IF NOT BOGOMILISM THAN WHAT? THE ORIGINS OF CATHERISM IN THE LIGHT OF THE SOURCES

Abstract. Since the end of the twentieth Century the traditional interpretation of Catharism, assuming it’s Eastern roots and dualist character is the object of a harsh criticism, formulated by the deconstructionist scholars. The moderated version of their new interpretation assumes that dualism didn’t play an important role in Catharism, and that the Cathar “dissidence” was not influenced by the Eastern dualist heresies (especially Bogomilism), but appeared independently in the West. According to the radical version Catharism didn’t exist at all and contemporary scholars should accept a new paradigm – Middle-Ages without Catharism.

The aim of this article is to examine the source arguments, which stand behind both interpretations – on one side the arguments concerning the contacts of the Cahars with the Eastern dualists, with special attention paid to the time of their emergence and character of these relations, and on the other the arguments concerning Cathar dualist doctrines, which according to the deconstructionists were constructed arbitrarily by the Catholic polemists, basing on the ancient anti-heretical works, especially anti-Manichaean writings of St. Augustine. The article will try to find the answer to the question if the Cathar doctrines described in the Catholic sources are indeed so closely similar to the Manichaean teachings known from St. Augustine and at the same time so different from the Bogomil dualism. The analysis of the sources will show if the new interpretation is based on the arguments that are strong enough to overthrow the traditional one and if it the theory assuming lack of Bogomil influence can be considered as a serious alternative.
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Since the time of Charles Schmidt (middle of the 19th century), scholars of Catharism, basing on the testimonies of the sources, underlined the Eastern, precisely Bogomil roots of this heresy. In the 20th century, as the new sources were discovered, scholars of next generations, such as Antoine Dondaine, Arno Borst, Christine Thouzelier, Malcolm Lambert or Edina Bozoky, confirmed and specified the claims of the German scholar, proving, that Catharism appeared under the influence of the earlier, eastern dualist heresies, especially Bogomilism1. Bernard
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Hamilton in his research noted also indirect influence of Paulicianism on Catharism, through the radically dualistic Bogomil church of Drugonthia.

Since more than two decades however, this traditional vision of Catharism is questioned by the adherents of the deconstructionist interpretation, who openly try to overthrow it. Revolutionary claims of this school were presented in 1998 in the volume entitled *Inventer l’hérésie?*, edited by Monique Zerner. Deconstructionist interpretation indeed totally deconstructs our whole knowledge about Catharism, because it denies both its Eastern roots and dualistic character. Its radical adherents (such as J.L. Biget, J. Théry or U. Brunn) even demand to abandon the names Cathars and Catharism, or openly claim, that our traditional perception of Catharism should be replaced with the modified one. Mark Gregory Pegg openly says about the need of a new paradigm – “Middle Ages without Catharism”. In more moderate form, the deconstructionist interpretation denies the Eastern origins of Catharism, but does not reject the relations of the Cathars with the East, usually claiming, that they appeared later, when their heresy was already formed. This moderate option bases on the interpretation, formulated in the 1950s by R. Morghen, later developed also by J. Duvernoy, who claimed that Catharism was an evangelical heresy, that appeared in the West, totally independently from any external influence, and its dualistic doctrine was the effect of a specific exegesis of the Bible. As Ernst Werner has put it – the Cathars had reinterpreted Christianity based on St. John’s Gospel, just like Martin Luther did it later, based on St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans. Moderate deconstructionists accept these claims,
however they significantly depreciate Cathar dualism, claiming that it did not play an important role in this heresy. Following M. Zerner and her adherents they accept the assumption (as it is in the case of P. Jimenez, J.L. Biget or U. Brunn), that the Cathar dualism had been arbitrarily constructed by the Catholic polemists, before it appeared among the dissidents as the effect of their independent exegesis, developed in the heretical schools. The main aim of the Catholic polemists was to discredit the evangelic dissidents through openly heretical, dualistic doctrine and to justify their persecution. According to this interpretation, when the dualist doctrine was already formed, the Cathars established contacts with the Bogomils – as Anne Brenon says – both groups grew from the same need of the return to the original Christianity, but appeared totally independently.

