CATHARS AND THE MATERIAL WORLD

by PETER BILLER

ON 6 August 1221 Dominic 'migrated to Christ' in the Dominican convent in Bologna. He had no bed of his own and he had lent his only tunic to someone. As he slept in the convent, he was lying on a borrowed bed and dressed in borrowed clothes.

This was the story later told by Moneta of Cremona, the friar who had lent his bed and clothing to the dying holy man.[1] Moneta features in another story, collected by a friar who was commissioned by a general chapter of the Order in 1256 to collect miracles and tales illustrating the wonderful early progress of the Order. Progress included the entry of important men.[2] At Bologna there was 'Master Moneta, who was then famous throughout Lombardy for his lecturing in the arts'.[3] The Dominican friar Reginald was preaching with great success in Bologna. Fearing the power of Reginald's sermons, Moneta tried to keep his students away from them. But he failed to protect himself. He happened to hear Reginald's preaching and was captivated by the first words he heard, falling to his knees and making his religious profession on the spot. Thus the great university master became humble and entered the Dominican Order. 'The quality of his holiness after his entry into the Order cannot easily be described', the account concludes, 'nor how much progress he made in word and teaching and in the confutation of heresies'.[4]

[1] Stephen of Salagnac and Bernard Gui, *De quatuor in quibus Deus Praedicatorum ordinem insignivit* 3.2, ed. T. Kaeppeli, Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica 22 (Rome, 1949), 33. For a modern account of these events, see M.-H. Vicaire, *Saint Dominic and His Times*, trans. K. Pond (London, 1964), 373–74.

[2] Gerald of Frachet, Prior Provincial of Provence. His *Vitae Fratrum* was written in 1259–60; ed. B. Reichert, Monumenta Ordinis Praedicatorum Historica 1 (Louvain, 1896).

[3] Ibid. 4.10 (ed. Reichert, 169): 'magister Moneta, qui tunc in artibus legens in tota Lombardia famosus erat'.

[4] Ibid. 4.10 (ed. Reichert, 170): 'Ingressus autem ordinem, qualis in omni sanctitate fuerit, quantum in verbo et doctrina et heresium confutacione profecerit, non de facili scribi posset.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This was in 1219, and Moneta died around 1260.[5] We know little about him between these dates, apart from the fact that he fought valiantly against heretics, and that around 1241 he wrote a treatise against Cathars and Waldensians.[6] Cathars occupy most of the space in this massive work. Moneta begins it by dividing them theologically into two main groups. One comprised those who believed in two Gods, creators of two alternative worlds, the evil God creating the visible material world. The other group contained those Cathars that believed in one God who, after creating matter, had allowed the Devil to shape it. These two forms of theological dualism led to the rejection of the good God's or the one God's creation of flesh and bodies, the notion that Mary and Christ took on real human flesh, the sacrament of marriage and the resurrection of the body.

The presence of such heretical dualism in Latin Christendom can be seen as significant in the genesis of a profound shift in Catholic Christianity. One aspect of this was increasing spiritual and mystical emphasis on the humanity and flesh of Christ and the emergence of the feast of Corpus Christi.[7] Another aspect was the Franciscan and Dominican friars' promotion in the new universities of a natural science of God's creation – the natural world – based upon recently translated works of Aristotle.[8] This broader picture and the theme of 'The Churches and the Natural World' provide the setting for this paper and its object. This is to look at and characterize more closely one of the consequences of Cathar dualist theology: the notion that the natural world that we can see was created by the bad God or the Devil. We shall do this

[5] See, on him, T. Kaeppeli and E. Panella, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 4 vols (Rome, 1970–93), 3: 137–39.

[6] Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque*, ed. T. A. Ricchini (Rome, 1743). On the manuscripts, see Kaeppeli and Panella, *Scriptores*, 2: 138–9, 4: 201; *Quellen zur Böhmische Inquisition im 14. Jahrhundert*, ed. A. Patschovsky, MGH Quellen 2 (Weimar, 1979), 87–88.

[7] C.W. Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley, CA, 1982), 130–31, 134; eadem, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, CA, 1987), 64, 252–53; eadem, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York, 1991), 143–44; M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1992).

[8] R. French and A. Cunningham, *Before Science: The Invention of the Friars' Natural Philosophy* (Aldershot, 1996), expound the view of this interest in the natural world as a response to heretical dualism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by looking at what Moneta wrote and what was said by Cathar believers questioned by inquisitors in Languedoc.

The approach adopted here needs explanation. Moneta presents textual puppets. A 'heretic' states a doctrine, and cites in its support *auctoritates* (passages from scripture) and *rationes* (arguments), and a 'Catholic' then rejects the doctrine, citing counter-authorities and stating counter-arguments. It all seems rather remote from lived religion. This quality of apparent abstractness has its part to play in a debate that is now raging among scholars about the nature of Catharism, a dispute which has suggested this selection of evidence.

At issue is the question whether we should retain or abandon the notion of two great high medieval sects, Catharism and Waldensianism, possessing a degree of identity or coherence. The demolition corps used to concentrate on arguing about a document emanating from a Cathar council of around 1170. This had to be a forgery, otherwise Catharism seemed both organized and ecclesial: too solid an entity. Now the front has widened, and the troops are led by an Australian historian who works in the United States, Mark Pegg. Pegg has produced two books of remarkable power and skill in which he has attempted to dismantle our picture of Catharism.[9]

According to Pegg, they were not called 'Cathars', nor were their preachers called 'perfects' (*perfecti*). They did not have an international organization. Cathar followers' 'adoration' of a 'perfect' was no more than a construction on the part of the inquisitors. They took something which was no more than a local custom of civility in Languedoc, namely doing lots of bowing when one met people, and constructed it into a formal ritual. Records of replies by heresy suspects are misleading. This is because questions were thought up by friars, who were trained in sequential logic, and then put to simple people whose minds were innocent of that mental mode of connectivity, innocent that is, until the moment of questioning. Although Pegg does not say this, the suggestion is analogous to the notion in modern physics that enti-

[9] M. G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, NJ, 2001); *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford, 2008). See the reviews of *The Corruption of Angels* by B. Hamilton, *AHR* 107 (2002), 925; P. Biller, *Speculum* 78 (2003), 1366–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ties are changed by the fact of measurement. Further, it is the friars who had abstract theological ideas in their minds, rather than the simple folk they were questioning. We should be sceptical, therefore, when the record shows such deponents, under questioning, making apparently abstract theological statements. There is no real early evidence of people in Languedoc believing in dualism and therefore rejecting God's creation of this present, material, visible, natural world. Above all, Pegg argues, modern historians have not shaken off an understanding of medieval heresy that is rooted in a nineteenth-century idealist way of envisaging a religion, as a coherent set of ideas, disembodied and disengaged from the real people who lived it. The historian's task is that of demolishing historians' idealist mythical constructions of these sects. In their place he or she should recover and describe the infinitely varying colours and shapes of the real individual's momentary contacts with a wide variety of thoughts and actions, some of which were named and conceptualized by Dominican friars and shoe-horned into an organized system of ideas labelled 'heresy'.

