
H-France Review Vol. 17 (October 2017), No. 174

John H. Arnold and Peter Biller, eds and transl. *Heresy and Inquisition in France, 1200-1300*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. xii + 521 pp. £91.00. (hb). ISBN 978-0-7190-8131-6.

Mark Gregory Pegg, Washington University in St. Louis and Collegium de Lyon.

This collection of edited and translated primary sources on heresy and the inquisitions into heretical depravity in thirteenth-century France (fifty-seven documents, more than 500 pages) by John H. Arnold and Peter Biller is marvellous.[1] As the authors themselves note, it is a collection consciously complementing the classic *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* by Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans (sixty documents, more than 800 pages) published in 1969 (and, as Wakefield was Evans' graduate student, Arnold is Biller's). In the forty-seven years between these books, there have been two notable volumes of primary sources on heresy from R.I. Moore and Edward Peters. Recently, there is the accomplished collection of sources on heresy and the Albigensian Crusade by Catherine Léglu, Rebecca Rist, and Claire Taylor.[2]

This lack of translated sources on heresy in Latin Christendom for almost five decades, while in part a reflection of the sheer wealth (and so enduring usefulness) of Wakefield and Evans' doorstopper, which was republished in 1991, as well as the slimmer tomes of Moore and Peters, which are still in print, is more an illustration of how the general historiography of the Middle Ages amongst Anglophone scholars relegated heresy, and to a lesser extent religion, to the sidelines until around twenty years ago. A historiographic outlier is Wakefield's own *Heresy, Crusade, and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100-1250* from 1974, which has six appendices covering sixty pages of translations related to heresy and inquisition; indeed, the translations came first and what was meant to be an introduction became an splendid historical monograph in itself.[3] Regrettably, this book is not in print. Since the turn of this century, the study of medieval heresy has changed so dramatically that it is now one of the most exciting topics amongst serious historians and, perhaps not surprisingly, one of the most contentious. Arnold and Biller's collection resoundingly exemplifies this scholarly revitalization and, in a manner inclined to tacit assumptions rather than explicit argument, why heresy and inquisition, especially in thirteenth-century France, is so controversial.

When Wakefield and Evans published their collection in 1969, what was generally known about medieval heresy was, for most part, unchanged for more than a century. New texts had been discovered and edited, but the overall narrative was fixed. It was a story that began just after the millennium with heretics reappearing in Latin Christendom for the first time since Late Antiquity, then a lull around 1100, until a resurgence of heresy after the middle of the twelfth century. This heterodox renaissance reached a crescendo around 1200 with the two most famous heresies of the Middle Ages, Catharism and Waldensianism. The Cathars were dualists, adopting this theology from furtive Bogomil missionaries travelling from the Byzantine Empire to southern France and northern Italy, perhaps during the eleventh century, definitely by 1170. By the end of the twelfth century, an international "Cathar Church" existed from the North Sea to the Mediterranean with an elaborate episcopate and a priestly elite of ascetic "perfects."

The heartland of Catharism lay between the Garonne and Rhône Rivers in what is now southern France. The Cathars so threatened the Church that Pope Innocent III proclaimed a crusade against these heretics in the lands of the count of Toulouse in 1208. This holy war lasted twenty-one years, decimating the heresy. After 1233 the Dominicans were instructed by Pope Gregory IX to persecute the surviving heretics through inquisitions into heretical depravity. Inquisitors effectively eliminated Catharism by the middle of the fourteenth century. The Waldenses, while never so numerous or initially so threatening to the Church as the Cathars, descended from a pious merchant named Valdes preaching the *via apostolica* in the streets of Lyon after 1173, and, despite persecution by inquisitors, developed into a unified movement throughout Latin Christendom, surviving into the fifteenth century (if not beyond). Arnold and Biller explicitly follow the same nineteenth-century narrative as Wakefield and Evans, even if much has changed since 1969, such as the irrefutable fact that Catharism has never existed.

To be more precise, Catharism only exists as a historical and religious paradigm invented in the nineteenth century by brilliant scholars as they restyled history and religion as modern sciences. These scholars designed Catharism as a new way of explaining the obsession with heresy gripping Latin Christian intellectuals in the late twelfth century and, most especially, as a more scientific explanation for the crusade against the count of Toulouse and the inquisitions after 1233. Until the early nineteenth century, the persecution of heretics by the medieval Church was explained by scholars within confessional and national parameters. In this Enlightenment scenario, the heretics of southern France, including Waldensians, were labelled “Albigensians.” This term derived from what northern French crusaders initially called anyone living between the Garonne and the Rhône Rivers, meaning “southerners” with no intimation of heresy. By 1211, “Albigensian” also meant “heretic” and *faidit* (anyone fighting the crusaders). This is why the holy war against the count of Toulouse is commonly known as the Albigensian Crusade. Albigensians were seen as the ancestors of Protestants and so, depending on denominational and national perspective, were either viciously oppressed or deserving of repression.