Already the first look at this concept shows its weaknesses, inconsistency and improbable character. First of all it says that the Cathars formed dualistic doctrine independently and later established contacts with the Bogomils, who existed earlier and accidentally professed very similar doctrine. Second – the Cathars accepted doctrinal concepts constructed by their enemies to discredit them, and later developed these concepts in their exegetical schools. Why would they do this? As J.L. Biget explained – it was the effect of simple psycho-social mechanisms – unfortunately he did not specify what kind of mechanisms he was thinking about. The concept that assumes arbitrary construction of the heresy to discredit the Cathars, who in fact were evangelical dissidents, trying to restore early Christianity basing on the Holy Scripture can also be logically questioned. In relation to it an obvious question arises: why would the Catholic polemists impose this dualist doctrine only on the Cathars and not on the Waldensians? And second: if the Cathars originally were not dualists, but evangelical dissidents, then what actually distinguished them from the Waldensians and what was the core of their identity? Besides, if we assume, that the Catholics had arbitrarily constructed
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dualistic doctrine and imposed it on one part of dissidents, calling them Cathars, than why would the representatives of the second part of the dissidents – the Waldensians, join this Catholic action of discrediting their evangelical brothers and fought their dualism in disputes and their own polemics, as it was in the case of Durand of Huesca11?

In the light of the above-mentioned inconsistencies it’s understandable, that the deconstructionist interpretation is criticized by many scholars, such as M. Roquebert, P. Biller, Y. Stoyanov, or J. Arnold, who accuse its adherents of selective attitude towards the sources and bending the facts to the previously formed assumptions12. On the other hand, the deconstructionist scholars very often roughly depreciate the claims of the traditional interpretation. M.G. Pegg says, that its adherents dwell in the old paradigm and ignore all new research13, while P. Jimenez calls the traditional interpretation “Catholic”, unambiguously suggesting that the religious adherence of the scholars determine the results of their research (it was directed primarily against A. Dondaine)14. As we can see, there are two irreconcilable interpretations of Catharism – first, developed through at least one and a half of a century, perceiving Catharism as a dualist heresy, rooted in Bogomilism, and second – a bit more than twenty years old that totally rejects all the conclusions of the previous, claiming that Catharism appeared independently in the West and originally was not dualistic in character. In such a situation we should take a closer look at the arguments (especially those taken from the source material), which

13 M.G. Pegg, The Paradigm…, p. 21, 34–35, 52. Throwing serious accusations at his opponents M.G. Pegg himself seems to ignore the criticism directed against his radically deconstructionist claims, denying the existence of Catharism. In 2011 Zdenko Zlatar overtrew all the revolutionary claims formulated by M.G. Pegg in his detailed analysis based on the testimony of the inquisitorial sources, cf.: Z. Zlatar, What’s in a Name? A Critical Examination of Published and Website Sources on the Dualism of the Cathars in Languedoc, JRH 35, 2011, p. 546–561.
stand behind both conceptions to determine if the younger one can be treated as a serious alternative to the older.

The deconstructionists in their interpretation of Catharism try to deny by all means its Eastern roots, but to do this, they have to propose a convincing reinterpretation of various source testimonies confirming Bogomil origins of this heresy. Pilar Jimenez presented an explanation, according to which, the Eastern origins of Catharism is a part of a corps of stereotypes, constructed by the Catholic clergymen to discredit the dissidents by attributing to them the connections with the negatively perceived East – a place of the crusaders defeat. Very similar is the opinion of J.L. Biget, who claims that the East was perceived extremely negatively as a source of all the heresies. According to M. Zerner the idea of the Eastern origins appeared already during the times of Gregory IX, when the relations of papacy with Bulgaria deteriorated. However, because all these scholars are obviously aware of the fact, that the contacts between the Cathars and the Bogomil East cannot be totally denied, so – as it was said above – they shift the beginnings of these contacts in time, claiming, that they actually appeared later. According to P. Jimenez they were established at the beginning of the 13th century, according to J.L. Biget – during the Fourth Crusade. This shift in time, aimed at eliminating the possibility of external influence on the formation of Catharism, is not a new idea. Even much earlier J. Duvernoy claimed that the Cathars did not know the Bulgarian dualism until the end of the 12th century – precisely to the time, when Interrogatio Iohannis appeared in the West.

Also in this case, serious reservations arise to the theories of the deconstructionist scholars. First it seems, that they forget, that we are talking about the Middle Ages (12th–13th centuries) and not about the 20th century, so the Catholic polemical works were not a part of a propaganda aimed at turning the society against the group that the authorities tried to eliminate. Second – as it was pointed out by T. Drakopoulos – the East at that time was not perceived so negatively as the deconstructionists claim, and connecting it with the “dissidents” would not be an effective tool to discredit them. Bernard Hamilton on the other hand noticed, that the Catholic authors were not especially interested in the issue of the origins of Catharism focusing rather on religious matters, which proves,
that the Eastern origins could not have been a tool of a propaganda aimed at discrediting of the dissidents. So as we can see, the deconstructionist interpretation is based on the assumption that the Catholic polemists have invented the Eastern origins of Catharism, which is based on another assumption that the East was perceived so negatively that connecting some group with it must have resulted with its total discrediting and stigmatization. None of these general assumptions is based on the source material.