This onslaught on the conventional picture of Catharism means that our first question must be both more elementary and more fundamental than it might have been in a more confident period thirty or forty years ago. Is rejection of divine creation of the natural world actually there, and if so what forms does it take? In what ways do the surviving texts construct the reality which (we used to think) we can discern through them?

Here we shall begin by applying these questions to two texts that are very close in time and that seem to play well to Pegg's tune. One is the representation of Cathar theology in Moneta's text, from around 1241. Its exploitation by modern historians could be evidence for one of Pegg's indictments, that idealist historians' accounts of the beliefs of heretics are disembodied and detached from human beings and context. The contention can be tested. The other text is a manuscript containing the interrogations of over five thousand people in the Lauragais area of Languedoc in 1245–6. This moves the investigation onto Pegg's own ground: it is the evidence exclusively used in his first book. These two texts also test the point about internationalism: one is from Lombardy, the other from Languedoc. Finally, on virtually every folio in the manuscript of interrogations, we can read two highly trained friar inquisitors, John of St Pierre and Bernard of Caux, putting

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

five theological questions to suspects. Pegg used the rest of this manuscript to produce a colourful picture of various locales in Languedoc, and in this luminous canvas these theological propositions – including denial of divine creation of the natural world – were simply alien intrusions coming from the minds of these friar inquisitors. Is this a persuasive view?

Let us look first at Moneta. A French Dominican memorializing him in the later thirteenth century described Moneta's five-book treatise as a 'most strong and enormous summa' (*validissima et maxima summa*) against heretics.[10] Its length, over 500,000 words, prevented it from becoming a best-seller, but it is extant in fifteen manuscripts, and we know that one, in a Benedictine monastery in Garsten near Steyer, was still being read in the 1390s.[11]

Earlier we summarized Moneta's preliminary account of Cathar faith. Let us return to this account to sample the words he uses.

> There are some of them who assert that there are two principles, without beginning and end. One they say is the father of Christ and all the just and the God of light, the other ... the God of darkness. They believe he [the God of darkness] created those four elements that we see, namely earth, water, air and fire, and all the things that are on this earth or this water or this air, likewise also the visible sky and all its adornment, that is to say the sun, the moon and the stars. They believe that this is the God about whom Moses spoke in chapter 1 of Genesis, *In the beginning God created heaven and earth.* ... They believe that the transitory and visible things of this world (*visibilia ista et transitoria*) come from him by creation. Conversely, they believe that the God, who is father of Christ and the just, is the creator only of permanent and eternal things, and that he created his own other four elements, and all the things that are in them, and his own heavens, and that he ordained [these other heavens] with a sun other than this visible one, and another moon and other stars ...[12]

[10] Stephen of Salagnac and Bernard Gui, *De quatuor in quibus* 3.2 (ed. Kaeppeli, 33). A terminus is given by the death in 1291 of the author of this part, Stephen of Salagnac.

[11] P. Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170–1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church*, Collected Studies 676 (Aldershot, 2001), 258–61, 273, 276, 290, 295.

[12] Moneta, *Adversus Catharos* 1, Descriptio fidei haereticorum (ed. Ricchini, 3): 'Quidam illorum duo asserunt principia sine initio et sine fine. Unum dicunt patrem

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Postponing his account of the beliefs of the other Cathars, Moneta now gets down to highly organized and systematic exposition and refutation. The heretic puts forward a proposition which is stated, he supports it with an authority (*auctoritas*), that is to say, a quotation from scripture, which is quoted, and he also supports it with logical arguments (*rationes*). Then, in alternating chapters, the Catholic opponent puts counter-statements of doctrine, counter-quotations from Scripture, and counter-arguments, some of them derived logically from axioms.

A fair number of comparable anti-Cathar treatises were written in northern Italy during the middle decades of the thirteenth century.[13] Though shorter than Moneta's, they are similar in style. Dualist heretical and Catholic beliefs are counterposed in a very formal fashion. One of them is a dispute presented as a dialogue between a Catholic and a heretic, virtually a script providing dialogue for a play. The protagonists whack each other over the head with scriptural quotations and arguments. Two of these treatises were written by convert heretics (Rainier Sacconi and Andrew of Florence), and it comes as no great surprise to find one written by a layman (Salvo Burci of Piacenza), given the levels of lay literacy in Italy. These Catholic treatises had their heretical counterparts, for the heretics of northern Italy also wrote theological treatises. These treatises were rooted in the realities of their time and place. Given the relative ineffectiveness of inquisi-

Christi et omnium justorum et Deum lucis, alium ... Deum tenebrarum. Isti credunt eum creasse quatuor elementa ista quae vidimus, scilicet terram, aquam, aerem et ignem, et omnia quae in terra hac vel in aqua ista vel in aere isto sunt, similiter et caelum istud visibile et omnem ornamentum eorum [*recte*: eius], scilicet solem, lunam et stella. Credunt etiam quod iste sit Deus de quo ait Moyses, Genes. cap. 1, *in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram etc.* ... Isti credunt visibilia ista et transitoria esse ab illo per creationem. E converso credunt Deum patrem Christi et justorum esse creatorem permanentium tantum et aeternorum, et credunt quod ipse alia sua quatuor elementa creaverit et omnia quae in eis sunt et suos caelos, et quod ordinaverit sole alio quam sit iste visibilis, et alia luna et aliis stellis.'

[13] See for the following, L. Paolini, 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in P. Biller and A. Hudson, eds, *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), 83–103. Notable among modern editions of these treatises are F. Šanjek, 'Raynerius Sacconi O. P. Summa de Catharis', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 44 (1974), 42–60; *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum Hereticum*, ed. C. Hoécker, Edizione Nazionale dei Testi Mediolatini 4, series 1, 3 (Tavarnuzze, 2001); Salvo Burci, *Liber Suprastella*, ed. C. Bruschi, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Fonti per la Storia dell'Italia Medievale, Antiquitates 15 (Rome, 2002); Andreas Florentinus, *Summa contra hereticos*, ed. G. Rottenwöhrer, MGH Quellen 23 (Hanover, 2008).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion in Italy up to 1250, much of the struggle between Catholic Christianity and heresy was carried on in preaching and debate. Catholics and heretics argued with each other.