A more secular and so scientific approach, particularly associated with the methods of the *Religionsgeschichte* (“religious-historical school”) developing at the University of Göttingen after 1850, consciously endeavoured to escape this confessional and national model (even if most scholars adopting this approach were Protestant). Charles Schmidt, who studied at Göttingen, anticipated this methodology when he published his *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois* in 1849.[4] Although accepting that the heretics persecuted by crusaders and inquisitors were known as Albigensians, he deliberately used the much less common term “Cathar” as a way of freeing himself from confessional and national histories. He constructed Catharism from “scattered debris and material collected from different coasts,” acknowledging his fabricated sect allowed him “to reestablish connections between events, which would otherwise appear to be accidents without consequence and without importance.”[5] Nevertheless, he still framed Catharism as a Christian sect within French national history. It was another four decades before Schmidt’s Catharism was transformed by practitioners of *Religionsgeschichte* into a “world religion” with Eurasian roots distinct from Christianity. A world religion possessed a clerical hierarchy, missionaries, fixed rituals, foundational sacred texts, and a clear distinction between the secular and the religious. As much as Hinduism, Confucianism, and Buddhism were fabricated as world religions by 1900, so too was Catharism.

It may be argued that even if these nineteenth-century scholars invented Catharism, what they thought they discerned really did exist, no matter what we call it. This is decidedly not the case. Everything about the “conventional picture of Catharism,” as Biller has labelled it, is a falsehood.[6] Catharism does not exist outside of its own historiography. Its history is only the history of what historians have written about it since the nineteenth century. No “living Cathars,” glimpsed however imperfectly, underpin the historiography of Catharism. No “living heretics” in the twelfth century underpin it either. By contrast, underpinning the historiography of medieval Judaism, no matter what historians argue, is

the fact that there were “living Jews” in the Middle Ages.[7] Despite the scholarly pedigree of Catharism, what was once dazzling Victorian and Wilhelmine craftsmanship, the very epitome of historical modernism, is now no better than a ripping yarn from a *Boy's Own Annual*. It is rare to say without reservation that a field of study self-evident for more than a century is false, so, whatever is read into my tone, I do not say it frivolously or flippantly. This is a profoundly serious issue that goes to the very core of what we do as historians. If the most famous heresy of the Middle Ages is a *fin-de-siècle* fiction, then everything we thought we knew about medieval heresy and medieval Christianity must be rethought and rewritten. This is not the stuff of angels on the head of a pin. The falsifiability of Catharism raises many questions, not the least of which is why so many excellent scholars still cling to this falsehood, what actually defines a religion or heresy, whether history is a science after all, and, with a topicality at once vital and alarming, what constitutes truth about the past, let alone the present.

Arnold and Biller never outline either the traditional paradigm of heresy and Christianity they accept or the arguments with which they disagree. There are some throwaway sentences and footnotes mentioning R.I. Moore, Uwe Brunn, Monique Zerner, and myself, but no description of what we argue or why the field is now so contentious because of our scholarship. This is not vanity on my part, rather it is about what responsible scholarship does in presenting a history and historiography that, as Malcolm Barber observes, is easily the most disputatious (and impassioned) in the study of the Middle Ages.[8] I do not see how students or scholars are helped by pretending that the sources they are about to read are not caught within a furious debate about the past reality that caused these texts to be written in the first place. This is the stark difference between now and 1969. Wakefield and Evans' introduction to their collection is intellectually responsible and their learned preambles to sources and lavish endnotes are still informative and exhilarating to read. Even taking into account that there was no serious debate five decades ago about the reality of heresy, a reader would have come away fully informed about the state of the field. Arnold and Biller do not even aspire to such a survey in their deliberately bland “Introduction,” all six and a bit pages, and it is this lack of intellectual generosity in framing and footnoting their sources with current scholarship in a critical and open-minded manner that is so disappointing.[9]

