heretical rhetoric of this period, not least the writings of Innocent III.

More significant is the shift away from the foxes and toward false appearance as the principal element of the topos. The growth and spread of the latter theme in our period makes it by far the most widespread, and the most

developed aspect of this level of construction. The two-sidedness of heretics, the disparity between their outer persona, characterized by false prophets and wolves, and their inner condition, which has the quality of corruption and the character of snakes, build a picture of a hidden nature and a false holiness. The prominence of false appearance in the Dominican material suggests a new dominance in anti-heretical writing. Again though, there is a layering of the construction here. To the Scriptural and polemical elements of false appearance is added a kind of practical hiddenness that seems to reflect a heretical lifestyle of disguise and secrecy, and which is apparently drawn from observation and experience.

A connection to the post-crusade, post-inquisition reality of heresy suggests itself here, in the move from fox to wolf. In the first place, it is easy to see an association between their generally hidden nature and an increasing need to be secretive in the face of a renewed campaign of repression by the church. That campaign, which put heresy at the front of the church's agenda, can perhaps also be seen reflected in the predominance of the wolf, and a more acute sense of the danger of heresy. If knowledge of the nature of an animal, according to Augustine, allows an understanding of the associations that go with it, while an ignorance of the animals used for comparison impedes understanding, then the picture of heretics drawn by the different animals used to describe them suggests that they were becoming scarier.[82] It is important to note finally, before moving on, that almost all of these images centre around, and construct the heretic, with little attention directed toward the error. The exception to this is of course the idea of venom, or poison, though this too is rarely without a snake or a scorpion to which it can be attached. The topos though, is applied to all, regardless of doctrinal character.[83]

II – Number

If we return to the foxes with which we opened this chapter, and look more closely at what is being expressed there about heresy, we can find our way into a broader

---

[82] L. Kordecki, 'Making Animals Mean: Speciest Hermeneutics in the *Physiologus* of Theobaldus', in N.C. Flores (ed.), *Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York and London, 1996), 85-102, p.97.
[83] Grundmann, 'Typus', p.105.

level of construction. As previously noted, the updated, papal version of the fox imagery that is drawn from the book of Judges constructs heretics in two ways: as plural, and as united against the church. Throughout our sources, the ideas of number that the fox topos raises are a consistent feature of the construction of heresy, comprising several interconnected elements that we will try now to disentangle.

Contemporary with the appearance of the renewed fox imagery of Innocent's *Vergentis in senium*, Alain de Lille's introduction to his *De fide catholica contra hereticos* was also portraying the 'heretics of our times' as unified, drawing together different errors, where those heretics of the past had created new dogma from nothing:

> Olim vero diversi haeretici diversis temporibus, diversa dogmata et adversa somniasse leguntur, quae generalis Ecclesiae publicis edictis damnata noscuntur: nostris vero temporibus, novi haeretici, imo veteres et inveterati, veterantes dogmata, ex diversis haeresibus, unam generalem haeresim compingunt, et quasi ex diversis idolis unum idolum, ex diversis monstris unum monstrum; et quasi ex diversis venenatis herbis unum toxicum commune conficiunt.[84]

This passage from Alain is directly comparable to Innocent's imagery: both portray modern heretics as united against the church, but Alain's view differs in that it sees the various heretical groups as one doctrinally coherent entity, as singular in their nature, rather than in their position or purpose.

Alain's remarks here have been read as representative of an important stage in the development of the idea of heresy in the thirteenth century. Michel Lauwers sees this passage, and Alain's stance as a whole, as a departure from a previously dominant patristic view of heresy, which saw it as a plural entity that needed to be catalogued. Alain, in Lauwer's view, made heresy singular, a general heresy of which individual heresies were part.[85] That is undoubtedly what Alain meant, and certainly there was at this time a shift to a view of contemporary heresy that included more material drawn from recent experience and literature, which was moving away from the reliance on models of early heresy for details of doctrine and

---

[84] *PL*, vol.210, 307-08.
[85] M. Lauwers, '*Dicunt vivorum beneficia nichil prodesse defunctis*. Histoire d'un thème polémique (xi^{e}-xii^{e} siècles)', in *Inventer*, 157-92, p.185.

custom. How much Alain's idea of a singular heresy is at work in our sources however, or how far they move away from patristic sources, is less certain.

A more useful perspective, from our point of view at least, is to be found in Patschovsky's view of this passage from the *De fide*. Patschovsky uses the above passage to illustrate what he sees as a stable pattern in the idea of heresy throughout these centuries: that, though they gave them different features, Catholic writers of this period viewed all forms of religious deviance as the same, characterized by the same things (idolatry, monstrosity, poison), what he calls the 'internal coherence of non-Catholic world'.[86] We can see that principle at work in several of the texts that we have used, either in description or in classification. Stephen of Bourbon and the Pseudo-James Capelli both place heretics together with other groups external to the Catholic faith, as the latter author has it, with Saracens and other men 'qui dapnantur' (sic), who 'ab unitate catholicae fidei heretici aberrantes'.[87] Stephen's stated aim at the beginning of his *De heresi* section is to 'probat et approbat fidem nostram per collacionem ad alias sectas' – a group that includes Saracens.[88] In the legal field, the *Liber extra* again treats heresy in the same context, locating it, as we saw, amongst sections concerning Jews, Saracens and Schismatics. The principle that Patschovsky sees in Alain's text, that all enemies of the church can be considered as a whole, seems indeed to inform these examples. However, it is less easy to find references to the specific unity of heretics that Alain talks about, with one main exception, the topos of the little foxes, which seems to echo Alain's text at least in part.

One of the clearest expressions of the new layer of the foxes topos outside Innocent's writing we have seen already, in the Anonymous of Passau. For the latter author, the lack of unity among heretics is a proof of their error. In contrast to the integrity of the Catholic faith, which 'non enim est divisa, sed una', the number and *differentiation* of heretical sects is held up as a sign of the Catholic Church's legitimacy, 'haereticorum plus quam LXX. sectae sunt'.[89] The idea of division is one we will come back to, but here it is suggestive of unity in so far as the depiction of that division as a flaw would imply at least in some way a potential for unity, a view of heresy as one big generic whole. The author later does just that, drawing

---

[86] Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society', pp.38-40.
[87] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.vi; cxii.
[88] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, p.275.
[89] Anonymous of Passau, p.263.

directly on the imagery of Innocent's bull, to say that 'sic haeretici, in sectis sunt divisi in se, sed in impugnatione Ecclesiae, sunt uniti'.[90]

The duality of the idea of division and unity is visible again in a more condensed expression in Stephen of Bourbon's text: 'inter se dissident, et contra nos omnes conveniunt', which, like the above example from the Anonymous of Passau, and as we saw earlier, is drawn from Innocent's use of that same passage in Judges. Stephen goes further, to illustrate his point with an *exemplum* that depicts a meeting of heretical delegations, come together to settle an internal dispute. Portrayed in a deliberately ludicrous manner, each delegation tries to prove the veracity of their version of their heretical faith, each repeating the same assertions, each failing to reach an accord. The 'man of understanding' from whom Stephen has this story assures him that many have come back to the Catholic faith as a result of this dissension.[91] Later, he repeats this idea, saying that 'sunt coadunati sive colligati ex [parte] posteriori in caudis quia omnis tendunt ad unum quia intendunt impugnare ecclesiam ut vulpes sampsonis qui habebant facies diversas colligatus caudas'.[92] Stephen uses the image of the foxes as at once divided and united for polemical effect: the first example he uses to prove that the Catholic faith is true and that heresy is to be confounded, the true faith confirmed in the hearts of the faithful. The second is the sixteenth item in Stephen's list of heretics' evil qualities.[93]

While it is perhaps rather unfair to have used Alain in this way, who surely did not intend his work to be read as the principal view of his period, his text provides us with a useful way into some of the ideas at work in our texts. And elements of Alain's view of heresy can in fact be seen at work in our texts, as part of Patschovsky's wider unity of enemies of the church, and also in places as a body united against church. The unity that does exist among heretics is not however specifically doctrinal in nature, as it is in Alain's text, and whether or not his view was, as Patschovsky suggests, representative of the only or even the dominant view of heresy, at least in the mid-thirteenth century, is less certain. In our sources, in fact, it seems not to be the case, for two main reasons: firstly, that where uniformity among heretics is a part of the construct, it is as a result of something other than

---

[90] Anonymous of Passau, p.264.
[91] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.278-79.
[92] 'Parte' is added in this BnF MS 14598 (f.234r), but Oriel MS 68 has it in the main text.
[93] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.275, 278-79.

doctrinal unity, and secondly that plurality and division are equally if not more present in the texts' depiction and representation of their subject.

Unity, or perhaps more correctly uniformity, is something that we have encountered before in the constructs of heresy that our sources present, most prominently perhaps in the texts designed for edification, and in the anti-heretical legislation of the first half of the century. In the edifying literature, there is a sameness that derives from the function of the heretics within that material. As we saw, all the heretics that appear in those hagiographical and exemplary texts are, with a few exceptions, invariably portrayed in the same way: nameless, and doctrinally indeterminate. They are all described in the same terms, and serve the same function, in the same way that the authors of our texts apply the different topoi of the anti-heretical tradition without regard for any differences between groups.

A different sort of uniformity, or at least one deriving from a different cause, is to be found in the legal material. Previous legislation by the 1163 council of Tours appears to have prefigured Alain's comments to some degree, where it states that: 'quoniam de diversis partibus in unum latibulum crebro conveniunt et praeter consensum erroris nullam cohabitandi causam habentes in uno domicilio commorantur'.[94] However, after Tours, a type of uniformity emerges in the representation of heresy by the church councils that is different to that described by Alain, and in the next century, after the 1215 council, there is nothing of that sentiment to be found. Instead a different idea of unity is entrenched, in a formulation that begins with the decretal *Ad abolendam*, where heresy is unmistakeably plural, but for all that is regarded as one in the eyes of the church, as a negative image. Though not immediately influential in political or legal terms, this decretal was effective in shaping subsequent ideas of heresy.[95] *Ad abolendam*'s idea reached its most condensed and neat expression in *Vergentis in senium*, as examined at the beginning of this chapter.[96] With Innocent III's fourth Lateran council, as we saw, heresy became a firmly homogenous entity in as much as the canons of that council defined heterodox opinion by opposition to a unified and

---

[94] Fredericq, vol.1, p.39.
[95] Maisonneuve, *Études*, p.155.
[96] Friedberg, vol.2, col.782.

closely delineated Catholic doctrine, which effectively denied autonomy to the individual error; the unity of the faith excluded them all equally.

In the regional councils, and within the higher levels of legislation as well, is another level of uniformity, which applies to the grades of guilt assigned to the heretics and their different followers, and which therefore translates also into the documents produced by the inquisition process. Each of the levels below heretics proper can be applied as equally to a follower of the Cathars as it can to a Waldensian follower, and the only place in which any differentiation occurs is in the upper reaches, where doctrine and direct contact with belief are at work. Even there, once condemned, all heretics are essentially the same, a legal status that creates the otherwise undifferentiated mass that can be seen in the majority of the legislation. Our previous examination of the regional councils made it clear that the heresy that they address is a previously defined and identified entity, that there is no engagement with the error, and that they deal almost entirely with the treatment of heretics after conviction. The difference between Alain's text and both general and regional councils is that where Alain's sameness derives from the heretics' own agency, the Lateran canon and the councils make heresy uniform only by virtue of doctrinal or legal exclusion, and it is this latter idea that is the more common in the texts of our period.

Though different types of uniformity emerge, ultimately, in all of the examples that we have looked at here, that uniformity would seem to arise from the removal of error, not the amalgamation of it. What unity there is in our sources in fact, applies to the common nature of figures and groups, while the unity of doctrine that Alain stresses is not present in any large way. The more common appearance of uniformity in the representation of heresy is less a part of an idea of heresy, as of the church's relationship to it; there is not so much a unity of heresy, as a homogeneity of heretics.

Let us return then to the foxes, and look at the other side of that construct, and the other reason that Alain's unity is not the main idea operating in our texts, namely, the degree to which heresy is represented in terms of plurality, and of division. We saw that the idea of division could be used in a polemical way, in juxtaposition to the unity of the Catholic church, and as a clear mark of the heretics' error. The

examples that we looked at above have been used recently by Peter Biller to illustrate a widespread idea of sects as many and divided, between each other and within themselves. That idea he sees as reinforced by the Scriptural foxes, but emanating ultimately from the use and diffusion of Isidore's *Etymologies*. In the section on heresies, the *Etymologies* presents a proliferation of heretical sects, naming around seventy groups, and providing for each one a derivation of the name, from either author or cause, along with a brief, one line description of the major error. Already a widely known text as a result of the 'swift and extensive' diffusion of the *Etymologies*, the availability of heresy section became even wider with its inclusion in the *Decretum*.[97] It is worth noting here that the formula that ends that list, which declares that 'dum in se multis erroribus divisae invicem sibi dissentiunt, communi tamen nomine adversus ecclesiam Dei conspirant', looks rather like the combination of heretics found in Innocent III's model.

Isidore's text, easily accessible and easily borrowed, in what Dondaine calls an 'erudition à bon marché', is cited in several of our texts, notably those written by or for inquisitors.[98] Anselm of Alessandria, at the end of his handbook, before the list of heretical elect, provides an adapted form of Isidore's list that names forty-seven sects, to which he adds 'aliorum infinitorum, sicut et catharorum, valdensium, speronistarum, circumcisorum, arnaldistarum'.[99] Though his *De heresi* section describes the errors of 'hereticis nostri temporis, scilicet Valdensibus et Albigensibus', Stephen of Bourbon also makes reference to Isidore's list. He recounts information given to him by a heretic concerning the heretics of Milan, who, according to Stephen's source, number 'septemdecim sectas a se invicem divisas et adversas, quas ipsi eciam de secta sua omnes damnabant'. After listing several of these, Stephen enjoins any reader that may want to learn more about their divisions and diversity to read Isidore's *Etymologies*, 'et inveniet ibi bene sexaginta septem vel octo nomina sectarum que jam precesserunt tempora hec'. He even quotes an exact reference to the extract's location in the *Decretum*.[100] The

---

[97] P. Biller, in work not yet published; the selection that the *Decretum* extract makes from Isidore's text, and the significance of what is or is not included, is further explored here. Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII.v, 'De haeresibus Christianorum', ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911), unpaginated; C.24 q.3 c.39, Friedberg vol.1, cols.1001-1006. For spread of *Etymologies* see L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 194-6.
[98] Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie II, III', p.252.
[99] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, pp.323-24.
[100] Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*, pp.279-81. There are in fact sixty-eight heresies named in the *Decretum* extract as marked out by Friedberg's edition, but, as anyone who has tried to count the

Anonymous of Passau gives the same number for modern heretics, over seventy, which he later gives for the ancient sects on the basis of Isidore's list.[101] The principle enshrined in that list can be seen working also in the Anonymous of Passau' later description of other sects, in which he uses this rule for deriving their names, from their author or their cause.[102] Perhaps this is why the Pseudo-David's original account of the birth of the Waldensian movement does not name Valdes, and focuses instead on the place of origin, that is, Lyon: as in the Anonymous of Passau, this text only ever calls this sect the *pauperes de lugduno*.[103]

None of these authors appear to see any great incongruity in using or adapting Isidore's list of ancient heretical sects to include or describe those of their own time. In fact, some of our contemporary writers were aware of and made reference to the disparity between what they saw of the heresy of their own times, and that described in the patristic descriptions that made up their anti-heretical inheritance, this most often in the arena of number. Those authors position their subjects firmly in the context of the presentation of the heretical past that they found in their source material, and this is an idea that we will return to shortly – there were many, now there are few: 'sectae hereticorum fuerunt plures, quam LXX. quae omnes, per Dei gratiam deletae sunt, praeter sectas Manicheorum, Arianorum, Runcariorum et Leonistarum'.[104] The concern to contrast past times still contains a view of sects as several, and where Alain saw a break with the past, others appear to see a difference only of number. Some authors, as Raniero did above, mark a reduction in numbers, while for others the situation is becoming relatively worse. 'Heu quod tot hodie haereses sunt in ecclesia' laments the Novice in Caesarius's collection of *exempla*.[105] There is even an apocalyptic tone to the preface to the *Disputatio*, in which the proliferation of heretics is a mark of the end of days, and the Patarines are only one of many groups: *Vergente ad occiduum mundo* et *instantibus periculosis temporis*, quibus multi discendentes a fide configunt sibi *sectam perditionis*, congregantes sibi discipulos *prurientes auribus*, unusquisque

---

number in Isidore itself knows, that number is very hard to pin down; perhaps for that reason we can spy a little wry humour behind the vagueness of Stephen's reference for his reader.