Turning back to Moneta's treatise, let us read it further with these things in mind, and ask about the relation between these arguments and the textual dialogue in Moneta's treatise or in the *Dispute between a Catholic and a Paterine Heretic.*[14] Would Moneta's treatise have been of any use to Catholics engaged in such debates if it had not accurately represented heretical positions? Questioning Moneta's text, we begin to notice some of the variations in the words he uses to attribute statements to a heretic. Most commonly we read 'the heretic says that' or 'the heretic argues that'. But we also encounter 'as a certain Cathar wrote'; 'they want to show this by many testimonies, which can be found in the writings of a heretic called Tetricus'; 'as a heretic wrote in a certain treatise of his'; 'Note that a heretic wrote and taught that'; and 'a heresiarch called Desiderius ... sometimes preached and wrote'.[15] At one point Moneta even supplies a text we could add to Anthony Grafton's history of academic citation:[16] 'As the heretic Tetricus wrote in one part of a certain book of his, in chapter 2'.[17] While Moneta's accuracy cannot be checked here, because Tetricus's work does not survive, it receives striking confirmation in another example. Moneta ascribes to the heretics the proposition that the serpent tempting Eve had sex with her using his tail,[18] in words which closely paraphrase the still extant text, once possessed and used by the Cathars, *The Questions of John* (*Interrogatio Iohannis*).[19]

[14] From the second half of the twelfth century, 'Patarene' denoted Italian Cathars: *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum Hereticum*, ed. Hoécker, xvi–xvii.

[15] Moneta, *Adversus Catharos* 1.3.2, 1.6.3, 1.8.3, 3.3.4, 4.1.9 (ed. Ricchini, 42, 71, 94, 248, 292): 'sicut quidam Catharus scripsit'; 'volunt autem hoc habere pluribus testimoniis, quae in scriptis cujusdam haeretici Tetrici nomine reperi [possunt]'; 'ut haereticus dixit in quodam suo tractatu'; 'nota haereticum dixisse et scripsisse quod'; 'haeresiarcha qui Desiderius vocatur ... aliquando ...praedicavit et scripsit'.

[16] A. Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA, 1997).

[17] Moneta, *Adversus Catharos* 1.6.2 (ed. Ricchini, 79): 'sicut Thetricus haereticus in quadam parte cujusdam libri sui cap. II'.

[18] Ibid. 1.1.2 (ed. Ricchini, 111).

[19] E. Bozóky, *Le livre secret des Cathares, Interrogatio Iohannis: Apocryphe d'origine Bogomile*, Textes Dossiers Documents 2 (Paris, 1980), 60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

After invoking the memory of Dominic, Moneta began his work with a statement that is both consciously written within a rhetorical tradition and at the same time a heartfelt plea:

> One thing however I beg of the readers of this work ... where they will have seen me positing certain arguments against the Church or replies on behalf of heretics, they should not tear into me, saying that these did not originate with the heretics, but that I used my own ingenuity to invent the sort of things that could nourish and help heretical wickedness. For I got these things from their own mouths and writings.[20]

Two things have become clear. First of all, we should avoid slipping from observation of the abstractness of the contents of this theological treatise into envisaging it as abstracted from reality. It was rooted in the reality of theological debates in Lombard cities. Secondly, while we can attribute the clarity of organization of the treatise to the powerful clarity of Moneta's own mind, the case of its contents is different. As we have seen, there is every reason to believe Moneta's opening remarks. That is to say, there is every reason to read his presentation of heretics' doctrines, authorities and arguments as acute and sharp quotations, paraphrases and summaries of what contemporary Italian heretics were actually writing and saying. Book 1, chapter 8, part 1 is entitled 'Heretics' proof that transitory things are not from God'. 'Let us see with what testimonies they are led to believe this', writes Moneta. 'As the Lord says, Matthew 24, verse 35, *Heaven and Earth will pass away*. From this they say, that because it will pass away, this visible heaven [the sky] is not from the good God'.[21] Reading the quotation and its interpretation, we are reading what the heretics said and wrote.

As we wander through Moneta's pages we see that the scriptural texts picked up by Cathar and Catholic debaters threw up

[20] Moneta, *Adversus Catharos* 1, Praefatio (ed. Ricchini, 2): 'Unum autem peto a lectoribus huius operis ... ubi etiam viderint me ponere argumenta aliqua contra Ecclesiam aut responsiones pro haereticis, non me lacerent, dicentes ea non ab haereticis duxisse originem sed me proprio ingenio adinvenisse hujusmodi quae possent nutrire et augere haereticam pravitatem – quia vel ex ore eorum vel ex scripturis illa habui.'

[21] Ibid. 1.8.1 (ed. Ricchini, 80, 81): 'Probatio haereticorum quod transitoria non sunt a Deo. ... Ut dicit Dominus, Matth. 24. v. 35, *Caelum et terra transibunt*.' I have not compared the printed text with manuscripts to see whether the enumeration of the verse comes from the eighteenth-century editor.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a miscellany of things concerning the natural world. Topics that were supplied by Scripture and invited argument about creation by a good or evil God included hunger and the enjoyment of food;[22] the rising and the setting of the sun;[23] sparrows;[24] poisonous creatures and harmful animals;[25] fields, seed and fruit;[26] the sky, the earth and the sea;[27] the distinction of four seasons;[28] the habitability or not of parts of the globe;[29] and the disposition of the bodies of a woman and of a man.[30] Although Moneta writes in a studiedly Olympian fashion, his prose can convey visceral disgust, as for example when he presents heretics using St Paul's letter to the Philippians (3: 8), 'I regard as excrement', as the basis for heretics seeing things as *foetida et inmunda*, 'stinking and dirty.'[31] Occasionally we can pick up something that is deeply felt. Debate about one of the four elements provides a momentary glimpse of two bitter contemporary realities, poverty and the burning of heretics. The heretic asks, 'How can it be that this fire comes from good creation, fire that burns the house of a little poor woman, and also in fact [the bodies] of holy men?'[32]

Moneta reports that heretics wanted to prove their case not only by scriptural authorities but also by logical arguments. The first of the latter cited by Moneta begins with a dictum from Aristotle's *On Generation and Corruption*, that the principles of contraries are contraries, and uses this to show that an evil principle created this world. Since good and evil are contraries, they have contrary principles. Since, therefore, the Highest Good is the cause of good, the principle of evil will be the highest evil.[33] Of more concern for us is the argument about the mutable materiality of the world rather

22 Ibid. 1.1.2 (ed. Ricchini, 22).
23 Ibid. 1.8.2 (ed. Ricchini, 84).
24 Ibid. 1.8.2 (ed. Ricchini, 86).
25 Ibid. 2.1.1 (ed. Ricchini, 116).
26 Ibid. 1.8.2 (ed. Ricchini, 87).
27 Ibid. 1.8.3 (ed. Ricchini, 89).
28 Ibid. 2.2.5 (ed. Ricchini, 122).
29 Ibid. 2.2.5 (ed. Ricchini, 122).
30 Ibid., 2.2.5 (ed. Ricchini, 123).
31 Ibid. 1.8.1 (ed. Ricchini, 82).
32 Ibid. 2.3.1 (ed. Ricchini, 124).
33 Ibid. 1.1.3 (ed. Ricchini, 23). These axiomatic arguments are investigated more fully in 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*, SCH S 11 (Woodbridge, 1999), 25–53.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

than its moral evil. 'They adduce a certain proposition. If a cause is invariable, so are its effects. Since therefore these visible things are variable, it cannot be that their cause is the holy and true God, who is invariable'.[34]

While Moneta states arguments used by heretics of his time and his Lombard milieu, the statements themselves draw us towards France. A strange, but never refuted, letter reported by Matthew Paris stated that Lombard and Tuscan heretics sent their cleverest students to Paris to learn logic. The axiomatic genre of theological argument had been in vogue in the theology faculty in the nascent University of Paris in the second half of the twelfth century. The axiomatic propositions reported by Moneta were repeated by Guillaume of Auxerre, who was a master in the theology faculty in Paris and knew of dualist heretics in the diocese of Auxerre.[35] We are just able to perceive a web of connections between identical propositions, proving that the material world was not created by the good God, which were held in common by the dualist heretics of Lombardy and of France. Given that the Cathars tried to be secret, we are lucky to be able to find such clear evidence about the links between them in different kingdoms.