Fortunately, in a recent collection of essays, *Cathars in Question*, edited by Antonio Sennis, we get a vivid sense of the introduction Arnold and Biller might have written to their sourcebook—and it is not a pretty sight. Biller's “Goodbye to Catharism?” is an intemperate criticism of Moore and myself, particularly our books *The Corruption of Angels* (2001) and *The War on Heresy* (2012), misunderstanding and mischaracterizing our scholarship, and whose general tone is one of “how it always was is how it always should be.”[10] Arnold's “The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem,” adopting a “move along, nothing to see here” approach to Moore and myself, similarly engages in misrepresenting what we argue, along with the imputation of unsavoury political views, so that in the end he never has to either address what we say or defend what he thinks.[11] These two essays are, though, valuable and worth reading, as they give real insight into why the falsification of Catharism is so upsetting and why it represents a paradigm shift that ultimately renders so much scholarship irrelevant. They also illustrate that when the only arguments you have left are *ad hominem*, then you have lost the debate. Few, if any, scholars ever overturn a field, which, despite whatever myths academics tell themselves, rarely happens and is rarely welcomed. Biller has been misinterpreting and misrepresenting my work for more than a decade, labelling me the leading “sceptic” and “deconstructionist” of Catharism specifically and heresy generally, and my work “controversial,” that academic kiss-of-death which lets the timid ignore what might rattle them. It is only in the last five years that he has turned his anger on Moore.[12] I have benefitted immensely from his genuine criticism and his sometimes genuine misunderstanding. If it were not for him, I would not now possess the clarity I have regarding Catharism, heresy, and medieval Christianity. (By the way, *The Corruption of Angels* was written as deliberate exercise in historical anthropology, influenced by Mary Douglas, where I was concerned about evoking a world from inquisition testimonies, and where what seems now the obvious fact that Catharism never existed was merely a consequence of the book and not its goal.[13]) I

should add that *Cathars in Question* is an exceptional volume, so unusual for such essay collections, even if half of the essays are attacks (learned, sincere, confused) against Moore and myself. This overall excellence includes the thoughtful introduction by Sennis, even if he has to keep his thumb on the scale to help out those who believe in Catharism against those who do not. [14]

All this scene-setting is crucial, for sourcebooks make arguments, not just in their introductions, but in the texts they choose and the order in which they place them. This is why Arnold and Biller's first source is so revealing of their commitment to the paradigm of Catharism. It is the famous Charter of Niquinta under the document title, "Heretical Council of St-Félix" (pp. 16-19). This charter only exists as a three-page appendix in Guillaume Besse's *Histoire des ducs, marquis et comtes de Narbonne* (1660) and, apparently, it was lost after he transcribed it. [15] It is a collation of three supposed twelfth-century Latin documents from an *antiqua carta* copied by the "good man" Peire Pollan for the "good man" and "bishop" Peire Izarn in 1223. Or it was a copy by Peire Pollan in 1232 of Peire Izarn's earlier copying of the "old charter." (The different dating depends on the placement of a full stop.) Arnold and Biller choose the earlier dating. The charter begins with a description of a council of "good men" in the village of Saint-Félix-de-Caraman (just outside Toulouse) in 1167, then an extract from a sermon given at this assembly by a *papa* Niquinta (or Nicetas) from Constantinople, before ending with the demarcation of new dioceses for the "good men" in the Toulousain, Carcassès, and Agenais and the "consoling" of new "bishops" by the Byzantine *papa*. In 1955, the great Yves Dossat thought this document was a forgery by Besse. At the beginning of this century, Denis Muzerelle (and other scholars from the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes) determined that the original text seen by Besse was "a homogeneous document contemporaneous with the events it relates and due to a single scribe." [16] This cautious judgement on a seventeenth-century copy of a lost thirteenth-century text copying a lost twelfth-century text (or the copy of that copying a decade later) allows Arnold and Biller to blithely argue the charter is authentically from 1167, describing "Cathar churches" in the Toulousain seventy years before the first inquisitions. This is wishful thinking by sophisticated scholars affecting a naiveté they would find intolerable in others. The charter, if it must be given the seriousness I do not think a document so compromised deserves, can only be explained as a forgery from the 1220s by some "good men" in the last decade of the Albigensian Crusade. In Arnold and Biller's sourcebook, it should not be the first document in part one, rather it should be somewhere between pages 291 and 457 in part eight.