[101] Anonymous of Passau, p.263.

[102] Anonymous of Passau, p.272.

[103] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, cols.1777-78.

[104] Anonymous of Passau, p.264.

[105] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, p.200.

fidelis, prout divisit sibi dues mensuram fidei, in illos hereticos debet insurgere, qui Patarini vocantur'.[106]

In fact, there is a level of continuity between the inherited ideas of the heresies of the past, and the new heretics, who, according to the Pseudo-David, 'antiquorum haereticorum errores suis adinventionibus miscuerunt'.[107] As we saw, Stephen and Anselm use the Isidore extract as a list to be added to, a process that has elsewhere been described as 'the yoking of experience with the authority of written texts'.[108] The inherited models of heresy are not discarded, but neither are our authors dependent on them for their material. That independence can be seen not only in the models that our texts use, but in the sources that they draw upon. Moneta draws a history of the Cathars within a framework that juxtaposes the Catholic and Cathar 'churches' directly: 'quod Ecclesia Romana a Christo velut capite sumspit exordium, nunc unde Catharorum Ecclesia originem duxerit ostendamus'. That origin he roots in the traditions of Pagans, Jews and Christian apostates, putting together an unusual collection of antique names, including Pythagoras and the Saducaei, as well as Mani, and portraying the Cathars as constructing a faith consciously from diverse elements of other error.[109] Mani remains as a feature of Cathar origins, from the borrowed anti-Manichaean texts of Augustine, as had been the trend in the previous century, but he is no longer alone, and the Isidorean author/heresy model is rather lost in this collection of names.

In fact, the obligation that Isidore's text brought with it, that a sect should be named for its author, or at least for its cause, had perhaps always presented a problem for the historical view of heresy. Valdes is included in the potted histories of the Waldensian sect, and the academic heresies such as those of Amalric and Joachim, at the turn of the century, also have their authors and their correspondingly derived name. For Catharism though, the idea of the grand heresiarch has disappeared to some extent, although Mani is sometimes still named. Aquinas still uses 'Manicheans' in a modern context to mean the Cathars, in statements such as 'quidem opinio usque hodie apud haereticos manet, quorum Manichei'.[110] The

---

[106] *Disputatio*, p.3.
[107] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1779. The Pseudo-David also sees a difference in openness, that modern heretics are hidden, where in the past heretics held their error openly, see above, p.163, n.115.
[108] Kordecki, 'Making Animals Mean', p.96.
[109] Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.411.
[110] Aquinas, *SCG*, 1.2, vol.I.i, p.61; 2.83, vol.II.i, p.272.

difficulty for contemporary authors of finding an author for this particular group may in part account for the adoption of the Manicheans, or the Patarines as a model, or even for the continued application of the general term 'heretics'.[111] In any case, Moneta is alone among the polemicists in trying to present a history of the sect, but the same concern can be seen to operate in the inquisitor's handbooks of Anselm, the Anonymous of Passau and the Pseudo-David. In none of these texts though, do the authors rely any longer on that inherited tradition for information about the details of the error or the custom of the sect, and the historical link to the antique past is sometimes included in such a way that it seems almost to be a sort of topos in itself.[112]

Similarly, the expectation that heresy should be plural, that there would be several sects, appears not to have been left behind, but to have remained and been adapted. *Ad abolendam*, as we saw, addressed 'diversarum haeresium pravitatem, quae in plerisque mundi partibus modernis coepit pullulare', and that plurality can be seen at work throughout many of our texts.[113] *Vox in Rama* addresses itself against new heretics that are 'inter diversas haeresum species'. The explicit to the third of Douais' *Summae auctoritatum* directs the texts against Manicheans, Patarines and heretics, as well as 'Passaginos' and 'Circumcisos', and many other heretics. The fourth of his *Summae* is more conservatively aimed at the Patarines alone, but within the text it still regards the latter as one amongst several: 'tangit manifestissime sectam Patarinorum, cum inter ceteras hereses illa sola sit hunc salvatorem inficians'.[114]

There is then a tendency, in particular in the manual material, to regard and represent 'heresy' as plural, and, as part of that plurality, to portray it in terms of the mutual division that forms the other half of the fox imagery, sometimes in a semi-polemical fashion. Connected to this, to a greater or lesser degree, is the representation of the internal divisions of the sects in question. Stephen of Bourbon's description of the attempts made by the Lombard heretics to convince each other of the legitimacy of their different opinions is a typically entertaining

---

[111] On the origin of the name 'Patarene' see Patschovsky, 'Heresy and Society', p.27-31.
[112] On academic authors using 'Manichei' contemporaneously, see Biller, 'Northern Cathars', pp. 25-26, 28-30, 45-47. See also C.M. Kurpiewski, 'Writing beneath the shadow of heresy: the *Historia Albigensis* of Brother Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31 (2005), 1-27, p.3, and p.25, n.146.
[113] Friedberg, vol.2, col.780.
[114] Mainz, 1233, *Vox in Rama*, Mansi, vol.23, col.324. Douais, *La somme*, IV, p.73.

and acute illustration of his argument, but it also appears to represent a fairly realistic portrayal of the heresy of that region. Native Salvo Burci similarly describes the efforts of the various Cathar groups of the north of Italy to reconcile their differences, and unite under a common faith, devoting much energy and expense, to no avail – proof, says Salvo, that 'non sunt Ecclesia Dei', quoting Luke's gospel, that 'every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation', in support. Like Stephen, Salvo tells us that the scandal caused by these factions have caused many to turn from the heretical sects to the Roman church, and Salvo similarly uses this piece of information to invite criticism.[115]

Unlike Stephen however, that internal division is, on a more broad level, much more an integral part of Salvo's conception of heresy in the rest of his text than it is for Stephen. Though not always in a consistent pattern, as well as the Waldensians Salvo's text addresses the errors of the Italian Cathars, dividing his treatment along the lines of their different factions, according to what their individual peculiarities of belief might be, and how that pertains to the point that he is trying to make. In fact, Biller sees this idea of division as potentially a more important formal idea than unity in the way that these texts construct heresy, and, as he points out, it functions as the organizing principle for many of Salvo's compatriots.

The most obvious examples of such organization are of course the two Italian handbooks by Raniero Sacconi and Anselm of Alessandria. As we saw in an earlier chapter, the structure of Raniero's text is based specifically upon the differences between the Italian Cathar churches, and includes a first section that covers beliefs and practice held in common, followed by detailed chapters on the separate beliefs of each of the main factions. As well as the organizational structure, it is worth noting that Raniero's text also presents a Catharism divided along lines of wealth, age, geography, number, knowledge, and level of initiation, a sort of structure of Cathar society, as well as an institution.[116] Like Raniero's text, the handbook written by Anselm of Alessandria is to some extent similarly structured around the differences between the Italian Cathar groups.

---

[115] Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*, pp.5-6; Lc.XI.17.
[116] Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*, respectively, pp.47; 51; 48-49 (also the Waldenses on this basis, 59f.); 50-51; 44, 47, 52, 58.

The frameworks of the polemical texts are also connected however, at least in a small way, to this idea of division, as we have seen already for Salvo. While the *Disputatio* only deals with one Cathar church, Moneta's *Summa* is certainly divided into books that deal individually with different factions of the Cathars, though it rather generally only treats 'moderate' and 'absolute'. The Pseudo-James Capelli sits somewhere between those two. The text opens with a description of 'de divisione heresum catharorum qualiter, de principiis rerum inter se dissentientes garriunt tractaturi', and in fact in its earlier parts it differentiates between absolute and moderate Catharism in the structure of its chapters. That structure falls away, but throughout there are occasional remarks that indicate an awareness of those divisions on the part of the author and, to some extent, demonstrate a framework dependent on the division of the sect. where he tells us for example that 'in hoc vero omnes consentiunt', that 'alii autem dissentientes a predictis credunt', or that 'diverse inter eos sunt opiniones'.[117] It is possible to see many of the principal treatises of our period as being structured to a greater or lesser degree around the internal divisions, or differentiations of their subject.[118]

Those internal differentiations run along purely doctrinal lines, as has already been described, a detail reinforced by the fact that for each faction, the customs and rituals that are described remain almost exactly the same, and are common to all the different groups, as indeed are the hierarchical structures. The division that we are dealing with here seems different from that which was at work in the topos of division and unity as used in those texts examined earlier. Of course, the level of detail is much greater, as would be expected, but more than that, it seems to be a matter for information only, drawn from experiential knowledge and observation. Division as a topos, however, is a two-sided thing which deals with on the one hand a plurality of sects and the division between them, and on the other the relative unity between them when facing the Roman church. It is also often more explicitly concerned with the character of the heretics than with the basis of division.

It is interesting to notice here that where that former construct of division occurs, it tends to be in texts that originate in the north of Italy. The prevalence of heresy in that region is almost a commonplace in non-Italian texts, in the writings of

---

[117] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.i, xxvii, xxxviii, xxviii.
[118] P. Biller, in work not yet published.

Stephen of Bourbon, noted above, of Jacques de Vitry, and of the Chronicler of the Franciscan Order, Jordan of Giano.[119] As the Novice comments to Caesarius in the *Dialogus miraculorum*, he has heard that there are many heretics in Lombardy, to which the monk replies, yes, no wonder, when they have teachers in every town, who openly read the Scriptures and perversely expound them.[120] Within the Italian texts, the complexity of that situation is fully revealed. Nearly all the *Summae auctoritatum* for example derive from south France or north Spain, and have, so far as it can be distinguished, a fairly undifferentiated picture. The only one for which this is not true is the *Brevis summula*, the one among those texts that is certainly Italian in origin, and which is, in part, quite consciously structured in terms of division, due to its inclusion of a list that catalogues the different articles by Cathar church.

The third part of Douais' edition of the *Brevis summula*, which Wakefield and Evans believe to have been written by the same author as the refutation, and which was reproduced more frequently than the other parts of the work, represents this division in its list of the different Cathar errors, by placing the letters A, B or C beside each article, to indicate which of the groups adheres to each belief.[121] All this proceeds with no intrusion or comment from the author. Although the *Brevis summula* is a composite work, the texts that the compiler chose to include in his Bible similarly define the Cathars and the divisions between the various groups in purely doctrinal terms; the Albigenses (sic), Bagnolenses, and Concorrezenses are different from each other because they believe different things, and because they have inherited their belief from different sources, the Albigenses from 'Brugutia' (Drugunthia), and the latter two from 'Sclavenia et ...Bulgaria'.[122]

What is also certainly worth noting is that while these Italian texts are immersed in an idea of heresy as an internally divided entity, none, save Salvo, make a polemical point of this fact. While it is difficult to make a very wide comparison on this point, as most of the texts in which the topos or descriptions occur come either from one place or the other – there is very little comparative

---

[119] J.F. Hinnebusch, *The Historia occidentalis of Jacques de Vitry. A Critical Edition* (Fribourg, 1972), pp.144-46; R.B.C. Huygens, *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/70-1240), évêque de St.-Jean-d'Acre* (Leiden, 1960), Letter 1.34-54, pp.72-73; *The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany*, Eng. trans. E. Gurney Salter (London, 1926), p.134.
[120] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, p.308.
[121] *Brevis summula*, pp.130-33.
[122] *Brevis summula*, pp.121-23.

polemic from France, for example – the inquisitor's handbooks might be helpful here. Anselm and Raniero employ no invective on the basis of division, or indeed, on very much at all, despite the fact that their description of the Cathar churches places them on much firmer ground than the Anonymous of Passau's account of the Waldensians, which includes no information on the trans-alpine schism in the movement, even the brief account in Raniero's text having been apparently removed.[123] The Pseudo-David of Augsburg similarly makes no point of criticizing the internal division of the Waldensians, although there are signs that the author was well aware of those divisions, in remarks such as: 'hoc autem quidam dicunt...alii autem'.[124]

There are then several connected and overlapping ideas about heresy and number, some to do with uniformity, some with division, and between them a fluctuating idea of heresy as either singular or plural in nature. The duality of the fox imagery represents quite neatly the different ideas of heresy at work, though they are not always at work in the same places. The unity of heretics that we saw in Alain's work at the beginning of the section in fact is relatively uncommon in our texts. Though the idea is operating in the background in several places, and heretics not only appear to be regarded in a broad sense as a part of a wider evil, but are also represented as united against the church in the topos of the foxes, the unity we see as part of that topos is not the unity of doctrine that Alain describes. Moreover, rather than moving away from their inherited views of heretics and heretical sects, these authors, though using patristic material less as a source for information, still use the ideas of heresy they contain in a more constructive way.

Far more common in our sources, where there is uniformity, is an idea of heretics as a homogenous mass precisely because connection with heretical doctrine has in one way or another been effectively removed from the construct of number. That homogeneity of different sects comes either a result of the tightening of Catholic legislation, or as the by-product of an ulterior didactic purpose, but it does not exclude the actual plurality of sects, and the importance of division in those

---

[123] Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*, pp.323-24. Anonymous of Passau nonetheless mentions connection with Lombardy, Anonymous of Passau, p.266.
[124] Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1779.

texts that deal with error, most obviously the polemics and the manuals, means that they do not present a singular view either. Plurality as a commonplace of the idea of heresy is not superseded, but it is manipulated. Connected to the unity of the church as mark of truth, division can function as a mark of error, but can also form part of the structure of the texts in question. Overall, it is this plural and divided image that is the more prevalent idea of heresy itself; homogeneity is more to do with the position of the church toward it.

It will have become clear that the various parts of this idea of number are not evenly spread across all our material. Internal division of the sect in question is central to and informs the structure of some our texts, namely, the *Brevis summula*, two of four inquisition handbooks, and the polemics, with the exception of the *Disputatio*, all of which are Italian texts. Our other sources, the legal material, inquisition documents, and most of the exemplary and hagiographical texts, treat any division as invective, and heresy in general as homogenous. Unlike the division of heresy presented by the former group, division as a flaw is to do with the characterization of heretics, and not the description of the sect or the error. Where there is unity, or uniformity, whether it is rhetorical or legal, it is not connected to or describing heretical doctrine. The idea that heresy should be plural though appears to operate behind all of the texts.

One very obvious source of homogeneity that we have not so far considered, but which must be addressed before we go any further, is what has been called by Markus, in the context of the early church, that 'ancient but inveterate habit of referring to [different sects and errors] by the blanket term "heresy"'.[125] In our period, that habit is complicated by the fact that heresy and heretic are often used not only in a general way, but also in specific reference, especially in the south of France, to the Cathars in particular. So far, though, as we stated in the introduction, we have considered 'heresy' to include whatever the sources label as such. For the most part, where a text has been addressed toward a particular sect, that heresy has usually meant the Cathars, although there is as we have seen, a great deal of differentiation even within that group. However, that label of heresy, and of heretic, has a general use as well, and is applied throughout our material, whether in

---

[125] R.A. Markus, 'The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church', in E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, volume One, The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries* (London, 1980), 1-15, p.5.

reference to a specific individual or error, or to a more nebulous and incidental evil, and it is to that general application that we look now, and to what consistencies or patterns there may be in the use of these most basic terms.