Let us turn to the manuscript containing interrogations of 1245–6 of deponents from the Lauragais in Languedoc: Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 609, (henceforth Toulouse 609).[36] On 27 May 1245 Pons Rainard of Mas-Saintes-Puelles took an oath and was questioned. He had seen heretics in the house of Peter of Saint André, namely John Cambitor and his companion, and with them William Vital; Bernard, the Lord of Mas-Saintes-Puelles; Arnold of Rosergue; Raymond of Causit and many others whom he could not recall. And all of them, together with him the witness, then adored the said heretics. And this was about fourteen years ago or thereabouts. He confessed five other similar sightings and actions, all dated. Then he confessed that he believed the heretics were good and had good faith, and that they told the truth and were friends of God. 'And he heard the heretics saying that

[34] Moneta, *Adversus Catharos* 1.8.1 (ed. Ricchini, 83): 'inducunt quamdam propositionem: si causa invariabilis, et effectus ejus. Cum ergo ista visibilia sint variabilia, non potest esse quod caussa [*sic*] eorum sit Deus sanctus et verus, qui invariabilis est.'

[35] Biller, 'Northern Cathars', 28–33, 50–53.

[36] The fundamental study of this manuscript is Y. Dossat, *Les crises de l'inquisition Toulousaine au XIII^e siècle (1233–1273)* (Bordeaux, 1959), chs 2–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

God had not made visible things, and that the sacred host was not the body of Christ, and that baptism of water was worth nothing, and that there was no salvation in marriage. And he the witness believed just as they said.'[37] The deposition concludes with a statement about a previous confession to an inquisitor, confession of an item Pons had forgotten, and abjuration of heresy.

The manuscript contains depositions from over five thousand people. Many of the depositions were not like this – they simply record denials and there was no further questioning. But where deponents had had a fair degree of involvement with heretics, the questioning usually went like Pons Rainard's. Most of what the scribes recorded was the answers deponents gave. But we know how the questions went from these answers and also from a standard question-list that was drawn up in the same decade. Did you see a heretic? In the case of a 'yes' to this question, the follow-ups were: Who was he or she? In whose house did you see the heretic? Who else did you see there? Did you engage in the ritual of adoration? How long ago was this?[38]

Before we analyse the question about God's creation of visible things, we need to bear in mind the relationship between action and belief in inquisitors' questions. Presented in its simplest form, the history of inquisitors' questions in Languedoc has two stages. In the first stage, inquisitors asked questions about actions only, beginning with the question about seeing a heretic, and going on to 'Did you hear a heretic?' The one nod in the direction of belief in the 1240s question-list came at the end: 'Did you believe the heretics to be good and to have good faith?' In the second stage, in the early fourteenth century, inquisitors were still asking, 'Did you see a heretic?', but the question 'Did you hear a heretic?' was now followed by the further question, 'What did he say?' This could open the floodgates, and depositions could now contain a lot of memories of heretics' sermons.

This potted history needs immediate qualification. At any given time, one inquisitor might well differ from another in the

[37] Toulouse 609, fol. 1^{v}: 'Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi, et quod baptismus aque nichil valet, et quod in matrimonio non est salus. Et ipse testis credebat sicut ipse dicebant.'

[38] *Texte zur Inquisition*, ed. K.-V. Selge, Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte 4 (Gütersloh, 1967), 71–72; ET in W. L. Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100–1250* (London, 1974), 250–58.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

extent and type of their curiosity, as we see in the early fourteenth century with the contrast between the more laconic records of Bernard Gui and the immensely detailed ones of Jacques Fournier. And although actions predominated in inquisitors' minds at this earlier period, in the 1240s, we do see the two main inquisitors of Toulouse 609, John and Bernard, showing a penchant for a little group of questions about doctrine. Here they are again, at the end of the confession of Raymond del Pont of Mas-Saintes-Puelles, where they appear transparently through the answers, though the scribe has compressed answers to two questions (on baptism and marriage) into one statement. 'And he heard them saying errors: about visible things, that God had not made them; about the sacred host, that it is not the body of Christ or the Lord; about baptism and marriage, that they do not have power for salvation; about resurrection of the flesh, that it will not be.'[39] There is no doubt about the source and role of this little quintet of questions. They were formulated by the two friar inquisitors. If the inquisitors thought a witness had had sufficient contact with heretics for hearing, understanding and memory of doctrine to be possible, these were the five questions they put to them. The questions were always the same.

Two modern historians of inquisition texts, John Arnold and Caterina Bruschi, have commented very acutely on the reading of depositions like these. Writing within a range of ideas drawn from Michel Foucault, John Arnold has said that inquisitors' questions developed and marked out a field of knowledge.[40] This does not lead to simple reduction of the truthfulness of what a deponent was recorded as saying, when he or she was questioned within this field. If inquisitors asked about A but not about B, the records of their interrogations will tell us about A, and the exclusion of B does not mean that A has been conjured up out of the air. In her discussion of formulaic questions put by inquisitors, Caterina

[39] Toulouse 609, fol. 7^{v}: 'et audivit eos dicentes errores: de visibilibus, quod Deus non fecerat ea; de hostia sacrata, quod non est corpus Christi vel Domini; de baptismo et matrimonio, quod non valent ad salutem; de resurrectione carnis, quod non erit.'

[40] J. H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, PA, 2001); idem, 'Inquisition, Texts and Discourse', in C. Bruschi and P. Biller, eds, *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge, 2003), 63–80, at 69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bruschi has divided the content of replies into two parts.[41] One part is the responses to the formulaic questions, when these are couched in the words of the questions that have been put. The other part contains variations in words and additions in substance. The second part she calls the 'surplus'. The more formulaic and repetitive the questions and the answers to them are, the more significant is this 'surplus'. Bearing these comments in mind, let us now look more closely at replies to John's and Bernard's five questions about doctrine.