"Part VIII: Inquisition Trials" is a revelation and, even if the rest of the book were not so full of riches, justification enough for publication. Almost all the documents in part eight have never previously been edited or translated. There are numerous selections from the Doat Collection in the Bibliothèque nationale. Jean de Doat, president of the Chambre des comptes of Navarre, was commissioned in 1667 by Jean-Baptiste Colbert to copy manuscripts from the archives of Béarn, Languedoc, and Guyenne. His scribes, writing in an elegant cursive with the Latin re-spelled *style classique*, eventually filled two hundred and fifty-eight volumes. In volumes twenty one to twenty six are excerpts from the lost registers of inquisitions undertaken in the Toulousain and Carcassès from 1237 to 1289. (So many missing documents only surviving in seventeenth-century copies.) Then there is document 48, pp. 380-441, consisting of testimonies from manuscript 609 in the Bibliothèque municipale in Toulouse. This paper manuscript is a copy of the original (lost) parchment register of the great inquisition (around 6000 individuals questioned) by the Dominicans Bernart de Caux and Joan de Sant-Peire in Toulouse between 1245 and 1246. Two other Dominican inquisitors, Guilhem Bernart de Dax and Renaud de Chartres, commissioned this copy sometime after October 1258, although no later than August 1263. Just having so many testimonies translated from both the Doat Collection and MS 609 makes it possible to teach in a way that was impossible beforehand. More than that, these translations will be an encouragement to new research.

Biller and Arnold correctly translate all testimonies in the third person. However, there is a caveat they do not address. As all individuals testified in the first-person vernacular and a scribe or notary simultaneously translated what he heard into third-person Latin, a historian can choose what is the

most appropriate pronoun in the translation of a text. If the purpose of a translated extract from a confession is to suggest the individual actually testifying before an inquisitor, then it is entirely proper for a translation to be in the first-person. Otherwise, a straightforward translation in the third-person is the rule.

The translations of inquisition records are exemplary. I only have two disagreements. First, Biller and Arnold translate *benedicite* in the ritual courtliness offered to the “good men” by villagers as “Bless” rather than “Bless us” or “Bless me.” For example, Peire de Mazerolles, lord of Gaja, recalled for the inquisition in 1246 that fifteen years earlier he genuflected to two heretics in a house in Labécède with four other nobles, saying thrice, “Good men, bless. Pray to God on behalf of this sinner.” (p. 407) This is awkward and stilted, eliminating the holy reciprocity of “Bless us.” Second, like many British scholars they Anglicize names from the Latin, so rendering *Petrus* as “Peter,” rather than the Occitan (or Old Provençal) “Peire.” This smooths over, even if only in a small way, the difference between individuals living between the Garonne and the Rhône Rivers and those from “France,” which is to say, northern France, or anywhere else in Latin Christendom.[17]

Fundamentally, though, I disagree with how Arnold and Biller understand these inquisition records. They find a “Cathar Church”; I find nothing of the sort. It may come as something of a shock to the sheltered reader to be told that in no inquisition testimony from southern France will they find the word “Cathar.” Similarly, they will not find the word “perfect,” that other mischievous term suggesting a priestly caste that never existed. Unfortunately, in a parenthetical aside in a footnote in an article from 2001 (and where the footnotes comprised close to three-quarters of the text) I incorrectly suggested that one of Doat’s scribes wrote *perfectus*. [18] Biller, in his pungent “Goodbye to Catharism?,” rightly condemns my parenthetical error, even devoting a block quotation and a page of analysis to it. [19] What is so intriguing about my error is that I added the aside at the last minute, despite my own transcription of this Doat testimony not having the word, because, while I was completely certain that “Cathar” never occurred in any inquisition record, despite so much scholarship suggesting otherwise, I was still reticent to think the relentless use of “perfect” by scholars was another falsehood. I knew I was right about “Cathar,” but perhaps I was wrong about “perfect,” misreading those seventeenth-century flourishes. Two leading scholars I read at the time persuaded me to alter that footnote. The first was Alan Friedlander, who referred to *vestiti et perfecti* in the Doat Collection, and, the second (perhaps this may come as no surprise) Biller himself, who litters an article from 1994 with Cathar *perfecti* from the Doat Collection. [20] I have never doubted my notes or my convictions again, and while Biller does not want me to forget my youthful parentheses, I hope he appreciates who led me astray. [21] This misuse of words is more than an exercise in hypocrisy, it is the only thing that gives cogency to the fiction of Catharism. When modern scholars consistently refer to almost all heretics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as Cathars, no matter what their accusers called them, Catharism comes into existence by sheer repetition of the name. When Arnold and Biller consistently preface all their inquisition documents with Cathar this and that, the guileless student will assume these texts are evidence of Catharism. [22]