III – Heresy and the Heretic

So we turn now in the last instance to consider the construct at its broadest level, the notion of heresy itself, as it runs through our texts. Throughout the discussions of rhetoric and plurality, we have so far taken for granted the meaning of the terms 'heresy' and 'heretic' as they are applied by our various authors, but the precise nature of that meaning, and indeed the boundary between the two has not always been easy to grasp firmly. Highlighted also during the course of the earlier chapters, that boundary has consistently been a point of tension in the representations of heresy in those treatments of the subject that form our primary material. In fact, though both terms are always present in some form, the majority of the material in these texts is directed, at least in the first instance, at the heretic. In other words, the construct of 'heresy' in a broad sense, the subject that these anti-heretical texts address, is most often composed of, or concentrated upon, the figure of the heretic. The term 'figure' is not used here in any specific rhetorical sense, or with any intention of discussing figural ideas as such, but merely as a convenient word to denote the heretic as individual as a distinct construct.

The themes and topoi used in our sources demonstrate the predominance of the figure quite clearly. Animal imagery, one of the most prominent aspects of the construction, though perhaps not the most prevalent, is concerned exactly with the characterization of that figure. Foxes, wolves, snakes and other assorted nasties are employed in order to say something about the nature of the heretic, and more often than not, that something has very little to do with error, and everything to do with describing aspects of the heretic that are not directly to do with the heresy itself: cunning, secrecy, deception. The exception to this is perhaps the snake, which, used to indicate corruption and poison, carries with it the idea, usually but not always implicit, that the poison is equivalent to heresy. The wider themes that can govern the construction of heresy in these texts, and of which the animal imagery

forms an illustrative part, again pertain specifically to heretics. Internal or mutual division, false appearance and deception, sophistry, the occasional bit of moral depravity, these are all traits of the individual, and are to do with moral condition and personal qualities. Stephen of Bourbon's long list of heretical qualities has almost nothing to say about their erroneous beliefs. As we might expect, where such rhetorically amplified elements are present, they are concerned with invective, and with the denigration of heretics. Even where such elements are absent however, the larger part of the material that makes up the substance of these texts, with the exception of the polemics and the *Summae auctoritatum*, is still concerned for the most part to convey information and discussion about heretics, as indeed the titles of most of these works announce.

The 'figure' of the heretic has appeared throughout our previous analyses in terms of how each text uses the word *hereticus*, or various equivalents, such as individual sect names. At this point, then, and before going on to consider the function and use of the figure itself, we can take a closer look at what our texts are actually referring to when they use this term. Raymond of Peñafort's Tarragona constitutions offer the most succinct definition of the heretic in our period. As we saw earlier, the 1242 council states simply that 'heretici sint qui in suo errore perdurant'. Though very brief, this short definition represents a crystallization of previous legal and theological ideas of the heretic, in particular, those ideas that make up the section of the *Decretum* that is concerned with definition. In his earlier work, the *Summa de poenitentia*, Raymond presented a four-fold definition of the heretic: those who err in the faith, following or inventing new opinions, who understand the Scripture in a way different to that taught by the Holy Spirit, who are divided from the sacrament and communion of the church, and who are perverters of those sacraments, can all be called heretics. All of these criteria are drawn from the *Decretum*, though only the first two are derived from the twenty-fourth *causa*, the principal discussion of heresy in the *Decretum*. The second two definitions, from the fourth and first *causae* respectively, are about division and the Christian community, an emphasis that is not present in the twenty-fourth *causa*'s treatment of 'qui sint heretici', though the idea is implicit in places. The principal themes of

the definitions given in this part of the *Decretum* are rather of error, and of obstinacy.[126]

Heresy, says Jerome, means choice, and heretics can therefore be defined as those who choose a teaching that seems better to them: 'quicumque igitur aliter scripturam intelligit, quam sensus Spiritus sancti flagitat...hereticus appelari potest'. Further, according to Augustine, heretics are those who, for the sake of temporal gain and recognition, 'falsas ac novas oppiniones vel gignit, vel sequitur'.[127] These two opinions are among the opening canons of the twenty-fourth causa's definitions, and will be immediately recognizable as those used by Raymond in his *Summa*. After this view of heretics as defined by their error, there is now in the *Decretum* a series of canons that further define the heretic in terms of obedience and obstinacy.

Obstinacy as a defining characteristic of the heretic is drawn ultimately from Paul's letter to Titus, where the Apostle counsels that 'haereticum hominem post unam et secundam correptionem devita, sciens quia subversus est'.[128] Quoting this passage, Augustine warns that those who are seduced by others cannot be considered as heretics, a sentiment surely also at work in the consultation of Gui Foulques, and wherever there is a concern with the seduction of the simple, prominent in the Pseudo-David for example, or the work of Stephen of Bourbon and the *legendae* of St. Dominic. Augustine then advises that care be taken not to convict those who do not defend their error, who 'nulla pertinaci animositate defendunt', and who are 'corrigi parati'. The thirteenth-century gloss to the *Decretum* further emphasizes the distinction between heretic and non-heretic on the grounds of obstinacy, by taking the idea to its logical conclusion, that 'qui in errorem cadunt, nec volunt corrigi: sunt inter hereticos deputandi'.[129]

Augustine's definition is repeated more forcefully in canon thirty-one. 'Qui in ecclesia Christi morbidum aliquid prauumque sapiunt, si correcti, ut sanum rectumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, suaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensare persistunt, heretici sunt.' The emphasis on obstinacy, or the knowing defence of error, in both of these extracts from Augustine

---

[126] See also above, p.123, n.75.
[127] C.24 q.3 c.27; C.24 q.3 c.28, Friedberg, vol.1, fols.997-98.
[128] Titus, III.10.
[129] C.24 q.3 c.29, Friedberg, vol.1, col.998; *Decretum divi Gratiani, totius propemodum iuris canonici compendium, summorum que pontificum decreta atque praeiudicia, una cum variis scribentium Glossis et expositionibus* (Lyons, 1560), col.1403.

is then further reinforced by a quotation from pope Urban, in which anyone who defends his own error is damned, and who also defends the error of others is condemned not only as a master of errors and a heretic, but as a heresiarch.[130] In an echo of Jerome's earlier definition of heresy, a slightly different aspect of obstinacy is introduced into the *Decretum* with a canon from pope Leo, about those masters of iniquity who condemn the teaching of truth, rejecting the wisdom of the church Fathers and following instead their own learning and interpretations. This is again reinforced by another canon, again from Jerome, which demonstrates that heretics overstep the bounds of the Fathers in their oppression of the clergy by means of sophisms and dialectical arts.[131]

Overall then, the definition of heretic given by the *Decretum*, in its principal section on heresy, revolves around two aspects. If a heretic is defined in the first place by error, an error that is moreover nearly always doctrinal or intellectual in its nature, then in the second place a heretic is also characterized by obstinacy, by an erroneous act of will. The common perspective that emerges from the patristic tradition, from which so much of the *Decretum* is drawn, places an emphasis on the 'religio-moral' aspect of heresy, and a 'corporate divisive stance'.[132] That latter element is indeed present elsewhere in the *Decretum,* as witnessed by Raymond's synopsis in the *Summa de poenitentia*, and certainly the idea of heretics as divided from the body of the church appears in a few places throughout our sources. However, the twenty-fourth *causa*, the source for so much of our legal material, presents a heretic that, though defined firmly in terms of belief, is identified primarily by obstinacy in that belief and a lack of obedience to the authority of the church's teaching and commands.

The second of these two characteristics is perhaps given more weight than the first by the greater number of canons that outline this criterion, as described in the previous paragraphs. In fact, the preponderance of canons dealing with obstinacy is a result of the addition in the second recension of several extracts that reinforce the significance of this aspect for the nature of the heretic. In its original form, the last part of question three consisted of canons twenty-six to twenty-nine and canon thirty-nine; that is, three definitions of heresy and of the heretic, from Jerome and

---

[130] C.24 q.3 c.31, C.24 q.3 c.32, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.998-99.
[131] C.24 q.3 c.30, C.24 q.3 c.33, Friedberg, vol.1, cols.998-99.
[132] *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* (15 vols., New York, 1967-79), vol.6, p.1063.

Augustine, which centre on error, and a further definition from Augustine, of heretics as obstinate. Thirty-nine is the extract from Isidore that we have spoken about elsewhere. To this, as we noted in chapter three, the five other canons that deal with obstinacy were added, an emphasis apparently further underlined by the attitude of the gloss.[133] Again, it is worth juxtaposing this development between the first and second recensions of the *Decretum* with 'reality', that is to say, with possible changes in the perception of the danger of contemporary heresy during these middle years of the twelfth century.

All of these elements form the view of the heretic that Tarragona condenses into the neat formula that makes heretics 'those that are obstinate in their error', and in one or both of its parts this model seems to hold throughout our body of texts. The other of our influential consultations, that by Gui Foulques, does not define the heretic explicitly as the Tarragona constitutions do, and instead spends its time outlining the boundaries of the different types of follower. Nevertheless, underlying the definitions of the lesser categories is the idea that defines the heretic in terms of error. The *credentes* are, as we saw both here and indeed in all the legal texts, believers of the heretics' errors. It is this proximity to error that makes the *credens* liable to be judged as a heretic, if it can be shown that their belief was accompanied by a conscious choice and understanding. And if error is present, so is the heretic's other defining trait; Foulques' description of *defensores*, as we have seen, draws a careful distinction between the practical defence of another person, that is, the protection of heretics from the authorities, and the theoretical defence of error. It is only in the latter, deliberate defence of error that heretics or heresiarchs are made, as they are in the words of Urban, quoted above.[134]

The same definitions inform the use of the term in nearly all the other texts that we have looked at. Chapter two of the Anonymous of Passau treatise attempts to say, briefly, 'quis sit hereticus'. The few lines that the compiler includes here are a contraction of the four criteria named by Raymond of Peñafort in his *Summa poenitentia*, a text that is also used in other parts of this collection. The Anonymous of Passau's chapter says first that a heretic is one 'qui falsam opinionem gignit, ut

---

[133] Of the canons of question three, parts four and five, which are the main treatment of heresy, constituted by canons 26-40, 26-33 are about the definition of heresy, 34-38, concern the behaviour of the orthodox in relation to heretics, 39 is Isidore, and 40 is from Augustine on why there should be heresy. See Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum ,Appendix, pp.218-20; p.34f. See also above, cap.3, p.124, n.79.

[134] Questions 9 and 12, Foulques, *Consilium*, pp.196-97, 199-200. See also cap.4, p.139, n.26.

Arrius. Item, qui imitatur haeresiarcham, ut Arriani', two statements that reflect Augustine's definition, but as mediated by Raymond, who is responsible for the introduction of the examples of Arius and his followers as illustration. The Anonymous of Passau says next that a heretic is one who understands Scripture wrongly, though not necessarily one who has receded from the communion or sacrament of the church. That statement conflates Raymond's second and third criteria, and his fourth, 'perversor sacramentorum; ut symoniacus' is rendered by the Anonymous of Passau as 'sacramentorum perversor, ut Simon Magus'.[135] Again a view of the heretic that depends on the *Decretum* definitions, though here at one remove, and including, as Raymond did, some extra, sacramental elements.

Similarly, 'heretic' is applied throughout the polemical and edifying texts to those figures that hold or expound error, whether in debate or in sermon. The *heretici* to whom Peter Martyr is related, his uncle and father, are those who try, 'per auctoritates', to prove heretical doctrine.[136] The Pseudo-James Capelli, always obliging with a colourful phrase, speaks of his subject in terms of their error, that is, as defined in direct contrast to specific articles of faith: 'patet igitur quod ihesus christus carnem assumpsit et omnes qui negant heretici sunt et seductores', and 'ergo omnes qui prohibent nubere a fide divisi sunt'. Heretics are further characterized by the same author in terms of their obduracy in the face of proofs both ecclesiastical and divine. 'O tenebrosa hereticorum perfidia et voluntaria obstinatio', laments the Pseudo-James, 'hic pervicacia erroris irretitus a vera fide exorbitas'.[137] We have seen that the same principles apply in the legal sources and in the documents produced by inquisition, that the term 'heretic' applies to those who are distinguished by error from the rest of their followers, though it is also used to designate the obdurate from the penitent; for this reason, relapses, that is, individuals who return to their belief or their behaviour after having been warned and made aware of their error, again implying a consciously made and therefore obstinate choice, are to be considered and judged 'as heretics'. All our texts appear to adhere to the same or similar ideas of what a heretic is, enshrined in the definitions given by the *Decretum*.

---

[135] Anonymous of Passau, p.263.
[136] *Vitae fratrum*, p.236.
[137] Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*, pp.cxxi, clxxvi, cxxiii, cxxx. Looking at the legendae of St. Dominic, there is actually very little reference to error at all, most of the time heretics are distinguished by false appearance, not by their connection to heretical error.

It is the heretic, therefore, that for the most part forms the initial focus of our texts, a heretic that all our authors seem to understand as defined by a particular and common idea. Used in the same sense, to indicate an individual figure or group of figures connected directly to error, it is this connection that determines the role played by the heretic in each of these texts. For while the heretic figure is in most cases the most immediate subject of the texts, it is not always, in fact relatively rarely, the ultimate target or subject matter. Instead, the heretic has a variety of functions, though these are nevertheless similar in their essential nature.

If we look first at those texts in which the figure has a very limited presence, that is the polemical treatises, and the *Summae auctoritatum*, we see a figure reduced to little more than a mouthpiece. As we saw, these types of text are similar in the way that they approach heresy, and construct their representation of heresy, as an exchange, a debate, whether written or oral; where a 'heretic' appears, it is as a much reduced figure, with little function beyond a token holder of the error under discussion. At the other end of the scale, the legal texts and the records of inquisition appear to present a more concrete version of the figure, not least as a result of the greater number of 'real-life' heretics they include. For the most part though, because the error is not theological but an error of association with heretics committed by others, even in the inquisition records the 'heretic' is actually not much more than the locus of error in the majority of depositions, which are concerned with the lesser grades of follower.

The representation used by the edifying literature is perhaps the most pronounced instance in which the heretic's function is to provide a vehicle for other ideas. What we find is a picture of heretics that places them most often in a context of argument and debate. The heretic is still defined by association with error, though in a much less detailed way, and the errors are almost never themselves related. The defective and wicked moral condition of the figure that results from this association with error means however that the heretic functions as a useful vehicle for the moral of an *exemplum*, or of an edifying tale of mendicant triumphs over evil. The latter usage of course also depends to some degree on a certain level of assumed background familiarity with heretics as a part of the contemporary social reality, a similar background hum of heretical presence to that which also comes through in the inquisition depositions about the movements and networks of heretics.

Though the function of the figure in each case is different, the essential role of the heretic seems to be as a medium or focus for other ends, and for another set of ideas that underlie the heretic's status as a heretic, namely, the idea of heresy. If we look to the universal condemnation of all heretics issued by the fourth Lateran council, we see that the heretics themselves were condemned by means of their association with error, as outlined by the council's first canon, which was directed against heresy rather than against heretics. Of course, the fact that the heretic and heresy are related ideas is an obvious point, but it is the mechanics of this relationship that we want to look at here, and the exact nature of each of the components. The two ideas of heresy and heretic cannot be completely untangled, but they can perhaps be seen to have somewhat independent constructions. We will turn now, given the prominence of 'error' in the definitions that we have examined so far, to look more closely at the heresy itself, and what it means.