If these five questions were like boxes in a questionnaire, how free were deponents to choose to tick or cross? 209 deponents put a tick, admitting that they had heard the heretics expressing these errors.[42] Among these, quite a lot said that they had only heard one or two of the errors.[43] A further handful initially said they had not heard the errors and then said they had done so.[44] This retraction suggests that, if any lying was going on, it was in this direction, that is to say, minimizing what a deponent had heard. Nevertheless, 174 put a cross in the box, saying said they had not heard heretics expressing these errors.[45] And usually the inquisitors left the matter at that.

[41] C. Bruschi, '"Magna diligentia est habenda per inquisitorem": Precautions before Reading Doat 21–26', in Bruschi and Biller, eds, *Texts*, 81–110, at 94.

[42] In the following, a number inside parentheses indicates the number of times something is attested. Toulouse 609, fols 1^{r} (2), 1^{v} (2), 2^{r} (2), 2^{v}, 3^{r}, 4^{v}, 5^{r}, 5^{v}, 6^{r}, 7^{v}, 8^{r}, 10^{r}, 10^{v} (2), 11^{r}, 12^{v}, 13^{v} (2), 14^{v}, 15^{r}, 16^{r}, 18^{r-v}, 19^{v}, 20^{r}, 21^{r}, 21^{v}–22^{r}, 22^{r}, 22^{v}, 24^{v}, 31^{r}, 32^{r}, 33^{r} (2), 33^{v} (2), 34^{r}, 34^{v}, 36^{r}, 40^{r}, 41^{rv} (2), 43^{v}, 45^{r}, 50^{r}, 50^{v} (2), 51^{v}, 52^{r}, 55^{v}, 56^{r} (2), 56^{v}, 58^{v}, 60^{r}, 62^{r} (2), 62^{v}, 63^{v}, 64^{r}, 64^{v}, 65^{v}, 66^{v}, 67^{r}, 67^{v}, 69^{r}, 70^{r}, 71^{v}, 72^{r-v}, 72^{v}, 73^{r} (2), 73^{v} (5), 74^{r} (5), 74^{v} (5), 75^{r} (4), 75^{v} (2), 76^{v}, 77^{r}, 77^{v} (2), 79^{r} (2), 80^{r}, 87^{v}, 88^{v}, 90^{v}, 91^{v}, 94^{r}, 96^{r}, 98^{r}, 99^{v}, 100^{r}, 101^{r}, 101^{v}, 102^{r}, 103^{r}, 110^{v} (2), 111^{r}, 112^{r}, 114^{v} (2), 117^{v}, 120^{r} (2), 121^{v}, 122^{r}, 123^{v}, 125^{r}, 126^{v}, 127^{r}, 130^{r}, 130^{v}, 131^{r}, 132^{v}, 133^{r} (2), 134^{r}, 136^{r}, 137^{r}, 140^{v}, 141^{r}, 142^{v}, 143^{r} (2), 144^{v}, 146^{r}, 147^{v}, 148^{r}, 149^{r}, 149^{v}, 150^{v}, 151^{v}, 152^{r}, 153^{v}, 154^{r}, 154^{v}, 155^{v}, 156^{r} (2), 156^{v} (3), 158^{r}, 158^{v}, 159^{r}, 159^{v}, 160^{v}, 164^{r}, 167^{v}, 168^{r}, 171^{r}, 173^{r-v}, 174^{r}, 175^{r}, 184^{v}, 187^{r}, 187^{v}, 188^{r}, 192^{v}–193^{r}, 193^{v}, 194^{r} (3), 195^{r}, 196^{v}, 197^{r}, 198^{r}, 198^{v}, 201^{r}, 203^{v} (2), 204^{v}, 210^{v}, 215^{r}, 215^{v}, 216^{r}, 219^{v} (2), 220^{r}, 220^{v}, 221^{v}, 224^{v}, 225^{r}, 225^{v}, 228^{r}, 235^{v}, 236^{v}, 243^{r}, 246^{v}, 251^{r}.

[43] Ibid. fols 4^{v}, 12^{v}, 19^{v}, 20^{r}, 24^{v}, 33^{r} (2), 41^{v}, 50^{r}, 50^{v} (2), 52^{r}, 62^{r}, 63^{v}, 64^{r}, 66^{v}, 67^{v}, 70^{r}, 71^{v}, 75^{r} (2), 76^{v}, 79^{r}, 110^{v}, 111^{r}, 122^{r} (2), 122^{v}, 123^{r}, 126^{v}, 130^{r}, 131^{r}, 132^{v}, 133^{r}, 136^{r}, 137^{r}, 143^{r}, 144^{v}, 146^{r}, 147^{v}, 149^{v}, 155^{v}, 156^{r} (2), 156^{v}, 158^{r} (2), 158^{v}, 164^{r}, 194^{r}, 204^{v}, 243^{r}.

[44] Ibid. fols 10^{v}–11^{r}, 21^{v}–22^{r}, 196^{v}; see also 210^{v}.

[45] Ibid. fols 1^{v}, 3^{v}, 5^{r}, 6^{v} (2), 7^{r} (2), 8^{v}, 9^{v}, 10^{r}, 12^{v}, 13^{r}, 14^{r} (2), 14^{v}, 16^{v}, 17^{r}, 17^{v}, 18^{r}, 18^{v}, 19^{r} (2), 19^{v}, 20^{r} (3), 21^{r}, 21^{v}, 23^{r}, 24^{r}, 25^{r}, 25^{v}, 26^{r} (2), 29^{r}, 29^{v}, 30^{v}, 31^{r}, 32^{v}, 351, 37^{v}, 38^{v}, 39^{r} (2), 40^{v} (2), 45^{v}, 49^{r} (2), 50^{v} (2), 51^{r}, 51^{v} (3), 52^{r} (2), 56^{v}, 57^{r} (2), 59^{r}, 69^{v}, 70^{r}, 73^{r} (2), 73^{v} (2), 74^{v}, 76^{r}, 76^{v}, 77^{r}, 78^{r} (3), 78^{v} (2), 79^{r}, 83^{r}, 83^{v}, 84^{r}, 87^{r}, 87^{v} (2), 88^{r} (4), 91^{v}, 92^{v}, 93^{r}, 94^{v}, 95^{r}, 97^{v}, 101^{v}, 105^{r}, 105^{v}, 108^{r}, 109^{r}, 110^{r}, 113^{r}, 115^{r} (3), 118^{r} (2), 118^{v}, 121^{r}, 121^{v} (2), 123^{v}, 130^{r}, 132^{r} (2), 134^{v} (2), 135^{r}, 135^{v}, 137^{r} (2), 137^{r-v}, 137^{v} (2), 138^{r}, 141^{v} (2), 142^{r}, 146^{v}, 152^{r},