All inquisition testimonies, especially before 1250, began with a person first abjuring heresy and then taking an oath that he or she would “tell the full and exact truth about oneself and about others, living and dead, on the accusation of heresy or Waldensianism.” (For example, document 46, “Imbert of Salles, 1244: Montségur and the Massacre of the Inquisitors at Avignonet,” p. 358.) For Arnold and Biller, the “heresy” is Catharism. For the inquisitors, it was either having once been a “good man” or “good woman” or having once been courteous to these individuals or having once listened to them or even having once just been near them. More precisely, the good men and good women were the “heretics” and those associating with them were “believers.” What complicates this picture is that, before the Albigensian Crusade, the good men and good women were not heretics. The world between the Garonne and Rhône Rivers was so changed by the crusade that the thoughts and actions of men, women, and children before 1210 scarcely resembled, except in the most superficial way, the thoughts and actions of such persons

after 1230. Whatever cursory continuities did exist were finally fractured and broken by three decades of the inquisitions into heretical depravity beginning in 1233. The new world that came into existence in the middle of the thirteenth century was one in which men, women, and children consciously chose to be heretics or, at the very least, were aware that adopting certain beliefs and behaviours would lead to their condemnation and persecution as heretics by ecclesiastical and secular authorities. This was not the case in the twelfth century, when the good men and good women did not think of themselves as heretics, were not thought of as heretical by their fellow villagers, and while sometimes accused of heresy, either by sons or local lords or travelling Cistercians, dismissed such accusations as having little or no effect on their lives.

Indeed, I would argue there were no heretics at all in the twelfth century, Waldensians included, if by that category we mean any individual purposely choosing to be labelled as *hereticus* or knowingly putting themselves at risk of persecution and punishment on account of what they believed or practiced. Of course, there were feverish accusations of heresy polluting the lands of the count of Toulouse by Latin Christian intellectuals in the twelfth century, but such polemics, while occasionally efforts at explaining actual phenomena, were not, as modern scholars all too frequently read them, unvarnished accounts. This does not mean I do not take such polemics seriously, I just do not think accusations of heresy, however sincerely believed by those making them, is the same as heresy actually existing as a historically verifiable entity. The good men and good women were not “dissidents” either, and while French *dissidentes* has a more nuanced meaning, it still presupposes conscious, coherent, and organized opposition to the Church, which was not the case. This is to confuse what was “different” about the world of the good men and good women with “dissent.” Again, we run the risk of allowing accusations of heresy from Latin Christian intellectuals, or just accusations from clerics against ordinary persons acting in ways that the Church was coming to define as not Christian, shape our own understanding of the past. Moreover, accusations of heresy between the Garonne and the Rhône Rivers in the twelfth century rarely focused on the good men and good women, the targets being counts, bishops, abbots, wandering preachers, hermits and mercenaries. This diverse landscape of “heresy” is lost when we read backwards from the thirteenth century. After 1230, the good men as heretics absorbed this earlier heretical diversity. [23]

This reading backwards from the late thirteenth century into the twelfth, that the evidence of heresy in 1260 demonstrates evidence of the same heresy in 1160, completely shapes the outlook of Arnold and Biller. Amongst practitioners of *Religionsgeschichte* this was the *Traditionengeschichtliche* method. This is why the Charter of Niquinta must be real and must be from 1167 for Arnold and Biller. Beginning in the 1220s, the last decade of the Albigensian Crusade, when any good man who still clung to that designation was a fugitive, some good men began calling themselves “bishops” and that what they were now part of was a persecuted “Church” or “churches.” (For example, p. 296, and document 41, “Raymond Jean of Albi, 1238: The Council of Pieusse and Bishops,” pp. 299-309.) They used the accusations of Latin Christian intellectuals against individuals such as themselves as a way of redefining who they were and why their holiness, once taken for granted before the crusade, was still vital and redemptive. As all those heresy accusations in the twelfth century were more about the Church defining itself and defining what it meant to be a Christian, any person who embraced what it meant to be a heretic incorporated notions of what defined a “Church.” The Charter of Niquinta can only be understood as a forgery in this context. Peire Pollan and Peire Izarn saw themselves as leaders of a Church with a long institutional memory and so required a document demonstrating this fact. A bureaucratic fiction replaced anarchic reality. None of this, of course, is evidence of a Cathar Church.