It is possible to discern two distinct notions of 'heresy' in our sources, two different but nonetheless connected uses of the term, one theological, and one legal. Evident most obviously in the polemical texts, and the *Summae auctoritatum*, but also perhaps in the edifying literature, and in a few places in the ecumenical legislative material, the first of these two notions would seem to use the term heresy to refer to a heresy comprised of errors and doctrine. On the other hand, much of the legal material, and certainly most of the inquisition registers, appear to use the term to signify a variety of criminal involvement in the affairs of heretics. We will look at both of these, beginning with the latter, legal sense of the term, before trying to place them side by side.

As we have already seen, the notion of heresy that we find in the practical legal sources for heresy, that is, the consultations, and the depositions and sentences of inquisitions, as well as much of the material emanating from the lesser, regional councils, is one of actions. A series of different grades of guilt, ranging from believer to general supporter, are all named and defined in terms of the actions that they involve, actions that are indicative of an interior condition. The focus on actions produces in interrogation questions that demand information on the facts and figures of heretical behaviour, though it is also fair to say that the need for such information in turn reinforces the focus on actions. In addition to this, it was a

standard practice of inquisition to produce question lists and formulas from pre-existing models. The reflexive nature of, and interaction between, the inquisition material, legal consultations, and the legislation of successive regional councils and papal letters produced a set of markers, or token behaviours that could be used to ascertain the level of involvement and therefore also the degree of guilt.

Of course these markers contain elements of heretical ritual, but these are worked into the system to produce a greater or lesser grade of guilt. If a deponent has 'adored' heretics, or kneeled before them, or said 'bless', all markers taken directly from the Cathar ritual greeting, or has eaten blessed bread with them, which would indicate involvement in a Waldensian ritual meal, an answer in the affirmative to any of these questions will produce a more serious charge than simply meeting with heretics. 'Heresy' here, when used in the context of this system, would appear to refer to any involvement in the activities that constitute that system, the crime of heresy. The point here is that the system of proofs is self-generated, established and reinforced within the context of repression, a coherent system of actions, built from the interaction of legislation and inquisition texts. The continuing emphasis on knowledge in the grades of guilt, on whether or not a deed is done knowingly makes intention more significant in this system than belief. The development in canon law of the idea of culpability, in which guilt was seen to lie principally in the attitude and will of the individual, is surely at work here.[138] At the same time, in some way that emphasis also reflects the principal that heresy must be obstinate, and makes heresy an error of will as well as of belief.

If the legal and inquisition texts use the term 'heresy' to refer to an idea of heresy as a crime, several of the texts for edification, and in particular the *Summae auctoritatum* and polemics, appear to mean something different by the term: a rather more predictable sense of theological error. More predictable, that is, in the sense that the idea of heresy as an error of belief is at first sight the more obvious one, especially given the prominence of error in the definitions that we have seen so far in the *Decretum* and elsewhere. The term 'heresy' had carried with it that sense of unorthodox thought or belief at least since the time of the early church, but within this use there were nonetheless differences in the extent to which that error was presented as theological or doctrinal in nature, or in the level of emphasis given

---

[138] Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (London and New York, 1995), pp.171-72.

to that doctrinal nature. That is to say, the degree to which heresy was perceived as a predominantly doctrinal phenomenon varied over time. In our period, there are signs of an upswing in this perception, in line in fact with wider developments, which underlie the notably doctrinal representation in our non-legal texts.

At the opening of the thirteenth century, growing concerns over the connections between speculative philosophy and heresy had led the University of Paris to prohibit, in 1210, the use of Aristotle's natural works. It was similarly Peter the Chanter's belief that rash questions, and the introduction of logical method into the study of theology would result in heresy.[139] The association between heresy and incautious intellectual inquiry continues in some places in our sources. In the earlier work of Caesarius of Heisterbach, the monk warns his novice of precisely those dangers of intellectual curiosity, in recounting the story of those heretics who provoked the Paris ban on Aristotle, the Amalricians. Less specific, but equally telling, Caesarius also describes the learning of heretics in terms that suggest disputative behaviour and scholastic learning: of the prevalence of heretics in Lombardy, he says 'habent enim suos magistros in diversis civitatibus, aperte legentes, et sacram paginam perverse exponentes'. A group of Catholic theologians go to visit 'scholas cuiusdam heresiarchae'.[140] The connection can also be found in the later compilation of the Anonymous of Passau, and in all the accusations of heretical sophistry that are made throughout the anti-heretical corpus. Even Moneta of Cremona has enough reservations about some points of Aristotelian thought to include a short section on the errors they contain at the end of his anti-heretical treatise. However, the new wave of scholars at Paris, unconnected with the previously dominant circle of Peter the Chanter, began during the first decades of the thirteenth century to move towards a view of heresy, and of the response of the church to it that led Guillaume d'Auxerre to advocate the use of dialectic specifically to combat heresy.[141] The establishment of the University of Toulouse was similarly intended to combat the problem of heresy on an intellectual level.[142]

Some insight into the general conception of heresy within the currents of thirteenth-century theological thought can be gained from Peter Lombard's

---

[139] J.W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: the Social Views of Peter the Chanter & his Circle* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970), vol.1, p.99.
[140] Caesarius, *Dialogus*, pp.307-309, Scott and Bland, pp.352-53.
[141] Baldwin, *Masters, princes, and merchants*, vol.1, p.107, Biller, 'Northern Cathars', p.27.
[142] Baldwin, *Masters, princes, and merchants*, vol.1, p.116.

Sentences, or *Libri IV sententiarum*, a highly structured and accessible collection of extracts compiled for the use of theologians in the 1150s, which became the standard textbook of a theological education from the 1220s onwards.[143] In the same mode as other mid-twelfth century texts emerging from the growing trend toward dialectic argument, such as the *Sic et non* and of course the *Decretum*, Peter's text proceeds by the juxtaposition and resolution of contradictions in thought. The text's author had of course himself narrowly escaped a charge of heresy over his Trinitarian doctrine, but had been defended at the fourth Lateran council against Joachim of Fiore, who was in turn branded a heretic in the second canon of the council. After this endorsement, the *Sentences*' orthodoxy was assured, and once Alexander of Hales had begun lecturing on the text a decade later, the text, and the principles contained within it, began to be diffused throughout the academic community.

Heresy appears to feature quite prominently in the prologue to the work, if we understand the long quotation from Hilary that makes up the third paragraph to refer to heretics. Certainly the now familiar theme of false piety and the language of that topos are at work in phrases such as 'ipsamque simulatam pietatem omni verborum mendacio impiam reddunt, falsae doctrinae institutis fidei sanctitatem corrumpere molientes', and in another, this time featuring the serpent image, that 'per domenicae fidei sinceram professionem, viperae doctrinae fraudulentiam prodidimus'. For the most part, though, there is little actual treatment of heretics in the body of the text itself. Many of the distinctions in which they are involved concern the validity of their actions in regard to the church, and to sacramental theology, the question of whether it is possible to rebaptize after a heretical baptism, for example, or the discussion of heretical ordinations that constitutes the first chapter of the fourth book's twenty-fifth distinction, which is about heretical ordinations.[144] The Lombard exploits anti-heretical texts for information and quotations, and makes the occasional reference to heretical doctrine in the course of discussions of the minutiae of the Catholic faith, but the only real discussion of heretics as heretics comes relatively late in the text.

---

[143] For a useful summary of the context and production of this text, see P. Biller, *The Measure of Multitude: Population in Medieval Thought* (Oxford, 2000), pp.29-31.

[144] Lombard, *Sententiae*, 4.6.2, vol.II, pp.268-70; 4.25.1, vol.II, pp.408-13. Compare to Guillaume d'Auxerre's very similar chapter on same subject, *Summa aurea*, ed J. Ribailler, Spicilegium Bonaventuriarum (4 vols. in 6, Paris & Grottaferrata, 1980-87), lib.IV, tract.XVI, cap.iv, vol.4, pp.376-79.

The question 'Quid faciat hereticum et quid sit hereticus' arises in the thirteenth distinction of the fourth book, and is answered with two quotations. The first, from Hilary, makes heresy a crime by virtue of incorrect understanding: 'de intelligentia enim haeresis, non de Scriptura est; et sensus, non sermo fit crimen', and again, 'intelligentiae sensus in crimine est'. The other quotation will seem very familiar; it is the same definition by Augustine, of the heretic as one who invents or follows false and new opinions, that is used by Gratian in the twenty-fourth *causa* of the *Decretum*, though here of course quoted not from the *Decretum*, but from Augustine's original text. The idea of heretics contained within that quotation must, by our period, have become firmly ingrained by virtue of its presence in both the standard legal and theological text books of the time.[145] The definitions here though, and more important, the majority of Peter's treatment, are all about interpretation; increasingly prominent in the material to which scholars were now exposed was therefore a discussion of heresy and heretics that had an abstract presentation, of a doctrinal heresy drawn from texts and developed through argument.

By the time that Aquinas had come to address heresy in the middle of the thirteenth century, as part of his long treatise against the enemies of the church, the *Summa contra gentiles*, the idea of heresy as an interpretative error had become firmly entrenched. Aquinas, we saw, considered it possible to counter heretics on a textual basis because, like the Jews, they shared a common text with the Catholic church in the New Testament. Aquinas' approach in this text is similar to that of the fourth Lateran council in some respects, in that he first defines the 'truth', and then outlines all other opinions as wrong by definition, as it were, in contrast to the Catholic reading. This means that where there is an overlap in understanding, the church is able to agree with some heretics, whilst standing against others, although their continuing condition as heretics might suggest that there is more to their status than error.[146] Aquinas distinguishes between heretics and Catholics in terms of attempted understanding on the one hand, and diligent reading on the other. The emphasis is placed firmly on interpretation, even more so where authorities used by

---

[145] Lombard, *Sententiae*, 4.13.2, vol.II, pp.314-315. Note also last line of previous cap, 'qui enim his [points of doctrine] contradicit, haereticus iudicatur'.
[146] Aquinas, *SCG*, e.g.1.20, vol.I p.106; 4.7, vol.IV.i, p.55.

Arius, Sabellius and Plotinus are reinterpreted in scholastic mode, in order to demonstrate that the authorities are sound, and only the interpretation wrong.

The significance of this generally literate and dialectic approach in a more narrowly defined anti-heretical context becomes clear when our polemical texts are considered next to those of the preceding period. The Catholic response to heresy moves away from what Iogna-Prat describes as the characteristically monastic, imprecatory approach of the twelfth century, in which the usual method, with the exception of Peter the Venerable's *Contra Petrobrusianos*, had been to attack the heretics themselves, particularly on the basis of moral condition and personality, rather than to address the error in much detail at all.[147] By the mid-thirteenth century, this approach has been abandoned, and the idea of heretics as *illitterati* no longer seems to have any currency in the new polemic, where the discussion of interpretative error has taken the place of invective and more rhetorical constructs as the location of the polemical attack. In this light, Iogna-Prat's assertion that the polemical approach represented by Peter the Venerable's more argumentative treatise 'had no literary progeny' appears invalid, even if the thirteenth-century polemics were not its direct textual descendants.[148]

The interpretative emphasis relies in large part on the structure of these texts, which are largely built within frameworks of exchange and debate, whether designed for or constructed as verbal exchange, or answering the presented heretical points in an academic and systematic fashion. This treatment is important in as much as heresy is now something that is engaged with on a doctrinal level, as witnessed by the emphasis placed on correct interpretation. The move to interpretation can itself be seen to reflect the *Decretum* definitions of heresy as incorrect understanding of the Scriptures, as well as the increasingly intellectual construction of heresy and the move to article based doctrine. 'Heresy', in this context, means a coherent system of thought, a series of articles of belief, at least in part as a result of the papal policy outlined in particular by Innocent III and the fourth Lateran council, which defines heresy in terms of doctrine, and doctrine in terms of articles of faith.

While the scholastic method with which our polemicists engage with their subject in itself constructs that subject as an intellectual and doctrinal phenomenon,

---

[147] On the approach taken by the *Contra Petrobrusianos* see above, p.30, n.45.
[148] Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*, p.255.

that construct appears to derive equally as much from the sources used by the polemics and various *summae*. Drawn from heretical texts, as well as from debate and conversation with heretics, the heresy that these texts refer to, the system of thought, is apparently not of the texts' making, but of their sources. We have seen in an earlier chapter that heretics, particularly the Cathars, were increasingly literate, and were moreover entirely capable of using and producing academic texts. We can see heretics using academic texts in various places, use of the *Decretum* and of the *Ordinary Gloss* by the Cathars in the *Disputatio*, for example, use of the *Decretum* again by the Waldensians in the Pseudo-David of Augsburg.[149] Aquinas sees no difficulty in locating the philosophical ideas of Plato in the doctrine of the Cathars: 'asserunt cum Platone, et eas de corpore ad corpus transire'.[150]

So, heresy in these texts means a coherent system of belief, and it is a system apparently drawn from heretical sources. While the thirteenth-century polemics stand in contrast to their predecessors, it is also important to remember that the heresy to which they were responding also stood in contrast to that which had gone before; error, or doctrine, was much less central to the anti-establishment heresies of the twelfth century.[151] While heresy as error had always been present in some form, however small, in our sources it is at the forefront, and has become more doctrinal in its form. In some cases, especially that of Catharism, that doctrine is of a higher, theological nature. More than this, heresy has come to be constructed as, and indeed received as, a coherent and systematic doctrine. The impulse to treat heresy as an intellectual phenomenon and its repression as an intellectual exercise stems from a wider development of scholastic thought and practice, while that trend at the same time accounts for the character of the heretical texts themselves.

The texts appear then, to present two different but connected ideas of heresy, and it does seem legitimate to read them in this way; Gui Foulques, as we saw, drew

---

[149] Use of the *Decretum*, *Disputatio*, p.61; of *Ordinary gloss*, an apparent reference to a heretical gloss in made by the Catholic, p.46, cited by Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.100, is corrected to 'bursa' by Hoécker, who suggests an oral rather than textual transmission. Cathar use of the Gloss is however, according to the arguments of Hamilton, visible elsewhere in the text, S. Hamilton, 'The Virgin Mary in Cathar Thought', *JEH*, vol.56.i (2005), 24-49, pp.39-41, 48; Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*, col.1780. Other possible use of the Ordinary Gloss by Cathars in Moneta, Moneta, *Adversos catharos*, p.279, see Paolini, 'Italian Catharism', p.98.

[150] Aquinas, *SCG*, 1.2, vol.I.i, p.61; 2.83, vol.II.i, p.272.

[151] J. Nelson, 'Society, Theodicy and the Origins of Heresy: Towards a Reassessment of the Medieval Evidence', in D. Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Studies in Church History, 9 (1972), 65-77, p.74.

a distinction between a relationship to the figure and to error in his definition of the *defensores*. Certainly there is some precedent for seeing heresy as either act or belief, if we look to the example of simony. Equated with heresy by some on the basis of belief, others saw simony as heresy by the nature of the act of separation from the church.[152] The dual nature of simony here is also reflected in the definition given by Jerome, reproduced in the *Decretum*, which saw simony as separation, heresy as error, but which also conceded that separation from the church also implied an error of belief in itself. To some degree though, the two ideas represent perhaps more closely the two constituent parts of the definition that we began with: if heresy is an error that is defended, then the consciously undertaken actions that make up the 'legal' idea of heresy can be seen as addressing that defence, and removing or punishing the implied disobedience. Nowhere does that legal notion of heresy address or look for the error that is being defended; error is dealt with elsewhere, but it is still an integral part of the same idea. A construction of heresy as error, taken from texts, and from post-conversion or imprisoned heretics, is applied not in legal repression, but in debate. It is significant that most of the sources that deal with error come out of a northern Italian context, a place where that two pronged attack on heresy, in debate and preaching as well as repression, would be necessary due to difficulties of conducting inquisitions within this region.