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The variation of response and the ready permission of negatives does not fit the suggestion that theologically minded friars were forcibly injecting these propositions into the minds of the deponents, but it accords well with John Arnold's comments. This quintet of questions constitutes the field of knowledge demarcated by the inquisitors. Relative freedom of response – in this set of depositions, at any rate – indicates that *within* this field we are getting to know things. Beyond ticks and crosses there are other things, however, variations and additions that fall within Caterina Bruschi's notion of 'surplus'. Asked the same question, 'Did you hear the heretics saying that that God had not made visible things?', a deponent could simply say, 'Yes', and be recorded affirming this in the same words as the question. But some added something, saying that they had heard the doctrines 'many times'.[46] A deponent could specify that the heretics 'preached' (rather than or as well as 'said'),[47] or identify the heretics in question. Peter Safaia of Laurac had received two female heretics into his house, Bruna his lady and her companion Rixenda. They stayed there for a week around 1234 and he heard them *predicantes*, 'preaching', the doctrines, beginning with God not having made visible things.[48]

Most significant, of course, are the precise words they produced. One deponent responded to the question about *visibilia*, visible things, with *transitoria*, transitory things. We are reminded of the couplet *visibilia et transitoria* with which Moneta opened his account. Some deponents switched from the negative about God to a positive: 'the devil had made all these visible things'.[49] Another remembered that 'flesh and blood will not possess the kingdom of heaven'.[50] Some replies included snatches of remembered phrases.

157^{r}, 160^{v}, 161^{v}, 162^{r}, 163^{r} (2), 163^{v}, 164^{v}, 167^{v}, 168^{r}, 169^{r}, 171^{r}, 171^{v}, 172^{r}, 174^{v}, 182^{r}, 185^{r}, 188^{r}, 189^{v}, 190^{r}, 190^{v}, 192^{r}, 193^{r} (2), 193^{v}, 194^{v}, 195^{r} (2), 195^{v}, 203^{v}, 204^{v}, 207^{v}, 213r, 214^{v}, 220^{r}, 221^{v}, 222^{v}, 225^{v}, 231^{r} (2), 232^{r}, 232^{v}, 235^{v}, 236^{r} (2), 252^{r}. Here I have noted those whose denials list the errors or refer to 'errors' (*errores*), suggesting questioning on the individual doctrines. Not noted are those who denied hearing heretics 'preaching' (*predicantes*), a reply that suggests that they deponents had only been asked the general question, 'Did you hear them preaching?', and had not been taken through the individual doctrines.

[46] Ibid. fol. 45^{r}: 'multociens'; for other examples, see fols 55^{v}, 75^{v}, 134^{r}, 224^{v}, 251^{r}.

[47] Ibid. fols 188^{r}, 246^{v}.

[48] Ibid. fols 192^{v}–193^{r}.

[49] Ibid. fol. 158^{r}: 'diabolus fecerat omnia ista visibilia'; for other examples, see fols. 2^{r}, 64^{r}, 150^{v}.

[50] Ibid. fol. 4^{v}: 'caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Williám of Pont had 'heard heretics saying that God had not made the sky and the earth'.[51] Sabdalina of Gourvielle had heard heretics saying that 'God did not make things come into flower and produce seed, but the earth did this of itself'.[52] A deponent could include in the reply a bit of crisply and clearly remembered theology. One deponent had heard heretics saying that 'nothing of those things that God had made could be corrupted or pass away':[53] the theological core of what Moneta reported, namely heretics' arguments about the incompatibility between the attributes of the Good God and the corruptibility and passing away of material things in this world. The recollections cited so far are like a few isolated jigsaw pieces that fit the larger picture of Moneta's account of absolute dualist relegation of God from anything to do with this material world. But not all. The reply made by Lady Willelma of Montgiscard to the question about visible things was a trifle longer than usual, and it made a very distinctive addition. 'Questioned about the errors, she said that she had heard the heretics well, stating that all visible things had been made with the will and in the face of God, nevertheless he himself had not made them'.[54] This looks like a jigsaw piece from a different picture, Moneta's representation of the less radical theology of those heretics who maintained that there was one God, who had permitted the devil to form and shape all matter, which was thereafter under his rule.

The formulaic question which followed this formulaic question about doctrine was, 'Did you believe as the heretic said?' Although most replies to this were 'yes' or 'no', a few could fall into Caterina Bruschi's 'surplus' category. They could be self-aware waverers, like Na Flors of Mas-Saintes-Puelles who believed just as often as she disbelieved.[55] Sometimes the only doctrine remembered was the rejection of divine creation of visible things,[56] or it was singled out among the other doctrines as the one that was not recalled.[57]

51 Ibid. fol. 15^{v}: 'audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecit celum et terram'.

52 Ibid. fol. 63^{v}: 'Deus non faciebat florere nec granare, sed terre hoc faciebant per se'.

53 Ibid. fol. 103^{r}: 'nichil de his que Deus fecerat potuerant corrumpi nec preterire'.

54 Ibid. fol. 65^{v}: 'de erroribus requisita, dixit quod bene audivit hereticos loquentes quod omnia visibilia facta fuerant de voluntate et vultu Dei, tamen ipse non fecerat ea'.

55 Ibid. fol. 22^{r}.

56 Ibid. fols 19^{v}, 24^{v}, 64^{r}, 111^{r}, 132^{v}, 133^{r}, 149^{v}, 156^{r}, 158^{v}, 194^{r}, 235^{v}, 243^{r}.

57 Ibid. fols 21^{v}, 33^{r}, 71^{v}.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The formulation of memory and belief could be emphatic. Thus some deponents stated that they had heard the doctrines often, or that that they believed them *firmiter*, very strongly.[58] Lady Ermessen of Saint Martin-de-Lalande was questioned on 11 June 1245, and clearly wanted to underline the strength of her belief. She believed all the doctrines stated by the heretics, 'and if there was more in the confession she had previously made to Friar Ferrier, she approved the whole of that (*totum*)' too.[59]

The deponents also include a stream of people who had received heretics and thought them to be good, while not believing the doctrines they stated,[60] a position expressed in a striking aphorism by Peter of *Garmassia*[61] of Fanjeaux. 'He believed their works were good and their faith bad'.[62] Deponents could reject all five doctrines, or just one. Sometimes the one with which they really did not agree was the proposition that God had not made this visible world. For example, Garnier of Mas-Saintes-Puelles had heard what the heretics said and believed what they said, 'apart from this, that he never believed that God had not made visible things'.[63] And some of the deponents said that they had disputed with the heretics about theology.[64]

The variety, theological sharpness and liveliness of response to belief in, and criticism of, the heretics' theological preaching is startling. It is startling that we can still discern it in these most laconic and formulaic of Languedoc depositions. But it is not surprising. Some of the deponents were very old, and in 1245 or 1246 these old people were recalling heretics fifty years before.[65] One deponent's first contact with heretics had been about seventy years before his interrogation, that is, around 1175.[66] We are hearing personal histories of people who had had contact with heretics

[58] Ibid. fols 55^{v}, 140^{v}, 173^{v}.