Arnold and Biller’s sourcebook presents a dilemma for me, if an intriguing and fascinating one. Is it possible for good scholarship to exist within a paradigm demonstrably wrong? Does the sheer wrongness of the historical narrative of Catharism framing the sources undercut the accomplishment of collecting and translating those sources? This sourcebook is a field-changing achievement, and yet, from my perspective, Arnold and Biller neither understand their documents or, as they are so in thrall to

the falsehood of Catharism, will they ever understand them.[24] There is no middle ground on Catharism. Arnold has suggested that a historian can believe in Catharism and that this has no effect on, say, his or her research into village life in southern France. Of course, it is possible for someone who believes in a flat earth to chart the Mediterranean coastline, but fundamentally they do not understand the world, and their own mapping will eventually disprove their cosmology.[25] If nothing else, surely we have now reached the point where it is no longer acceptable for even the most brilliant scholars, such as Chris Wickham in his recent *Medieval Europe*, to nonchalantly write that he uses the label “Cathar” for “convenience,” when such expediency is merely an excuse for not seriously addressing what is patently false (or at the very least addressing the debate about falsehood) and so avoiding the hard work of having to rethink what actually constitutes not just medieval Christianity, but the medieval world.[26] It is a sad state of affairs when the most intellectually responsible work of scholarship on Catharism, inquisitors, and heretics in the last year is the prize-winning (and best-selling) Young Adult novel, *The Passion of Dolssa*, by Julie Berry.[27]

The falsibility of Catharism has, very much unexpectedly, led me to see history as science, not like those nineteenth-century scholars who saw it as analogous to the natural sciences (or their modern heirs studying “deep history” or the “history of emotions” [28]), but in the way Karl Popper defined a science. His idea that if a field of study within a discipline can be unequivocally demonstrated as falsifiable, no matter how rare is such a demonstration, it should be embraced, as it indicates that truth, or at least the verification of reality, is possible within that discipline. He argued that we should not try and prove conjectures, we should endeavour to disprove them, and that the ability to disprove is what defines a science (which is why psychology and literary studies are not sciences, as whatever is argued can never ultimately be disproved).[29] I believe in historical truth, even if it is always outside my reach, even if it can never be grasped. We live in a world where the search for truth, or even just believing that the search matters, has never mattered more. The falsifiability of Catharism gives this search for truth unexpected vitality and support, lifting a topic seemingly esoteric and obscure into the very heart of what it means to live in a democracy in the twenty-first century.

NOTES

[1] I would like to thank R.I. Moore, Julien Théry, and Jean-Paul Rehr for their comments on this review.

[2] See: Walter Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages: Selected Sources Translated and Annotated* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), R.I. Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (Edward Arnold: London, 1975); Edward Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980); and Catherine Léglu, Rebecca Rist, Claire Taylor, *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 2013).

[3] Walter L. Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade, and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100-1250* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974).

[4] Charles Schmidt, *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares ou Albigeois* (Paris: J. Cherbuliez, 1849), 2 vols.

[5] Schmidt, vol. 1, pp. v-vi. Now, see the excellent Lucy J. Sackville, “The Textbook Heretic: Moneta of Cremona’s Cathars,” in Antonio Sennis, ed., *Cathars in Question* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press--Boydell and Brewer, 2016), pp. 208-228, esp. 208-210.

[6] Peter Biller, "Cathars and the Material World," in *God's Bounty? The Churches and the Natural World. Papers Read at the 2008 Summer Meeting and the 2009 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Woodbridge: The Ecclesiastical History Society and The Boydell Press, 2010), p. 92.

[7] This observation was suggested by David Nirenberg, *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2013), pp. 7 and 10, where he takes for granted that under the mask of "anti-Judaism" there were always "living Jews." It is worth noting that Nirenberg's review of Moore's *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* in *Speculum* 88(2013): 1133, seems, upon first reading, sanctimoniously dismissive and misguided. I commented to that effect in Pegg, "The Paradigm of Catharism," in Sennis, *Cathars in Question*, pp. 49-50. I now realize I was mistaken and unfair, even if that is very much how Nirenberg's review could be read. Instead, like so many brilliant scholars trying to make sense of this debate from the outside, he inadvertently adopts the tone and so the rhetoric of Moore's opponents, even if that was not his intention.

[8] Malcolm Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages*, 2nd Ed. (Harlow: Pearson, 2013), p. xv.