What is important is the fact that both of these ideas are present at the vanguard of repression of heresy, in the minds of the inquisitors, many of whom of course produced the polemics and treatises that treat heresy as error, but nonetheless carry out their office in the application of the idea of heresy as a crime. Inquisitor's manuals, handbooks, and the collections of texts that they used contain samples of nearly all our material; not only formulae and consultations that inform the inquisitor about the application of the series of markers of guilt that make up the crime of heresy, but also detailed information on the errors and customs of the different sects, even the different factions of each sect, as well as extracts from other useful informative texts, such as the *De heresi* section of Stephen of Bourbon's work, and parts of polemical treatises.

---

[152] J. Gilchrist, '*Simoniaca haeresis* and the Problem of Orders from Leo IX to Gratian', in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law* (1965), 209-235, repr. in *Canon Law in the Age of Reform, 11th-12th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1993), p.217ff.

One noticeable gap between the two ideas that is worth mentioning briefly is the level of differentiation between different heresies. While the polemics and manuals and *Summae auctoritatum* are careful to distinguish even the finest lines of distinction between the doctrines of different groups, the legal texts apply almost the same list of actions regardless of sect or, apparently, the level of involvement in it. Clearly the context of the legal idea requires it to be universally applicable, while the heresy as error idea had less application in this field – though over time, and especially in the fourteenth century, differentiation comes to feature with increasingly frequency in the interrogations of inquisitors. Of course, we must also remember in this context the tendency of the legal material to construct heresy as homogenous.

How then, are the ideas of heresy connected to the figure of the heretic? We have already seen that the heretic acts almost as a vehicle, or a focus for either system, and is defined either by direct contact with heresy as error, or by a position as the point of contact for heresy as crime. Although the figure is dependent upon these two systems, they to some extent they exist independently of the figure, or rather have a separate existence as written textual entities, the one contained and created by the legislation and the function of inquisition, and the other conveyed and responded to in texts both heretical and orthodox. In either case, the system functions as an autonomous set of ideas that, like the Catholic faith, can exist beyond and separate from its individual proponents.

IV

Overall conclusions for this chapter are difficult to make, and are probably best left until the main conclusion of the thesis, but there are some broad points to be made in brief here. First, it seems necessary to point to the layering of the construction throughout our material, both in terms of the different levels of representation and composition, and of the variety and mixture of motifs used. In that context, it is also necessary to note the mixture of inherited ideas with new material, either from other texts, whether Catholic or heretical, of from experiential, observational sources. The patterns of construction themselves reveal a great deal of interaction

and exchange between the texts, not only within their own generic group, but often across the fluid and shifting boundaries between those groups. In part perhaps as a result of *Liber extra* and the prominence of his work within its section on heresy, Innocent III's contribution to the general construct of heresy looms large. Behind all of that, and something that must have become very clear throughout all three sections of this chapter, is visible the importance of textbooks in the spread of ideas. The *Decretum* and the *Liber extra* especially, but also the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and the *Ordinary gloss*, provide a common base of reference for all our authors.

Conclusion

By the middle of the thirteenth century, the threat posed by heresy had provoked a variety of responses from the Catholic Church, each of which had generated its own textual tradition – a vast corpus of written material that represented an equally vast array of sources, images and attitudes. The picture of heresy that those texts present is consequently a difficult and highly constructed one, yet to unravel and understand the complexities of that picture is necessary not only to achieve a clear reading of the texts themselves, but also to elucidate the ideas of heresy that inform them. To gain access to those ideas we have explored the textual construction of heresy across a broad selection of that mid-thirteenth century material. First in discreet groups, then across the whole range of texts, we have tried to understand the mechanics of that construction, and the components from which it was built.

Probably the most prominent, certainly the most memorable level of construction employed by our texts, albeit unevenly, was the figurative representation of heretics. A collection of standard motifs can be seen behind our material, commonplaces of language and imagery that Grundmann labelled the 'topos of the heretic', and which provided a common stock of vocabulary and images from which authors could draw. In our texts, the main themes of that topos crystallized around vivid animal images, of the fox, the wolf and the serpent, all standards of the anti-heretical tradition, drawn ultimately from Scripture. However, while our authors were able to rely on a shared and standard set of figurative devices, neither the form, nor the function of those devices remained static. Although some elements in the figurative tradition were already well-established, particularly ideas of corruption and disease that had been used in the representation of heretics since the patristic era, there was in our period a shift in the balance of the topos.

The image of the little foxes from the Song of Songs that had so dominated the Cistercian polemic of the previous century survived into the thirteenth, often in

a metonymic form, and provided a foundation for the introduction and dissemination, through *Vergentis in senium* and subsequent legislation, of Sampson's foxes. The use of that Judges verse introduced a duality of division and unity into the topos of the heretic, which reinforced and coincided with wider notions of number and cohesion, and was absorbed rapidly into the anti-heretical tradition alongside the original *vulpeculae*. Beside this manipulation of received imagery however, was the increasing use of false appearance as the primary figurative device in the characterization of heretics. The false appearance of heretics revolved around a duality of outer piety and inner corruption, often cast in words drawn from Paul's second letter to Timothy, and their deceptive nature was neatly summed up by the image of the wolf in sheep's clothing, and all the associations that went with it.

The theme was particularly prominent in Dominican literature, such as the *exempla* collection of Stephen of Bourbon, and especially in the accounts of the early years of the Order and its founder saint; in that hagiographical tradition, false appearance played a role both in the construction of the heretics of the story, and in constructing the Order itself through juxtaposition with those heretics. The function of false appearance in these texts seems to have been born, at least in part, out of the interaction of early Dominican preachers with heretics in the south of France, and their competition for the devotion of the laity through the superior holiness of their lifestyle. In fact, where a figurative level was used in the construction of heretics by our sources, the shift that occurred generally towards false appearance as the dominant element in that construction was perhaps more broadly reflective of the changing nature of heresy, and the increasing role of inquisition in the church's response to it. The aspect of hiddenness and secrecy that runs through the theme is surely the counterpart of the more active seeking out of heretics by the church, and to the subsequent practical need for heretics to be hidden, especially after the 1230s - something that we can see behind all the deposition accounts of night-time journeys and secret meetings.

Overall, the complex of commonplaces and images that made up the topos was almost entirely concerned with the characterization of the heretic, that is, with the condition of the figure, and as such was applied without distinction, regardless of error. Unlike the trend of the preceding century, in which anti-heretical polemic led the way in the development of rhetorical devices, figurative construction did

not, on the whole, feature strongly within the polemical texts, and what new developments there were in the basic form of the topos often occurred rather in the central legislation of the church, and particularly in the writing of Innocent III.

The figurative imagery of the anti-heretical tradition was, then, not fixed in its expression. Though the component elements of the tradition may have remained relatively stable, the role of those elements, or the emphasis that they received, appears to have changed according to their contemporary application. Beneath that figurative layer, so often commented upon, lay other, deeper layers of construction to which it was connected, but which were much broader in scope. Throughout all the texts that we have looked at was an aspect of construction that dealt with number: whether heresy was plural or singular. The general construction of heresy on this level was of a plural entity, consisting of more than one heresy, but within that general idea there were nonetheless several elements. In places, an apparent unity can be seen among those different groups, a deliberate part of the fox motif. According to that model, all heresies were united against the church, a reinforcement of the doctrinal distinctness and, more importantly, correctness of the Catholic Church through the enmity of outsiders.[153]

More usually, wherever there was an apparent uniformity in the construction of heresy, it came as the result of a homogeneity created through the agency of the text. So, the heretics of the *exempla* collections were largely undifferentiated because their presence was, on the whole, subordinate to the narrative structure of the *exemplum* in which they feature. Their presence in those instances was dependent on their ability to function as a more or less specific evil, on their status as heretics, rather than on the root of that status. In a similar way, in parts of the legal material, particularly the regional council canons and some of the inquisition documents, the fact that the heretics mentioned were already labelled and convicted as such meant that their legal status as heretics made redundant any difference between them. In both cases, it was the removal of error that allowed homogeneity, though in fact, in the case of the legal material, doctrinal difference was ultimately rendered irrelevant by the fourth Lateran council, whose opening creed made heresy uniform by exclusion.

---

[153] R.A. Markus, 'The Problem of Self-Definition: from Sect to Church', in E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, vol.1: the Shaping of Christianity in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries* (London, 1980), 1-15, p.3.

At no point, though, did our texts take a view of heresy as singular. While it may have been at times homogenous, and in places said to be unified against the church, underlying all that was always a presupposition of plurality; certainly it was never doctrinally singular. Even the fox topos, where mutual division functioned as a mark of error, relied on a basic view of heresy as plural. If anything, heresy could perhaps be more plural in construction than it was in fact, through the use and adaptation of Isidore's list of heresies. A generally plural view of heresy also informed the role of division in the organization of the polemical texts and the inquisitor's handbooks, where real, doctrinal divisions, between a variety of sects, and among the factions of a sect - both Cathars and Waldensians - structured the texts' treatment of heresy.

At a more fundamental level, heresy was constructed by some of our texts as a doctrinal phenomenon. That construction occurred in two ways, through description and through response. The polemics, the *summae auctoritatum*, and the inquisitor's handbooks, all presented their subject as a sequence of errors; the heresy that they describe consisted of a series of articles, which in most cases formed a coherent doctrinal system. A similar picture can be seen occasionally in the few descriptions of error included by other texts, such as the *Dialogus miraculorum*, and in particular the *De heresi* section of the *Tractatus de diversis materiis*, unsurprisingly, given that it had more in common with inquisitor's handbooks than with the rest of Stephen's collection.

The doctrinal heresy of the polemics and the *summae*, however, was built not only from the detail given of a developed system, but also through the response of the texts in question. The point by point refutation by which the polemics addressed the heresy they described, the provision of Scriptural and rational proofs, and the reinterpretation of the proofs used by the heretics, all combined to suggest a view of heresy as something to be engaged with on a doctrinal level, in terms of academic theology; as Stock observes, it is possible to see what was understood by heresy, through the means that were considered effective to combat it.[154] The *summae* did something very similar, though in a much more condensed form.

---

[154] B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton and Guildford, 1983), p.107.

Beneath the systematic refutations of the polemics lay the original source materials, as it were, the heretical texts that our authors tell us consistently that they are using, and which their method would betray even if they did not. Though only a few originals survive today, the one-time existence of other books of heretical doctrine can be understood from the numerous references made to them by Catholic authors. The work of Hamilton, among others, has demonstrated from the books that do survive that they contain what can be considered as a coherent belief system.[155] In our texts, these books can be seen to contain a discussion of doctrine that requires the same in return.

Heresy was not only doctrinal in the polemics and the *Summae* then; it was also intellectually driven and expressed. Background impressions from our other texts, particularly the edifying literature, provide a plausible context for such a picture, not least the corresponding picture of the heretics themselves as educated. Throughout most of our material, this was achieved simply through the use of titles such as *magister*, with connotations ranging from *teacher* to *master* of the schools. Most convincing in this regard though is the background picture that permeated the *exempla* collections, the Dominican literature and the inquisition registers. Here, not only were the heretics depicted frequently in debate - indeed the heretics that appear in the *Lives* of St. Dominic and Peter Martyr do so almost exclusively in that context - but there was also a consistent proximity to, and use of books by the heretical élite in a way that recalls Stock's model of a textual community.

More specific to the heresy itself, the fourth Lateran creed also provides a background to that doctrinal and intellectual construct. That creed was in large part a direct response to, and defined by the specific tenets of external belief systems, particularly Cathar doctrine, but also the theological disputes of the preceding decades. Though there is no intention here to discuss ideas of Christian self-definition, it is important to note here that, along with the heretics, the Christian community also constructed itself through its juridical definition of what was and was not orthodox. That heresy ought to be treated as doctrinal was the assumption behind the fourth Lateran creed, which, through its exclusive definition of doctrine, required all heterodoxy to be defined and addressed in those same terms. It also seems reasonable to assume that the same processes that lay behind the

---

[155] B. Hamilton, review of M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*, in *American Historical Review*, 107 (2002), 925-26.

development of Catholic doctrine in the new creed – the expansion of the schools and of speculative thought, and within that expansion, the increasing role of precisely those disputative tendencies that appear so prevalent among the heretics – were also responsible for the increasingly theological character of heresy. In fact, the codification, and progressively more intellectual nature of heresy, and the development of sharply defined, article based Catholic doctrine can and have been read as in part resulting from the interaction between the two systems.[156]

So, the academic image of heresy that emerges from the polemical engagement with it would seem to have had some real foundation outside those texts. Overall, that attitude in the polemics represented a significant shift in comparison to the trends of the previous century, a move away from an attack that avoided any engagement with the heresy itself, and relied instead on invective and a denigration of the character of the heretics, and towards an approach that addressed the error directly as the primary focus of the response, and which treated it as an answerable doctrine, and an issue of interpretation and exegesis. The lack of attention paid to the heretics themselves by the polemic of the thirteenth century goes some way to explain the absence of topoi within those texts. The new, improved, educated heretic likewise presented a corresponding change from the topos of the illiterate heretic that had pervaded earlier polemic, though here there are regional variations. The imagery persisted in that material that was concerned primarily with the Waldensians, most if not all of which derived from Germany. It is not coincidental that those texts which consistently constructed both a highly theological heresy and an educated heretical community, namely the polemical sources and the *Summae*, were not only directed against the Cathar heresy, but were also the products of a northern Italian context where rates of lay literacy were unusually high.

At same time, in the rest of the conciliar material, in the legal consultations, and in most of the documentary remnants of inquisition a different construct of heresy was

---

[156] G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages. The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c.1250-c.1450* (2 vols., Manchester, 1967); H. Fichtenau, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, transl. D.A. Kaiser (Pennsylvania, 1998), orig. pub. as *Ketzer und Professoren: Häeresie und Vernunftglaube im Hochmittelalter* (Munich, 1992); M.-H. Vicaire, 'Les Cathares albigeois vus par les polémistes', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 3 (1968), 107-28.

at work, one built of actions and of externally measurable qualities. The actions were used as markers, to access an interior condition of the deponent that was very closely tied to intention, as the continuing emphasis on knowledge in all the categories of follower would indicate. Within that idea of heresy as a series of actions, the heretic took on a pivotal role as the location of error, and the centre of the activity that marked out the guilt of their followers. The precise nature of error itself was in this scheme immaterial; its quality as error was what mattered, and belief in it was the culpable action. Here, a list of culpable deeds defined the involvement of the guilty party in a broadly defined crime of 'heresy', which was in essence a graduated scale of association with 'heretics'.

To be a heretic, that is, a heretic proper rather than one of the lesser grades of *credens* or *fautor*, the deponent had either to be regarded by the church as a member of the élite – a membership measured not by the belief in error, but by participation in a ritual of initiation – or judged as a heretic by the sentence of the inquisition. A judgement of heresy itself required obduracy, either a defence of error, a classic definition, or equally a relapse into former activity, a refusal to obey the judgement of the church. Either way, heretical status in the eyes of the law required a recognizable action of ritual or sentence. The presence or otherwise of error was not at issue, as is evident where heretics appear as deponents. Belief and error were not ignored: they had simply been condensed into marker actions in the list, surely in large part as a practical measure, to allow a universally applicable system of prosecution that could be quickly and easily used by any individual inquisitor. Error was not addressed in that system, though, because it was not the purpose of inquisition to discover new error, but to police the crime of heresy, the involvement in and support of the activity of heretics. It is important to realize in this respect that heretics themselves were not the only or even the main focus of attention, and that inquisitions were concerned with the whole range of followers.