[59] Ibid. fol. 36^{r}: 'et si plus inveniretur in confessione facta fratri Ferrario, totum approbabat'. For another example of belief in *totum*, see fol. 134^{r}.

[60] Ibid. fols 3^{r}, 12^{v}, 16^{r}, 34^{v}, 52^{r}, 56^{r} (2), 58^{v}, 62^{v}, 63^{v}, 70^{r}, 75^{r}, 80^{r}, 117^{v}, 123^{r}, 156^{r}, 159^{v}, 160^{v}, 188^{r}, 192^{v}–193^{r}, 228^{r}, 236^{v}.

[61] Unidentified place-name.

[62] Toulouse 609, fol. 157^{v}: 'opera tamen eorum credebat esse bona et fidem malam'.

[63] Ibid. fol. 13^{v}: 'preter hoc quod nunquam credidit quod Deus non fecisset visibilia'; for other examples, see fols 1^{r}, 4^{v}, 150^{v}, 156^{r}, 243^{r}.

[64] Ibid. fols 42^{r}, 130^{v}.

[65] Ibid. fols 133^{v}, 136^{r}, 142^{v}, 177^{r}, 213^{v}, 225^{r}, 243^{r}.

[66] Ibid. fol. 159^{r}.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stretching backwards from 1245–6, deep into the twelfth century. Younger deponents were the children and grandchildren of parents and grandparents who had received and listened to heretics. In many cases a parent, aunt or uncle or grandparent had been a vested heretic, before the crusade of 1209 living in communities with other vested heretics, roughly comparable to Catholic communities of religious. The doctrinal instruction that took place inside these religious communities and the preaching within the houses of adherents were supported by theological books, which do not survive.

Outside both sorts of houses there were several ways in which the heretics' theology was ventilated. The disputations referred to in the hearings of 1245–6 have a history which goes back to 1165. There were large formal disputations between Catholics and heretics, with appointed judges to decide who won the debates, and long ones, like the fortnight at Montréal in 1205, when heretics and Catholics exchanged their positions in written texts. And there were little and informal ones, a disputation in a carpenter's workshop, or just informal chats in front of a church after mass. Theological argument seems to have taken the place of football and television in Languedoc.[67] Friends, believers in the heretics rather than heretics themselves, or unspecified 'others' could be alleged to be the main source of knowledge of doctrines. One deponent who had not heard heretics saying these things had nevertheless 'heard it said that heretics said' them.[68] This could be a lie, but if so it will have been plausible to suggest that one could just pick the stuff up anywhere. And one source of clear information, of course, was Catholic anti-heresy preaching. Two sorts of evidence are extant about this preaching, its textual sources, and statements by those who had heard it. Two Latin Bibles of the mid-thirteenth century, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, contain a few leaves with references to passages in the Bible which can be used to hit the heretics. Twenty quotations are presented to use in argument against denial of God's creation of the material world.[69] The manu-

[67] Disputations: ibid. fol. 25^{r}.

[68] Ibid. fol. 222^{v}: 'audivit dici quod heretici dicebant'; see also ibid. fols 111^{r}, 114^{v}, 152^{r}.

[69] C. Douais, *La somme des autorités à l'usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au xiii^{e} siècle* (Paris, 1896), 36–37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scripts are tiny pocket-books, one measuring 19 cm x 13 m, the other 17 cm x 12 cm: in physical terms, archaeological evidence of the itinerant Catholic clerics wandering round Languedoc preaching against heretics. At the same time there are deponents questioned in 1245–6 who claimed that they had not heard the doctrines expounded by heretics, but they did know them through the clergy preaching against heretics.[70] One deponent specified the cleric – 'he had heard the error that "God had not made visible things" from the bishop of Toulouse'.[71] In an account of the Albigensian crusade written by the Cistercian Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, the Count of Toulouse is reported as uttering a witticism about things not going well for him and God not creating this world.[72] Making such a quip only made sense in a culture and society where this heretical doctrine was an utter commonplace. It was in the air. And in 1245–6 it had been in the air for a very long time.

As we have said, in later decades inquisitors' questions began to lighten up. Here is an example from an inquisition in Toulouse in 1273. Inquisitors' questioning of Petronilla, the wife of William of Castanet of Verfeil, in the diocese of Rodez elicited two sources of her beliefs, a godmother and her own husband.

> 'One day [she said], she visited her godparents Daide of Bras and Petronilla, who are from Villefranche, and she slept in their house and ate. And in the morning – it was a Sunday and the people had gone to church – the same witness remained alone with the said Petronilla, her god-parent, and when she had shown her the house, and the corn, and the wine, and the other things which she had, she said that all these things were of the devil ...[73]

[70] Ibid. fol. 110^{r}: 'audivit tamen clericos exprimentes errores quos heretici dicunt de visibilibus, de baptismo, de hostia sacrata, de resurrectione carnis' ('He heard, however, clergy expressing the errors that heretics say about visible things, about baptism, about the consecrated host, about the resurrection of the flesh'). For other examples, see fols 1^{v}, 16^{v}, 17^{r}, 18^{v}, 31^{v}, 232^{r}.

[71] Ibid. fol. 235^{v}: 'sed audivit ab episcopo Tholosano <hereticos dicere> quod deus non fecerat visibilia'.

[72] *The History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's Historia Albigensis*, trans. W. A. and M. D. Sibly (Woodbridge, 1998), 22–23.

[73] Paris, BN, MS Collection Doat 25, fols 7^{v}–8^{r}: 'quadam die visitavit compatrem suum Deodatum de Brass, et commatrem suam Petronillam, qui sunt de Villa Franca,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The inquisitors of 1273 were continuing to use the laconic and action-focused 1240s question-list, but by now inquisitors' lower workload was giving them more contact hours with each deponent, so they were getting more out of each of them. By the early fourteenth century the question-list of the 1240s had been superseded by more belief-friendly ones, and although some inquisitors had very full timetables, one of them, Jacques Fournier, could spend many days on a particular deponent.

To an even greater degree than in the case just cited from 1273, the recollections presented to Fournier by deponents in 1319–20 are given detailed and colourful settings, of the sort familiar to readers of Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's *Montaillou*,[74] and doctrine is recollected in greater detail.[75] Visibility – the evil God's or Devil's creation of all visible things – becomes a subject in itself. There is emphasis on the evil creation of all the human senses with which material things are perceived. And there is more detailed listing of things in the natural world. Thus Raymond Valsiera remembered one of the family of Autier heretics preaching that 'the malign God had made all things which can be perceived by the physical eyes or by other physical senses, such as the sky and earth, and all animals, air and water, and all the things that are in them'.[76] Heretics were reported in Toulouse 609 saying, as we have seen, that 'nothing of those things that God had made could be corrupted or pass away', and now they are being reported to Fournier as saying that 'God only made that which lasts and perseveres forever ... but that God had not made those things that are corrupted and destroyed'.[77]

et in domo ipsorum iacuit, et comedit, et facto mane, cum esset dies dominica, et populus ivisset ad ecclesiam, ipsa testis remansit sola cum dicta Petronilla, commatre sua, et cum ostendisset ei domum et bladum, et vinum, et alia quæ habebat, dixit quod omnia ista erant diaboli'.