[9] In *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade: A Sourcebook*, Léglu, Rist, and Taylor also follow this model of presenting the historiography of heresy and Catharism as if there is no debate in the field and that really nothing has changed since 1970.

[10] Peter Biller, "Goodbye to Catharism?," in Sennis, *Cathars in Question*, pp. 274-304.

[11] John H. Arnold, "The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem," in Sennis, *Cathars in Question*, pp. 53-78.

[12] See, especially, Peter Biller, review of R.I. Moore, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe*, (review no. 1546), <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1546>, Date accessed: 18 June, 2017. This is easily the most mean-spirited, seethingly furious, and untruthful review I have ever read. Cf. Moore's masterfully elegant, learned, and witty response following the review.

[13] The only reviewer who grasped that *The Corruption of Angels* was an exercise in historical anthropology inspired by Mary Douglas was, ironically enough, John H. Arnold in his review for *H-France Review*, 1/31(November 2001). He disagreed with my dismissal of Catharism--and my arguments were certainly not as lucid as they are now--but the review was insightful and generous.

[14] It is worth noting that "Cathars" have never been in question, as this was a term used, if infrequently, by Latin Christian intellectuals; rather, what is in question is the nineteenth-century historiographic edifice of Catharism. Sennis, like many of the essayists in the volume, confuse (and are confused by) this profound distinction. I have an essay in this volume, "The Paradigm of Catharism; or, the Historians' Illusion," in Sennis, ed., *Cathars in Question*, pp. 21-52, as does R.I. Moore, "Principles at Stake: The Debate of April 2013 in Retrospect," in Sennis, ed., *Cathars in Question*, pp. 257-273. Early reviews of this volume are remarkable for demonstrating just how difficult it is for excellent scholars to even imagine what it means to argue against the convention of Catharism. For example, James Givens in *The Medieval Review*, 17.01.27, consistently misreads Moore and myself to such an extent that he can write that we "have both acknowledged the existence of a Cathar heresy in thirteenth-century Languedoc and Italy, but both would deny that evidence for this thirteenth-century Catharism can be read back into the twelfth century." Givens begins with a firm belief in Catharism and, no matter what he reads, everything confirms that all scholars really believe this too, no matter what they argue.

[15] Guillaume Besse, *Histoire des ducs, marquis et comtes de Narbonne, autrement appelez Princes des Goths, Ducs de Septimanie, et Marquis de Gothie. Dedié à Monseigneur l'Archevesque Duc de Narbonne* (Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1660), pp. 483-486.

[16] Jacques Dalarun, Annie Dufour, Anne Grondeux, Denis Muzerelle, Fabio Zinelli, "La «Charte de Niquinta», Analyse Formelle," in Monique Zerner, ed., *L'histoire du catharisme en discussion: Le 'concile' de Saint-Félix (1167)* (Nice: Centre d'Études Médiévales Faculté des Lettres, Arts et Sciences Humaines Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, 2001), p. 199.

[17] Peter Biller, Caterina Bruschi, and Shelagh Sneddon, eds., *Inquisitors and Heretics in Thirteenth-Century Languedoc: Edition and Translation of Toulouse Inquisition Depositions, 1273-1282* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 125, where my preference for Occitan names is "part of an attempt to use all the means at the disposal of an imaginative and creative writer to produce for the reader the palpable *feel* of things in mid-thirteenth century Languedoc, including sounds."

[18] Mark Gregory Pegg, "On the Cathars, the Albigensians, and good men of Languedoc," *Journal of Medieval History*, 27(2001): 192-193, n. 28: "It seems that *perfectus*, if it was transcribed, has only survived in the Collection Doat (e.g. Doat 26, fol. 258r-259r)."

[19] Biller, "Goodbye to Catharism?", in Sennis, *Cathars in Question*, p. 284.

[20] Alan Friedlander, *The Hammer of the Inquisitors: Brother Bernard Délicieux and the Struggle Against the Inquisition in Fourteenth-Century France* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 43, where he specifically references Doat 26, fols. 258r-259r, and Peter Biller, "The Cathars of Languedoc and Written Materials," in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 61-82. On the meaning and use of *perfecti*, see Arnold and Biller, *Heresy and Inquisition in France*, document 40 "Bernard Gui on *perfecti*," pp. 289-290.

[21] Biller, of course, never noticed my initial error in 2001, as it obviously agreed with and still agrees with his assumptions about perfects and Catharism. It was Biller's student, Chris Sparks, in his excellent *Heresy, Inquisition, and Life Cycle in Medieval Languedoc* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press--Boydell and Brewer, 2014) who mentions my footnote error in a footnote on p. 15. He never comments on his own advisor's erroneous misreadings.