Unlike the doctrinal idea of heresy, the criminal version was a self-perpetuating system that is generated by a reflexive exchange, between the legal consultations and textbooks on the one hand, and the process of inquisition itself on the other, via the inquisitor's handbook. That exchange determined the content of the depositions, and the focus on action derived from the legal idea of heresy that the consultations contained. Both doctrinal and criminal ideas were represented in equal measure by the inquisitor's handbooks, though the formula of inquisition

neither provided for nor required the gathering of detailed information of error, such as that given by the manuals and the extracts of treatises that they contain. The formulae and inquisition documents that did contain a question list for error, and they were not common, presented a list of errors which was almost a tick list, and approached the subject from a position of knowledge, not of enquiry. Nevertheless, we have seen that detailed information about error was sought by inquisitors; when it derived from an oral source, rather than from heretical writings, it was taken not from the depositions of heretics or their followers, but from imprisoned, or post-conversion heretics.

Essentially then, there were two connected ideas of heresy at work. On the one hand, 'heresy' could be understood as a crime, as a series of actions that implied guilt, and which involved all the grades of follower. The grades themselves, as well as the system of markers, were all the product of the texts and ideas surrounding inquisition, and are imposed from outside upon those labelled as 'heretics'. Heresy in that sense was further defined by a parallel with secular crime, particularly the crime of treason, and by ideas of intention. On the other hand was a perhaps more conventional notion of heresy as a series of errors, but one which saw those errors as part of a coherent doctrinal programme, and which was in some ways a departure from immediately previous ideas of heresy in which error itself was not as predominant. That doctrinal heresy was constructed ultimately from imported heretical sources, and from the other Catholic texts produced in reaction to it. In the case of both crime and belief system, the constructs of 'heresy', as a result of that written nature, can be seen to have been independent of the figure of the heretic. Unlike most previous accounts of heresy, heretics were attached to the error, rather than the other way around; heresy had become independent of its creators, and the need for an author seems, at least in the case of non-academic heresy, to have been largely dispensed with.

The figure itself had a range of meaning. It was always defined by, and in direct connection with, error, even though that error may have been adumbrated, as in the case of the inquisition materials, or the *exempla* collections. The heretic had a role, in the edification texts, and also within those texts formulated around a debate framework, as a mouthpiece for the errors, or as a token carrier of error. At

the same time, the figure also carried its own and different layers of construction. As we saw, the elements of the topos adhered to and construct the heretic, while saying little about heresy itself.

Lastly, we can ask what are the broader implications of talking about a 'construct' of heresy – how far was it just that, a construct, and how far was it a representation, or was it rather a more complex interaction between the two? If the broad view afforded by a comparison of sources allows us to see that there was more than one construction at work, though they were connected through the fluid generic boundaries, then it also shows us that these were neither static constructs nor static texts, not in the topoi they used, and not in their use of inherited material. What is apparent is a layering of the construction, both in terms of different types and motifs, as well as the mixture of inherited ideas with new material, from other texts, Catholic or heretical, and from material based in experience and observation of the real contemporary people and movements the Church labelled as heretical. Behind much of the construction of all our sources stood the textbooks, those products of the 'text-book movement' of the high middle ages that rooted teaching and thought in common, inherited texts: the *Ordinary Gloss* and the *Sentences*, the *Decretum* and the *Liber extra*. The prominence of the last two in particular was clearly one reason for the wide-ranging influence of the language and imagery of the legislation.[157]

If the text-books constituted authoritative and universally received sources of the ideas of heresy deriving from biblical exegesis, theology and canon law, we should perhaps set alongside them the treatises and handbooks of the inquisitors. Ultimately part of the same process of textualization and standardization in the Church, the handbooks provided the authoritative knowledge in their particular area of heresy and its repression, and represented another stratum in that common textual tradition, another more immediate source for the sharing of knowledge and ideas, and one in which all the constructs that we have seen co-existed.

Awareness of the traditional sources and rhetorical characteristics of these texts should not lead one towards epistemological pessimism, however. Our texts not only relied on a shared comprehension of the rhetorical and figurative mechanisms at work, but also on a common understanding of the reality of heresy,

---

[157] B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, 1964), pp.51-52.

of the background-ness of heretics, of what *mos hereticorum* meant. The large idea or concept of heresy that they embodied was a varied but coherent one, built from parts drawn from both tradition and experience. Ultimately, the balance of those parts, and the role that they came to play within the texts and the idea as a whole, was determined by their interaction with each other, and with the reality of their subject. If whistling to birds was a simile of deception, it was at the same time a real component of one Dominican's view of real contemporary preachers.

Abbreviations

Acta sanctorum	-	*Acta sanctorum quotquot tot orbe coluntur, vel a catholicus scriptoribus celebrantur...* (new edn., 65 vols. in 67, Paris, 1863-1931)
AFP	-	*Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* (Rome, 1931-)
AHDLMA	-	*Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1926-)
Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus*	-	Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie II, III', 308-324
Anonymous of Passau	-	Anonymous of Passau, <*Tractatus*>, ed. J. Gretser, *Lucae Tudensis episcopi, scriptores aliquot succedanei contra sectam Waldensium* (Ingolstadt, 1613), 262-75
Aquinas, *SCG*	-	Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate catholicae fidei contra gentiles, Opera omnia* (25 vols. in 23, Parma, 1852-73), vol.5
Arnold, *Inquisition*	-	J. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001)
BAV	-	Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City
BnF	-	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
Biller and Hudson	-	P. Biller and A. Hudson (eds) *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530* (Cambridge, 1994)
Biller, 'Northern Cathars'	-	P. Biller, 'Northern Cathars and Higher Learning', in P. Biller and R.B. Dobson (eds.), *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life; essays in honour of Gordon Leff*, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 11 (Woodbridge, 1999), 25-53
Biller, *Waldenses*	-	P. Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170-1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot, 2000)
Brevis summula	-	*La Somme des autorités, à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1896), 114-43
Bruschi and Biller	-	C. Bruschi and P. Biller (eds), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, York Studies in Medieval Theology, 4 (York, 2003)
Caesarius, *Dialogus*	-	Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (2 vols., Cologne, 1851, repub. Ridgewood, N.J., 1966)
Canetti, *L'invenzione*	-	L. Canetti, *L'invenzione della memoria; il culto e l'immagine di Domenico nella storia dei primi frati Predicatori* (Spoleto, 1996)
Cantimpré, *Bonum universale*	-	Thomas of Cantimpré, *Les exemples du Livre des Abeilles*, ed. and transl. H. Platelle (Turnhout, 1997)

Capelli, *Adversus haereticos*	-	*L'eresia catara. Appendice:* Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos. *Codice inedito Malatestiano del sec. XIII.*, ed. D. Bazzocchi (Bologna, 1920)
CF	-	*Cahiers de Fanjeaux* (Toulouse, 1966-)
D'Alatri, Orvieto	-	M. d'Alatri, *L'inquisizione francescana* (Rome, 1996)
DdeS	-	*Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascetique et mystique: doctrine et histoire* (17 vols. in 21, Paris, 1937-95)
DEC	-	Alberigo, J. et al. (eds.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, transl. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London and Washington, 1990)
Disputatio	-	*Disputatio inter catholicum et patarinum hereticum. Die Auseinandersetzung der katholischen Kirche mit den italienischen Katharern im Spiegel einer kontroverstheologischen Streitschrift des 13. Jahrhunderts,* ed. C. Hoécker (Florence, 2001)
DMA	-	*Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. J.R. Strayer (13 vols., New York, 1982-89)
Doat	-	Paris, BnF, collection Doat
Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie I'	-	A. Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie. I Le "De heresi catharorum in Lombardia"', *AFP*, XIX (1949), 280-312, repr. in *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition, XII^e-XIII^e siècles. Documents et études*, ed. Y. Dossat (Aldershot,1990)
Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie II, III'	-	A. Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II and III', *AFP*, XX (1950), 234-324, repr. in *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition, XII^e-XIII^e siècles. Documents et études*, ed. Y. Dossat (Aldershot,1990)
Dondaine, 'Manuel'	-	A. Dondaine, 'Le Manuel de l'Inquisiteur (1230-1330)', *AFP*, XVII (1947), 85-194, repr. in *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition, XII^e-XIII^e siècles. Documents et études*, ed. Y. Dossat (Aldershot,1990)
Dossat, *Crises*	-	Y. Dossat, *Les crises de l'inquisition toulousaine au XIIIe siècle* (Bordeaux, 1959)
Douais, *Documents: Textes*	-	C. Douais, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'inquisition* (2 vols.., Paris, 1900), vol.2, *Textes*
Douais, *La somme*/I,II,III,IV,V	-	*La Somme des autorités, à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1896)
DTC	-	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (15 vols in 30, Paris, 1923-50)
Duvernoy, *Quercy*	-	*L'inquisition en Quercy. Le registre des pénitences de Pierre Cellan 1241-1242*, ed. J. Duvernoy (Castelnaud La Chapelle, 2001)

Foulques, *Consilium*	-	*L'eresia a Vicenza nel duecento. Dati, problemi e fonti*, ed. F.L. Tognato (Vicenza, 1988), edn. of *Consilium domini Guidonis Fulcodii* pp.193-203
Fredericq	-	*Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae*, ed. P. Fredericq (5 vols., Ghent, 1889)
Friedberg	-	*Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. E. Friedberg (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1959), vol.1, *Decretum magistri Gratiani*, vol.2, *Decretalium collectiones*
García, *Lateran 4*	-	*Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*, ed. A. García y García (Vatican City, 1981)
Grundmann, 'Typus'	-	H. Grundmann, 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung', in *Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, Festschrift für W. Goetz* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1927) 91-107; repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXV (3 vols., 1976), vol.1, pp.364-416
Humbert, *Opera*	-	Humbert de Romans, *Opera de vita regularis*, ed. J.J. Berthier (2 vols, orig. Rome, 1888-89, repr. Turin, 1956)
Inventer	-	M. Zerner (ed.), *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition* (Nice, 1998)
Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion*	-	D. Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion. Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)*, tr. G.R. Edwards (Ithaca and London, 2002).
JEH	-	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (London, etc., 1950-)
Lenherr, *Gratian*	-	Lenherr, T., *Die exkommunikations- und depositionsgewalt der häretiker bei Gratian und den Dekretisten bis zur* Glossa Ordinaria *des Johannes Teutonicus*, Münchener theologische studien iii. Kanonistische abteilung 42 band (St. Ottilien, 1987), edn. of C.24 q.1 pp.18-56
Lombard, *Sententiae*	-	Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, ed. I. Brady, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum IV (2 vols. in 3, Grottaferrata, 1971-81)
Lourdaux and Verhelst, *Concept*	-	W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th – 13th C.)* (Louvain, 1983)
Maisonneuve, *Études*	-	H. Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'inquisition*, 2nd edn., L'Église et l'État au Moyen Âge, 7 (Paris, 1960)
Mansi	-	*Sacrum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. G.D. Mansi (53 vols., Florence, Venice and Paris 1759-1927, repr. Graz 1961)

Moneta, *Adversos catharos*	-	Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus catharos et valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T. A. Ricchini (Rome, 1743, repr.1964)
MOPH	-	*Monumenta ordinis fratrum praedicatorum historica* (Rome, 1933-)
MOPH XVI	-	*MOPH*, XVI (1935), *Libellus de principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum/Legendae sancti Dominici*
Paolini, 'Italian Catharism'	-	L. Paolini, 'Italian Catharism and written culture', in Biller and Hudson, 83-103
Patschovsky and Selge, *Quellen*	-	Patschovsky, A. and K.-V. Selge (eds), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser* (Gütersloh, 1973)
Pelhisson, *Chronique*	-	*Guillaume Pelhisson, Chronique (1229-1244) suivie du récit des troubles d'Albi*, ed. J. Duvernoy (Paris, 1994)
PL	-	*Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne (217 vols., Paris, 1857-66)
Preger, Pseudo-David	-	W. Preger, 'Der Tractat des David von Augsburg über die Waldesier', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 14 no.2 (1879), 204–35
Pseudo-David, *De inquisitione*	-	*Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand (5 vols., Paris, 1717), vol.5, cols.1777-1794
Raniero Sacconi, *Summa*	-	Raniero Sacconi, *Summa de catharis*, ed. F. Šanjek, *AFP*, XLIV (1974) 31-60
Rottenwöhrer	-	G. Rottenwöhrer, *Der Katharismus* (4 vols. in 8, Bad Honnef, 1982)
Salvo Burci, *Suprastella*	-	Salvo Burci, *Liber Suprastella*, ed. Caterina Bruschi, Instituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Fonti per la Storia dell'Italia Medievale, (Rome, 2002)
Selge, *Texte*	-	*Texte zur Inquisition*, ed. K.-V. Selge (Gütersloh, 1967)
SOPMA	-	T. Kaeppeli and E. Panella, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* (4 vols., Rome, 1970-93)
Stephen of Bourbon, lib.1	-	Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus: prologus, prima pars, de dono timoris*, ed. J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis, 124 (Turnhout, 2002)
Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus*	-	Stephen of Bourbon, *De septem donis spiritus sancti: Stephani de Borbone tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, ed A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirées du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle*, Société de l'histoire de France, Publications, CLXXXV (Paris 1877)

Tocco	-	F. Tocco, *Quel che non c'è nella divina commedia. Dante e l'eresia, con documenti e con la ristampa delle questioni dantesche* (Bologna, 1899)
Vitae fratrum	-	Gerard of Frachet, *Vitae fratrum ordinis praedicatorum nec non cronica ordinis ab anno MCCII usque ad MCCLIV*, ed. B.M. Reichert, *MOPH*, I (1896)
Vitry, Crane	-	*The* Exempla *or Illustrative Stories from the* Sermones Vulgares *of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. T.F. Crane (repr. New York, 1971, orig. pub. 1890)
Vitry, Greven	-	*Die* Exempla *aus den* Sermones feriales et communes *des Jakob von Vitry*, ed. J. Greven (Heidelberg, 1914)
Wakefield and Evans	-	*Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, transl. W.L. Wakefield and A.P.Evans (New York, 1969, repr. 1991)
Wakefield, 'Notes'	-	W.L. Wakefield, 'Notes on some Anti-Heretical Writings of the Thirteenth Century', *Franciscan Studies*, 27 (1967), 285-321.

Bibliography

I - Unpublished Primary Works

Oxford, Oriel College

MS 68

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

Collection Doat

23

24

25-26, used in typescript of the edition being prepared by Peter Biller, Caterina Bruschi and Shelagh Sneddon

36

MS Lat. 174

MS Lat. 2584

MS Lat. 3656

MS Lat. 13151

MS Lat. 14598

MS Lat. 14599

MS Lat. 14927

MS Lat. 14983

MS Lat. 15970

Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

MS Reg. Lat. 428

MS Vat. Lat. 3978

Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale

MS 609

II - Published Primary Works

Acta sanctorum quotquot tot orbe coluntur, vel a catholicus scriptoribus celebrantur... (new edn., 65 vols. in 67, Paris, 1863-1931).

Alain de Lille, *Compendiosa in cantica canticorum ad laudem deiparae virginis mariae elucidato*, Patrologia Latina, vol. 210, cols.51-110.

Alberigo, J. et al. (eds.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, transl. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London and Washington, 1990).

Anonymous of Passau, <*Tractatus*>, ed. J. Gretser, *Lucae Tudensis episcopi, scriptores aliquot succedanei contra sectam Waldensium* (Ingolstadt, 1613), 262-75.

Anselm of Alessandria, *Tractatus de hereticis*, ed. A. Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II and III', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XX (1950), 234-324.