74 E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: Cathars and Catholics in a French Village, 1294–1324*, trans. B. Bray (London, 1978).

75 *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier évêque de Pamiers (1318–1325)*, ed. J. Duvernoy, Bibliothèque Meridionale 3rd ser. 41, 3 vols (Toulouse, 1965), together with J. Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier évêque de Pamiers (1318–1325): Corrections* (Toulouse, 1972).

76 *Registre*, ed. Duvernoy, 1: 281–2: 'Deus vero malignus fecerat omnia que occulis corporalibus sentiri possunt, vel aliis sensibus corporalibus, sicut sunt celum et terra, et omnia animalia, aer et aqua, et omnia que sunt in eis.'

77 Ibid. 2: 422: 'illud solum quod durat et perseverat semper ... fecerat Deus, set illa que corrumpuntur et destruuntur Deus non fecerat'; cf. ibid. 2: 35 for a similar formula.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are glimpses of the way that heretics' sermons had packaged rejection of divine creation of the natural world. Striking is their emphasis on animals and weather that people did not like, such as wolves, flies, lizards, snakes, storms and hailstones.[78] Fertility looms larger. Whereas fertility was only briefly glimpsed in one recollection in Toulouse 609, that the good God did not make things flower and seed (*florere et granare*), it came up often in depositions in front of Fournier and an inquisitor acting slightly earlier (1308–9), Geoffroi d'Ablis. The same phrase is used – *florere et granare*[79] – but in longer statements, which also give several glimpses of an illustrative image used by heretics when preaching. This was that seed placed on a bare stone did not germinate; this only happened when placed in earth and because of earth:[80] we shall return to this. The good God was entirely removed from fertility in this world. Arnaut Sicre heard the heretic saying that 'the celestial father did nothing at all in this world, not for things to flower or seed, nor for beings to conceive or give birth, nor to produce babies'.[81] In the heaven of the good God there was no fertility, a point whose expression mixes poetry and lack of logic. There 'corn may be born and grow and will flower, yet will not produce seed; and vines may throw out shoots, and yet they will not produce fruit; and trees will have leaves and blossom, and yet they will not produce fruit'.[82]

At this point let us terminate the survey of evidence of heretical rejection of the good God's creation of the natural world. Recapitulating what we have found, let us sort it into three strands. One of these is a past reality. We get keyhole glimpses of it: the application of Parisian axiomatic logic to the fundamental theology of

[78] Ibid. 1: 304, 378; 2: 36, 58, 113–14.

[79] Ibid., 1: 230, 283; *L'Inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis et les Cathares du Comté de Foix (1308–1309)*, ed. A. Pales-Gobilliard, Sources d'Histoire Médiévale Publiées par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 15 (Paris, 1984), 134; *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui*, ed. A. Pales-Gobilliard, Sources d'Histoire Médiévale Publiées par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 30, 2 vols (Paris, 2002), 1: 680, 684, 704, 740.

[80] *Registre*, ed. Duvernoy, 1:.230; *Inquisiteur Geoffroy d'Ablis*, ed. Pales-Gobilliard, 104.

[81] *Registre*, ed. Duvernoy, 2:.58: 'pater celestis nichil omnino faciebat in hoc mundo, nec florere nec granare, nec concipere, nec parere, nec fetus producere'.

[82] Ibid. 2: 36: 'blada nascentur et crescent et florebunt, et tamen non granabunt; et vine emitent palmites, et tamen non fructificabunt; et arbores habebunt folia et flores, et tamen non fructificabunt'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the position; books of heretical theology; formal and street-corner disputations in Languedoc; scholastic debates between learned and treatise-writing Catholic and heretical theologians in Lombard cities; and sermons over many decades in the houses of heretics' followers in Languedoc. The second strand is those constraints on the different sorts of evidence that shape the keyholes through which we peer. Moneta's reporting of listening to heretics and reading their books has to stand in for the absence of any records of the debates and the loss of the heretics' theological treatises, while we have to negotiate the subtle problems of inquisitors' questions and the ways in which they developed over time in order to assess how they shaped what deponents said. The third strand is that of modern historical scholarship and the debate about Catharism as an entity, where deconstructionists present difficulties in the evidence and past 'reality' as muddy and impenetrable.

This survey suggests three concluding points. First, there are many overlaps and verbal similarities between the texts we have been surveying, while the differences we see seem to flow naturally from the different parts of past heretical reality from which the evidence comes and the different ways in which different types of text skew things. The notion that the theology has been entirely imposed by a collective clerical fantasy beggars belief.

Secondly, throughout the inquisition records there is evidence of opposition to this particular doctrine. Many people liked the heretics and their doctrines, but did not like this one. Further, when the preaching of rejection of the natural world concentrated on fertility, it almost automatically slipped sideways. It moved away from God's or a God's role (that is, absence of a role) to autonomous fertility, and, in the case of agrarian pastoral production, it moved from autonomous fertility towards statements about good things on the earth. 'Things do not grow because of the good God' becomes 'things grow because of the goodness of the earth'. Preaching in this way, heretics either stimulated or perhaps simply provided the occasion for the expression of materialist views, while the more open inquisitions of post-1273 and 1319–20 ensured the entry of these views into written records. Growth: no God had anything to do with it, just seed, manure and rain.[83]

[83] See W. L. Wakefield, 'Some Unorthodox Popular Ideas of the Thirteenth

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let us allow the third and final point to emerge through one example of this, a scene reported by one deponent questioned by Jacques Fournier. Around the feast of John the Baptist the witness, Adémar of Bédeilhac, was together with Arnold of Bédeilhac the Elder; Bernard John, the parish priest of Bédeilhac; and others he could not remember. They were sitting under an elm tree. They had been talking about a miraculous spring in the diocese of Couserans, and a miracle which had taken place in olden times, when some fish frying in a pan had jumped out of the frying pan and into the fountain. The witness Adémar said that he then said, 'Similarly we see God performing miracles every day'. 'In winter we see that all the trees are dry and leafless, and then they flower in summer, and they bear fruit'.[84] Arnold then replied that this came about because of the nature of the earth. Debate about the natural world was being stimulated by heretical preaching, and in this instance something more can be seen in this conversation under an elm tree. It is using one's eyes to look at the natural world, and seeing something of beauty in the transition of trees through the seasons.

University of York

Century', *Medievalia et Humanistica* ns 4 (1973), 23–35, on the expression of these views in the depositions contained in MS Collection Doat 25.

[84] *Registre*, ed. Duvernoy, 3: 52: 'similiter vidimus cotidie quod Deus facit miracula ... nos vidimus quod in yeme omnes arbores sunt sicci et sine foliis, et in estate floriuntur, et granantur'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press