[22] There is an online transcription of MS 609 by the late Jean Duvernoy, which, for its many benefits just being out there, has numerous mistakes, as is to be expected in such a massive undertaking. Nevertheless, many of the mistakes are due to the paradigm of Catharism. For example, on fol. 123r he transcribed a line of the testimony of Guilhema Peire remembering the heretic Raimona de Bonheras as *et tunc heretica perfecta fuit capta in dicta domo*. The correct transcription is *et tunc heretica prefata fuit capta in dicta domo*. There is a world of difference between "and then the perfected heretic was captured in the said house" and "and then the aforesaid heretic was captured in the said house." The latter is exactly how thousands of testimonies read, the former only reads that way if you want to misread an abbreviation that way. This particular error by Duvernoy has led astray a number of exemplary scholars. Moreover, out of almost 6000 testimonies this would be the only reference to "perfect" when the logical run-of-the-mill word is obvious. Such an erroneous reading can only happen if you let the weight of a century or more of the historiography of Catharism make you see things that are not there. Jean-Paul Rehr, under the direction of Julien Théry, is currently finishing a superb edition of MS 609.

[23] R.I. Moore disagrees with these arguments about heresy in the twelfth century.

[24] Biller, Lucy Sackville, and Shelagh Sneddon are currently engaged on a five-year (2014-2019) Arts and Humanities Research Council award of £802,825 at the University of York investigating "The

Genesis of Inquisition Procedures and the Truth Claims of Inquisition Records: The Inquisition Registers of Languedoc 1235-1244.” This project will produce editions of the earliest registers from the Doat Collection accompanied by translations. The website <https://www.york.ac.uk/res/doat/> is excellent and informative. Unfortunately, the same lack of intellectual generosity marring Arnold and Biller’s sourcebook is on display, where the debate about the reality of heresy, especially Catharism, is again mostly ignored or grossly misrepresented. For example, “Some scholars have been suggesting that the medieval Church, via the inquisition tribunal especially, conjured up heretical sects. If they are correct, these inquisition trials were the fraught meeting-point of real people and a monstrous fraud wrought by the medieval Church.” No scholar argues this, particularly Moore and myself. I strongly believe in editing texts and I absolutely consider Biller’s “Doat Project” important and worthy, but there is a long tradition, especially amongst medievalists, where the editing of texts is somehow a more “objective” exercise than a monograph, an endeavour untouched by historiographic controversy, safe in the “scientific” methods of the philologist. Surely, the falsification of Catharism erases such simplistic assumptions.

[25] Arnold, “The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem,” in Sennis, *Cathars in Question*, pp. 77-78.

[26] Chris Wickham, *Medieval Europe* (Yale and London: Yale University Press, 2016), p. 166, and p. 276 n. 47, where he writes that Arnold’s “The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem,” “sums up the debate neatly.” Wickham, *Medieval Europe*, p. 276 n. 49, even succumbs to the same rhetorical style as Arnold when he inexplicably refers to my *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), as “angry.”

[27] Julie Berry, *The Passion of Dolssa* (New York: Penguin, 2016).

[28] For example, in the history of emotions, William M. Reddy’s *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900-1200 CE* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), argues that the origins of Western romantic love, a dualism of love and desire, occurred when troubadours and trobairitz sang a “counter-doctrine” to the Church in the twelfth century. This counter-doctrine “grew up in part as a kind of covert religious dissent.” Ultimately, his argument is conventional, and conventionally mistaken about the world between the Garonne and Rhône Rivers, while his methodology is redolent of the search for similarities across cultures of the great nineteenth-century anthropologists. Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), while lacking Reddy’s gloss of sophistication, also misunderstands love, treachery, the troubadours, and the lands between the Garonne and Rhône Rivers, as will anyone who assumes the existence of Catharism, as she does. What is so intriguing about practitioners of the history of emotions is that, apart from the essentialism at the very core of the field and literalness in what defines an emotion, they confuse a new (up to a point) topic as equalling a new methodology. The history of emotions is defined by the most traditional style of intellectual history.

[29] Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (London and New York, Routledge, 2002).

Mark Gregory Pegg
Washington University in St. Louis and Collegium de Lyon
mpegg@wustl.edu

Copyright © 2017 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews

at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Review* nor republication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of *H-France*. The views posted on *H-France Review* are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172