Augustine, *Sermones ad populum, V, sermones dubii*, Patrologia Latina, vol.39, cols.1639-43.

Bernard Gui, *Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis*, ed. C. Douais (Paris, 1886).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Opera*, ed. J. Leclerq, C.H. Talbot, H.M. Rochais (8 vols., Rome, 1957-77).

Bible moralisée: Codex Vindobonensis 2554, Vienna, Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, comm. and transl. G.B. Guest, Manuscripts in Miniature (London, 1995).

Biblia sacra, cum glossis ... Nicolai Lyrani postilla & moralitatibus, Burgensis additionibus & Thoringi replicis (6 vols., Lyons, 1545).

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam Clementinam, ed. A. Colunga and L. Turrado (4th edn., Salamanca, 1965).

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, ed. R. Weber et.al. (2 vols, Stuttgart, 1969).

Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange (2 vols., Cologne, Bonn and Brussels, 1851, repub. Ridgewood, N.J., 1966).

Caesarius of Heisterbach: see also Hilka.

Chronica ordinis, ed. B.M. Reichert, *Vitae fratrum ordinis praedicatorum nec non cronica ordinis ab anno MCCII usque ad MCCLIV*, MOPH 1 (1896), 321-338.

Constantine of Orvieto, *Legenda sancti Dominici*, ed. H.C. Scheeben, *MOPH*, XVI (1935), 263-352.

Constitutiones concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum commentariis glossatorum, ed. A. García y García (Vatican City, 1981).

d'Alatri, M., *L'inquisizione francescana* (Rome, 1996).

De heresi catharorum in Lombardia, ed. A. Dondaine, 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie. I Le "De heresi catharorum in Lombardia"', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XIX (1949), 280-312.

de Kerval, L. (ed.), *Sancti Antonii de Padua vitae duae quarum altera hucusque inedita* (Paris, 1904).

Disputatio inter catholicum et patarinum hereticum. Die Auseinandersetzung der katholischen Kirche mit den italienischen Katharern im Spiegel einer kontroverstheologischen Streitschrift des 13. Jahrhunderts ed. C. Hoécker (Florence, 2001).

Douais, C. (ed.), *Documents pour servir a l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc* (2 vols., Paris, 1900), vol.2, *Textes*.

Douais, C., *La Somme des autorités, à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1896).

Fredericq, P. (ed.), *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae* (5 vols., Ghent, 1889).

Friedberg, E. (ed.), *Corpus iuris canonici,* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1879, repr. Graz, 1959).

Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae fratrum ordinis praedicatorum nec non cronica ordinis ab anno MCCII usque ad MCCLIV*, ed. B.M. Reichert, *MOPH* 1 (1896).

Gervase of Tilbury, *Otia imperialia: Recreation for an Emperor*, ed. S.E. Banks and J.W. Binns (Oxford, 2002).

Gratian, *Decretum divi Gratiani... una cum variis scribentium Glossis* (Lyons, 1560).

Gratian: see also Lenherr.

Gui Foulques, *Conisilium Guidonis Fulcodii de quibusdam dubitacionibus in negocio inquisicionis*, in F.L. Tognato (ed.), *L'eresia a Vicenza nel duecento. Dati, problemi e fonti* (Vicenza, 1988).

Guillaume d'Auxerre, *Summa aurea*, ed J. Ribailler, Spicilegium Bonaventuriarum, XVI-XIX (4 vols. in 6, Paris and Grottaferrata, 1980-87).

Guillaume Pelhisson, *Chronique (1229-1244) suivie du récit des troubles d'Albi*, ed. J. Duvernoy (Paris, 1994).

Gurney-Salter, E. (tr.), *The Coming of the Friars Minor to England and Germany* (London, 1926).

Hilka, A. (ed.), *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, vol.1, *Einleitung*, exempla *und Auszüge aus den Predigten des Caesarius von Heisterbach* (Bonn, 1933).

Hugh Eteriano, *Contra Patarenos*, ed. B., J. and S. Hamilton (Leiden and Boston, 2004).

Humbert de Romans, *Legenda sancti Dominici*, ed. A. Walz, *MOPH*, XVI (1935), 355-433.

Humbert de Romans, *Opera de vita regularis*, ed. J.J. Berthier (2 vols., Rome, 1888-89, repr. Turin, 1956).

Ilarino da Milano (ed.), *Il "Liber supra Stella" del piacentino Salvo Burci contro I catari e altri correnti ereticali*, in *Eresie medievali. Scritti minori* (Rimini, 1983), 205-367, orig. publ. in *Aevum* XVI (1942) 272-319; XVII (1943) 90-146;XIX (1945) 218-341.

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay (2 vols., Oxford, 1911).

Jacobus de Voragine (Iacopo da Varazze), *Legenda Aurea*, ed. G.P. Maggioni (2nd edn., 2 vols., Florence, 1998).

Jacques de Vitry, *Die* Exempla *aus den* Sermones feriales et communes *des Jakob von Vitry*, ed. J. Greven (Heidelberg, 1914).

Jacques de Vitry, *Die* Exempla *des Jacob von Vitry: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Erzahlungsliteratur des Mittelalters*, ed. G. Frenken (Munchen, 1914).

Jacques de Vitry, *La traduction de l'historia orientalis de Jacques de Vitry*, ed. C. Buridant (Paris, 1986).

Jacques de Vitry, *Lettres de Jacques de Vitry (1160/70-1240), évêque de Saint-Jean-d'Acre*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Leiden, 1960).

Jacques de Vitry, *The* Exempla *or Illustrative Stories from the* Sermones Vulgares *of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. T.F. Crane (repr. New York, 1971, originally published 1890).

Jacques de Vitry, *The* Historia occidentalis *of Jacques de Vitry. A Critical Edition*, ed. J.F. Hinnebusch (Fribourg, 1972).

Jordan of Saxony, *Libellus de principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. H.C. Scheeben, *MOPH*, XVI (1935), 1-88.

Kaeppeli, T., 'Une somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?)', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVII (1947), 295-335.

Legendae S. Francisci Assiensis I, Analecta franciscana, sive chronica aliaque varia documenta ad historiam fratrum minorum, vol.X (Quaracchi and Florence, 1941).

Lenherr, T., *Die Exkommunikations- und Depositionsgewalt der Häretiker bei Gratian und den Dekretisten bis zur* Glossa Ordinaria *des Johannes Teutonicus,* Münchener Theologische Studien iii,. Kanonistische abteilung 42 (St. Ottilien, 1987).

Liber augustalis, *or, Constitutions of Melfi promulgated by the Emperor Frederick II for the Kingdom of Sicily in 1231*, transl. J.M. Powell (Syracuse, New York, 1971).

Mansi, G.D. (ed.), *Sacrum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (53 vols., Florence-Venice-Paris 1759-1927, repr. Graz 1961).

Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus catharos et valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. Ricchini (Rome, 1743, repr.1964).

Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P. Migne (217 vols., Paris, 1857-66).

Patschovsky, A. and K.-V. Selge (eds.), *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser* (Gütersloh, 1973).

Peraldus, *Summa de vitiis*, ‹http://www.english.upenn.edu/~swenzel/peraldus.html›, website maintained by S. Wenzel et. al. (05/05/2004).

Peter Ferrandi, *Legenda sancti Dominici*, ed. M.H. Laurent, *MOPH*, XVI (1935), 197-260.

Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae,* ed. I Brady, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum IV (2 vols. in 3, Grottaferrata, 1971-81).

Peter of les Vaux de Cernay, *Hystoria albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon (3 vols., Paris, 1926-39).

Pierre Cellan, *L'inquisition en Quercy. Le registre des pénitences de Pierre Cellan 1241-1242*, ed. J. Duvernoy (Castelnaud-la-Chapelle, 2001).

Pontal, O., *Les statuts synodaux Français du XIII^e siècle* (4 vols., Paris, 1971-95).

Pseudo-David of Augsburg, *De inquisitione hereticorum*, ed. W. Preger, 'Der Tractat des David von Augsburg über die Waldesier', *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 14 no.2 (1879), 204–35.

Pseudo-David of Augsburg, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* ed. E. Martène and U. Durand (5 vols., Paris, 1717) vol.5, cols.1777 C-1794 B.

Pseudo-James Cappelli, *L'eresia catara. Appendice:* Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos. *Codice inedito Malatestiano del sec. XIII.*, ed. D. Bazzocchi (Bologna, 1920).

Raniero Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. F. Šanjek *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XLIV (1974) 31-60.

Raniero Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. A. Dondaine, *Un traité néomanichéen du XIIe siècle. Le* Liber de duobus principiis *suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare*, ed. A. Dondaine (Rome, 1939).

Raymond of Peñafort, *De poenitentia et matrimonio* (Rome, 1603, repub. Farnborough, 1967).

Remigius, *Enarrationes in psalmos*, Patrologia Latina, vol.131, cols.572-77.

Ripolli, T. (ed.), *Bullarium ordinis ff. praedicatorum* (8 vols., Rome 1729-40).

Salvo Burci, *Liber Suprastella*, ed. Caterina Bruschi, Instituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Fonti per la Storia dell'Italia Medievale (Rome, 2002).

Šanjek, F., 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale (MS 47 della Bibiothèque Municipale di Albi). Memoria di Raoul Manselli', in *Atti della Accademie Nazionale dei Lincei. 1: Classe di Scienze Morale Storiche e Filologiche*, Fasc.6 (1985) 324-397. Text of *Summa* in Appendix, ed. F. Šanjek, 355-395.

Selge, K.-V. (ed.), *Texte zur Inquisition* (Gütersloh, 1967).

Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, ed A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirées du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle,* Société de l'Histoire de France, Publications, CLXXXV (Paris, 1877).

Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus: prologus, prima pars, de dono timoris,* ed. J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis, 124 (Turnhout, Brepols, 2002).

Thomas Aquinas, *Opera omnia* (25 vols. in 23, Parma, 1852-73).

Thomas of Cantimpré, *Les exemples du Livre des Abeilles,* ed. and transl. H. Platelle (Turnhout, 1997).

Thomas Agni de Lentino, *Legenda beati Petri Martyris*, in *Acta Sanctorum,* April III, 29, cols.686-719.

Tocco, F., *Quel che non c'è nella divina commedia. Dante e l'eresia, con documenti e con la ristampa delle questioni dantesche* (Bologna, 1899).

Tugwell, S. (ed. and transl.), *Early Dominicans, Selected Writings* (New York, 1984).

Wakefield, W.L. and Evans, A.P. (transl.), *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York, 1969, repr. 1991).

III - Secondary Works

Altaner, B., *Der hl. Dominikus. Untersuchungen und Texte*, Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, II (Breslau, 1922).

Amundsen, D.W., 'Medicine and Faith in Early Christianity', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 56 (1982), 326-50.

Arbesmann, R., 'The concept of "Christus medicus" in St Augustine', *Traditio*, 10 (1954), 1-28.

Arnold, J., *Inquisition and power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001).

Arnold, J., 'The Preaching of the Cathars', in C. Muessig (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden, 1998), 183-205.

Arnold, J., 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', in Bruschi and Biller, *Texts and Repression*, 63-80.

Baker, D. (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Studies in Church History, 9 (1972)

Baldwin, J.W., *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: the Social Views of Peter the Chanter & his circle* (2 vols., Princeton, 1970).

Barber, M., *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2000).

Barr H. and A.M. Hutchison (eds.), *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, Medieval Church Studies, 4 (Turnhout, 2005), 267-80.

Bauer, W., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (London, 1972).

Belhomme, M., 'Documents inédits sur l'hérésie des Albigeois', *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique du Midi de la France*, 6 (1852), 101-146.

Berlioz, J., *"Tuez les tous, Dieu reconnaîtra les siens". Le massacre de Béziers (22 juillet 1209) et la croisade contre les Albigeois vus par Césaire de Heisterbach* (Portet-sur-Garonne, 1994).

Berlioz, J., '*Exemplum* et histoire: Césaire de Heisterbach (v.1180-v.1240) et la croisade albigeoise', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 147 (1989), 49-86.

Berlioz, J., '"Les erreurs de cette doctrine pervertie...". Les croyances des Cathares selon le Dominicain et inquisiteur Étienne de Bourbon (mort. v.1261)', *Heresis*, 32 (2000), 53-67.

Berlioz, J., 'La face cachée de Thomas de Cantimpré. Compléments à une traduction française récente du *Bonum universale de apibus*', *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Litteraire du Moyen Âge*, 68 (2001), 73-94.

Biget, J.-L., 'Un proces d'inquisition à Albi en 1300', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 6 (1971), 273-341.

Biget, J.-L., '"Les Albigeois": remarques sur une dénomination', in Zerner, *Inventer*, 219-55.

Biller, P., *The Measure of Multitude: Population in Medieval Thought* (Oxford, 2000).

Biller, P., *The Waldenses, 1170-1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot, 2000).

Biller, P. and A.Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530* (Cambridge, 1994).

Biller P. and A.J. Minnis (eds.), *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, York Studies in Medieval Theology, I (York, 1997), 61-81.

Biller, P. and R.B. Dobson (eds.), *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life; Essays in Honour of Gordon Leff*, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 11 (Woodbridge, 1999).

Biller, P., 'The Cathars of Languedoc and Written Materials', in Biller and Hudson, *Heresy and Literacy*, 61-82.

Biller, P., 'Cathars and Material Women', in P. Biller and A.J. Minnis (eds.), *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*, York Studies in Medieval Theology, I (York, 1997), 61-81.

Biller, P., 'Northern Cathars and Higher Learning', in Biller and Dobson, *The Medieval Church*, 25-53.

Biller, P., 'William of Newburgh and the Cathar Mission to England', in D. Wood (ed.), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c.1100-c.1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross*, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 12 (Woodbridge, 1999), 11-30.

Biller, P., 'The Earliest Heretical Englishwomen', in J. Wogan-Browne et.al. (eds.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy*, (Turnhout, 2000), 363-76.

Biller, P., 'The *topos* and Reality of the Heretic as *illiteratus*', in Biller, *Waldenses*, 169-90.

Biller, P., 'Through a Glass Darkly. Seeing Medieval Heresy', in P. Linehan and J. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001), 308-26.

Biller, P., review of M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*, *Speculum*, 78 (4) (2003), 1366-70.

Biller, P., '"Deep Is the Heart of Man, and Inscrutable": Signs of Heresy in Medieval Languedoc', in H. Barr and A.M. Hutchison (eds.), *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, Medieval Church Studies, 4 (Turnhout, 2005), 267-80.

Bird, J., 'The Construction of Orthodoxy and the (De)construction of Heretical Attacks on the Eucharist in *Pastoralia* from Peter the Chanter's Circle in Paris', in Bruschi and Biller, *Texts and Repression*, 45-61.

Borst, A., *Die Katharer*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XII (Stuttgart, 1953), French transl. by C. Roy as *Les Cathares* (Paris, 1984).

Brett, E.T., *Humbert of Romans, his Life and Views of Thirteenth-Century Society* (Toronto, 1984).

Brundage, M., *Medieval Canon Law* (London and New York, 1995).

Bruschi, C. and P. Biller (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, York Studies in Medieval Theology, IV (York, 2003).

Bruschi, C., '"Magna diligentia est habenda per inquisitorem": Precautions before Reading Doat 21-26', in Bruschi and Biller, *Texts and Repression*, 81-110.

Canetti, L., *L'invenzione della memoria; il culto e l'immagine di Domenico nella storia dei primi frati Predicatori* (Spoleto, 1996).

Cazenave, A., 'Aveu et contrition. Manuels de confesseurs et interrogatoires d'inquisition en Languedoc et en Catalogne (XIII^{e}-XIV^{e})', *Actes du 99e Congres National des Sociétés Savantes*, pt. 1 (1977), 333-352.

Clanchy, M.,T., *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-1307* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1993).

d'Alatri, M., *L'inquisizione francescana* (Rome, 1996).

d'Avray, D.L., *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford, 1985).

Degrandi, A. et. al. (eds.), *Scritti in onore di Girolamo Arnaldi, offerti dalla Scuola nazionale di studi medioevali* (Rome, 2001),

Dictionary of the Middle Ages, ed. J.R. Strayer (13 vols., New York, 1982-89).

Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascetique et mystique: doctrine et histoire (17 vols. in 21, Paris, 1937-95).

Dictionnaire de théologie catholique (15 vols. in 30, Paris, 1923-50).

Dondaine, A., *Un traité néo-manichéen de XIIIe siècle: Le* Liber de duobus principiis, *suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare* (Rome, 1939).

Dondaine, A., *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition, XIIe-XIIIe siècles. Documents et études* ed. Y. Dossat, (Aldershot, 1990).

Dondaine, A., 'Le Manuel de l'Inquisiteur (1230-1330)', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVII (1947), 85-194, repr. in Dondaine, *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition.*

Dondaine, A., 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie. I Le "De heresi catharorum in Lombardia"' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XIX (1949), 280-312, repr. in Dondaine, *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition.*

Dondaine, A., 'La hiérarchie cathare en Italie II and III', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XX (1950), 234-324, repr. in Dondaine, *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition.*

Dondaine, A., 'Durand de Huesca et la polémique anti-cathare', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XXIV (1959), 228-76, repr. in Dondaine, *Les hérésies et l'Inquisition.*

Dossat, Y., *Les crises de l'inquisition toulousaine au XIIIe siècle* (Bordeaux, 1959).

Dossat, Y., 'Gui Foucois, enquêteur-réformateur, archevêque et pape (Clément IV)', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 7 (1972), 23-57.

Douais, C. (ed.), *La Somme des autorités, à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1896).

Douais, C. (ed.), *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc* (2 vols., Paris, 1900).

Douais, C., 'Les Hérétiques du Midi au XIIIe siècle: Cinq pièces inédits', *Annales du Midi*, III (1891), 367-80.

Duvernoy, J., *Le Catharisme: La religion des Cathares* (Toulouse, 1976).

Duvernoy, J., *Le Catharisme: L'histoire des Cathares* (Toulouse, 1979).

Duvernoy, J., 'L'acception: 'haereticus' (iretge) = 'parfait cathare' en Languedoc au XIII^e siècle', in Lourdaux and Verhelst, *The Concept of Heresy*, 198-210.

Esposito, M.M., 'Sur quelques écrits concernant les hérésies et les hérétiques aux xii^e et xiii^e siècles', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 36 (1940), 143-62.

Études d'Histoire du Droit Canonique Dediées à Gabriel le Bras (Paris, 1965).

Fichtenau, H., *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, transl. D.A. Kaiser (Pennsylvania, 1998), orig. pub. as *Ketzer und Professoren: Häeresie und Vernunftglaube im Hochmittelalter* (Munich, 1992).

Flores, N.C. (ed.), *Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York and London, 1996).

Foreville, R., *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.6, *Latran I,II,III et Latran IV* (Paris, 1965).

Freudenreich, P.I.-M. (ed.), *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien P. Michael Bihl, O.F.M., als Ehrengabe dargeboten* (Strasburg, 1941), 50-64.

García y García, A., 'El concilio IV de Letrán (1215) y sus comentarios', *Traditio*, 14 (1958), 484-502.

Gilchrist, J., '*Simoniaca haeresis* and the Problem of Orders from Leo IX to Gratian', in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law* (1965), 209-235, repr. in *Canon Law in the Age of Reform, 11th-12th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1993).

Given, J.B., *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, N.Y.; London, 1997).

Grabmann, M., 'Der Franziskanerbischof Benedictus de Alignano († 1268) und seine Summa zum Caput Firmiter des vierten Laterankonzils', in P.I.-M. Freudenreich (ed.), *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien P. Michael Bihl, O.F.M., als Ehrengabe dargeboten* (Strasburg, 1941), 50-64.

Grundmann, H., *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. u 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Berlin, 1935); English transl. S. Rowan, *Religious movements in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame and London, 1995).

Grundmann, H., *Ausgewählte Aufsätze,* Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXV (3 vols., 1976), vol.1, 313-27.

Grundmann, H., 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung', in *Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, Festschrift für W. Goetz* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1927) 91-107; repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze,* vol.1, 313-27.

Grundmann, H., '*Litteratus-illiteratus*. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XL (1958), 1-65.

Grundmann, H., 'Oportet et haereses esse. Das Problem der Ketzerei im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Bibelexegese', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XLV (1963), 129-64, Italian transl. by O. Capitani, in *L'eresia medievale*, ed. O. Capitani (Bologna, 1971), 23-60.

Grundmann, H., 'Ketzerverhöre des Spätmittelalters als quellenkritisches Problem', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 21 (1965), 519-75, repr. in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, vol.1, 364-416.

Guiraud, J., *Histoire de l'inquisition* (2 vols., Paris, 1935-38).

Hamilton, B., 'Wisdom from the East: the Reception by the Cathars of Eastern Dualist texts', in Biller and Hudson, *Heresy and Literacy*, 38-60.

Hamilton, B., review of M.G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels*, *American Historical Review*, 107 (2002), 925-26.

Hamilton, S., 'The Virgin Mary in Cathar Thought', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 56.i (2005), 24-49.

Head, T. and R. Landes (eds.), *Essays on the Peace of God: The Church and the People in Eleventh-Century France.* Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques, 14 (3) (1987),

Hudson, A., *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988, repr.2001).

Ilarino da Milano, 'Fr. Gregorio, O.P., Vescovo di Fano, e la "Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum"', *Aevum*, XIV (1940), 85-140.

Iogna-Prat, D., *Ordonner et Exclure. Cluny et la société Chrétienne face à l'hérésie, au Judaïsme, et à l'Islam 1000-1150* (Paris, 1998); English transl. by G.R. Edwards, *Order and Exclusion. Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)* (Ithaca and London, 2002).

Jiménez-Sanchez, P., 'Le "Traité cathare anonyme": un receuil d'autorités à l'usage des prédicateurs cathares', *Heresis*, 31 (1999 for 1996), 73-100.

Kaeppeli, T. and E. Panella, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* (4 vols., Rome, 1970-93).

Kaeppeli, T., 'Une somme contre les hérétiques de S. Pierre Martyr (?)', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVII (1947), 295-335.

Kienzle, B.M., *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229. Preaching in the Lord's Vineyard* (York, 2001).

Kienzle, B.M., 'Tending the Lord's Vineyard: Cistercians, Rhetoric and Heresy, 1143-1229. Part 1: Bernard of Clairvaux, the 1143 Sermons and the 1145 Preaching Mission', *Heresis*, 25 (1995), 26-61.

Kordecki, L., 'Making Animals Mean: Speciest Hermeneutics in the *Physiologus* of Theobaldus', in Flores, *Animals in the Middle Ages*, 85-102.

Kurpiewski, C.M., 'Writing beneath the shadow of heresy: the *Historia Albigensis* of Brother Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay', *Journal of Medieval History*, 31 (2005), 1-27.

Lansing, C., *Power and Purity: Cathar Heresy in Medieval Italy* (Oxford, 1998).

Lauwers, M., '*Dicunt vivorum beneficia nichil prodesse defunctis*. Histoire d'un thème polémique (xi^{e}-xii^{e} siècles)', in Zerner, *Inventer*, 157-92.

Le Bras, G., C. Lefebvre, J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique, 1140-1378: Sources et théorie du droit* (Paris, 1965).

Leclerq, J., *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol.8, *Vienne* (Paris, 1964).

Leff, G., *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages. The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c.1250-c.1450* (2 vols., Manchester, 1967).

Lerner, R., *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1972).

Lobrichon, G., 'Le clair-obscur de l'hérésie au début du XIe siècle en Aquitaine: une lettre d'Auxerre', in T. Head and R. Landes (eds.), *Essays on the Peace of God: The Church and the People in Eleventh-Century France.* Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques, 14 (3) (1987), 422-44.

Lobrichon, G., 'Arras, 1025, ou le vrai procès d'une fausse accusation', in Zerner, *Inventer*, pp.67-85.

Lourdaux, W. and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th – 13th C.)* (Louvain, 1983).

Maisonneuve, H., *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition*, L'Église et l'État au Moyen Âge, 7 (Paris, 1960).

Manselli, R., 'Una "Summa auctoritatum" antiereticale (MS 47 della Bibiothèque Municipale di Albi). Memoria di Raoul Manselli', *Atti della Accademie Nazionale dei Lincei. 1: Classe di Scienze Morale Storiche e Filologiche*, Fasc.6 (1985), 324-397.

Markus, R.A., 'The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church', in E.P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 1, *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries* (London, 1980), 1-15.

McGuire, B.P., 'Written Sources and Cistercian Inspirations in Caesarius of Heisterbach', *Analecta Ciscterciensia*, 35 (1979), 222-82.

McGuire, B.P., 'Friends and Tales in the Cloister: Oral Sources in Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*', *Analecta Cisterciensia*, 36 (1980), 167-247.

McSheffrey, S., 'Heresy, Orthodoxy and English Vernacular Religion 1480-1525', *Past and Present*, 186 (2005), 47-80.

Merlo, G.G., *Eretici e inquisitori nella società piemontese del Trecento: con l'edizione dei processi tenuti a Giaveno dall'inquisitore Alberto De Castellario (1335) e nelle Valli di Lanzo dall'inquisitore Tommaso di Casasco (1373)* (Turin, 1977).

Moore, R.I., *The Origins of European Dissent* (Toronto and London, 1977).

Moore, R.I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society : Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Oxford, 1987).

Moore, R.I., 'Heresy as Disease', in Lourdaux and Verhelst, *The Concept of Heresy*, 1-11.

Moorman, J., *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517* (Oxford, 1968)

Morris, C., *The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050-1250* (Oxford, 1989).

Muessig, C. (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden, 1998).

Muessig, C., 'Les sermons de Jacques de Vitry sur les cathares', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 32 (1997), 69-83.

Nelson, J., 'Society, Theodicy and the Origins of Heresy: Towards a Reassessment of the Medieval Evidence', in D. Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, Studies in Church History, 9 (1972), 65-77

Nelson, J., 'Religion in "Histoire totale": Some Recent Work in Medieval Heresy and Popular Religion', *Religion*, 10 (1980), 60-85.

Nickson, M.A.E., 'The "Pseudo-Reinerius" Treatise, The Final Stage of a Thirteenth-Century Work on Heresy from the Diocese of Passau', *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Litteraire du Moyen Âge*, 34 (1967), 255-314.

Paolini, L., 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in Biller and Hudson, *Heresy and Literacy*, 83-103.

Parmeggiani, R., 'Un secolo di manualistica inquisitoriale (1230-1330): intertestualità e circolazione del diritto', *Rivista Internazionale di Diritto Comune*, 13 (2002), 229-70.

Patschovsky, A., *Der Passauer Anonymus. Ein Sammelwerk über Ketzer, Juden, Antichrist aus der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts,* Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften, XXII (1968).

Patschovsky, A., 'The Literacy of Waldensianism from Valdes to c.1400', in Biller and Hudson, *Heresy and Literacy*, 112-135.

Patschovsky, A., 'Heresy and Society. On the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World', in Bruschi and Biller, *Texts and Repression*, 23-41.

Pegg, M.G., *The Corruption of Angels. The Great Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, 2001).

Petrucci, A., *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy. Studies in the History of Written Culture*, ed. and tr. C.M. Radding (New Haven and London, 1995).

Piazza, A., '"Affinché ... costituzioni di tal genere siano ovunque osservate". Gli statuti di Gregorio IX contra gli eretici d'Italia', in A. Degrandi et. al. (eds.), *Scritti in onore di Girolamo Arnaldi, offerti dalla Scuola nazionale di studi medioevali* (Rome, 2001), 425-458.

Quétif, J. and J. Echard (eds.), *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis*, (2 vols., orig. Paris, 1719-21, repr. New York, 1959).

Reltgen-Tallon, A., 'L'historiographie des Dominicains du Midi: une mémoire originale?', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 36 (2001), 395-414.

Reynolds, L.D. (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983).

Rottenwöhrer, G., *Der Katharismus* (4 vols. in 8, Bad Honnef, 1982).

Rouse, M.A. and R.H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses. Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, 1991).

Rouse, M.A. and R.H. Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians: a New Work by Durand of Huesca', in Waugh and Diehl, *Christendom and its Discontents*, 86-111.

Salisbury, J.E., 'Human Animals of Medieval Fables', in Flores, *Animals in the Middle Ages*, 49-66.

Sanders, E.P. (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 1, *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries* (London, 1980), 1-15.

Schmidt, C., *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois* (2 vols., Paris, 1848-49).

Smalley, B., *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, 1964).

Stock, B., *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton and Guildford, 1983).

Taylor, C., 'The Letter of Heribert of Périgord as a Source for Dualist Heresy in the Society of Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine', *Journal of Modern History*, 26 (2001), 313-49.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia (15 vols., New York, 1967-79).

Thouzellier, C., 'L'*inquisitio* et saint Dominique', and 'Réponse au R.P. Vicaire', *Annales du Midi*, LXXX (1968), 121-130, 137-38.

Tosh, J., *The Pursuit of History* (New York, 1999).

Tubach, F.C., *Index exemplorum, A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales* (Helsinki, 1981).

Tugwell, S., 'Notes on the Life of St. Dominic', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, LXV (1995), 5-169.

Tugwell, S., 'L'évolution des *vitae fratrum*. Résumé des conclusions provisoires', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 36 (2001), 415-18.

Ullmann, W., 'The Significance of Innocent III's decretal "Vergentis"', *Études d'Histoire du Droit Canonique Dediées à Gabriel le Bras* (Paris, 1965).

Vicaire, M.-H., 'Les Cathares albigeois vus par les polémistes', *Cahiers de Fanjeaux*, 3 (1968), 107-28.

Vicaire, M.-H., 'Note sur la mentalité de saint Dominique', *Annales du Midi*, LXXX (1968), 131-36.

Wakefield, W.L. and A.P.Evans (tr.), *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York, 1969, repr.1991).

Wakefield, W.L., *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France 1100-1250* (London, 1974).

Wakefield, W.L., 'Notes on Some Anti-heretical Writings of the Thirteenth Century', *Franciscan Studies*, 27 (1967) 285-321.

Wakefield, W.L., 'Some unorthodox popular ideas of the thirteenth century', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, n.s.4 (1973), 23-35.

Waugh, S.L. and P.D. Diehl (eds.), *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution and Rebellion, 1000-1500* (Cambridge, 1996).

Welter, J.T., *L'*exemplum *dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du Moyen âge; La* tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti, *recueil d'*exempla *compilé en France à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Paris and Toulouse, 1927, repr. Geneva, 1973).

Wessley, S., 'The Composition of Georgius' *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum hereticum*', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XLVIII (1978), 55-61.

Winroth, A., *The Making of Gratian's* Decretum (Cambridge, 2000).

Wogan-Browne, J. et.al. (eds.), *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain. Essays for Felicity Riddy*, (Turnhout, 2000), 363-76.

Wolter, H. and H. Holstein, *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques*, vol. 7, *Lyons I et Lyons II* (Paris, 1966).

Zerner, M. (ed.), *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition* (Nice, 1998).

Ziegler, J., *Medicine and Religion c.1300. The Case of Arnau de Vilanova* (Oxford, 1998).