What about the second, at the first glance more probable part of this concept, which says that the contacts with the Bogomils appeared when Catharism was already doctrinally formed – so at the beginning of the 13th century or later? To verify this hypothesis we should analyze numerous source testimonies confirming the contacts of the Cathars with the East. First sources mentioning the East as a source of the Cathar heresy appeared very early. In 1143 Evervin of Steinfeld in his letter to Bernard of Clairvaux quoted the words of the heretics caught in Cologne (whom he had interrogated), who said, that their faith survived since the times of the apostles in Greece and other lands. From 1167 we have the acts of the Cathar council of Saint-Felix-de-Caraman, which was led by “papa” Nicetas – Bogomil bishop od Constantinople, who administered to the Cathars the sacrament consolamentum and episcopal ordinations, and at the end instructed them about the organization of the heretical churches. The same Nicetas appeared also in the anonymous De heresi catharorum in Lombardia from the beginning of the 13th century, which mentioned his visit in Italy, and presented him as the representative of the Drugunthian order (ordo Drugonthiae), trying to distract the Italian Cathars from the Bulgarian order (ordo Bulgariae), which they professed until then. The same source also says about the visit of a certain Petracius “from across
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the sea’, who brought new information discrediting Nicetas (claiming that he had committed a mortal sin), which caused a schism among the Italians. To end the internal conflict the Italian Cathars went to the bishop “from behind the mountains” – so from France – and he ordered that they should choose a new bishop and send him to Bulgaria for ordination. Finally, after various perturbations the Italian Cathars split into several independent churches, which newly elected bishops were sent to the East – to Bulgaria, Drugonthia or Sclavonia for ordination.

Independent French source from the 20s. of the 13th century – *Contra manichaeos* written by Durand of Huesca, a Waldensian converted to Catholicism, confirms the information of the *De heresi*. It says that the Cathars are internally divided and some of them are obedient to the heretics from Bulgaria, some to those from Greece, and others to those from Drugonthia. In the middle of the 13th century an Italian inquisitor and former Cathar perfect through 17 years – Rainer Sacchini finally explains the situation. Enumerating all the dualistic churches, existing at that time, at the end he says that all of them come from the two main ones – the church of Bulgaria or the church of Drugonthia. Finally the *Tractatus de hereticis*, written in the 60s of the 13th century probably by the inquisitor Anselm of Alexandria, contain a short mention, which can be described as a summary of the history of Catharism. The author derives the whole medieval dualism from Mani – who
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26 De Heresi, p. 306: *Preterea alio tempore venit quidam de ultramarinis partibus, petracius nomine cum sociis suis, et quedam retulit nova de quodam symone episcofo drugonhie, a quo origo suscepti ordinis a nicheta processerat. Et dicebat ipse petracius, quod ille simon fuit inventus in conclavi cum quadam, et quia alia contra rationem fecerat.*

27 De Heresi, p. 306: *…ille episcopus rationibus utriusque partis auditis et diligenter inspectis, talem protulit sententiam, […] ut ille episcopus sorte electus iret in bulgariam ordinem episcopatus suscipere; et ut repatriatus, suscepto ordine bulgarie, totam multitudinem illorum reconsolaretur per impositionem manuum.*

28 De Heresi, p. 308: *Ipsae episcopii […] misit Johanni iudeo ut iret in bulgariam et completet que continebatur in sententia, ut esset praelatus in lombardia, omnibus subesse volentibus. […] quidem de diszennzano, facta congregatone elegerunt quendam sibi episcopum nomine Johannem bellum, et eum miserunt ultra mare in drugonhiam ut ibi ordinaretur episcopus […] Item quidam de mantua cum sui sequacibus elegerunt quemdam nomine Calimannem sibi in episcopum et, eo in Sclavenia misso, post receptionem ordinis, episcopatus officio super eos functus est. Eodem itaque modo, quidam alius, Nicola nomine, a congregatione vincentiorum electus et in Sclavenia ad ordinem recipiendum missus, post reditum ab eis, episcopus teneretur.*


allegedly spread his teachings in Bulgaria and Drugonthia. From Bulgaria the heresy was brought to Constantinople by the Greek merchants and later the crusaders brought it from Constantinople to France. To what conclusions do these sources lead us? First it becomes clear, that the deconstructionist theory assuming the construction of the Eastern origins of Catharism by the Catholic polemists is unsustainable. Undoubtedly it would be much easier for the deconstructionists, if the earliest source was *Tractatus de hereticis*, because it would mean, that its relation became a pattern for the later Catholic authors. But the truth is different, *Tractatus* is the latest source and about the earlier ones we cannot say that they were written with the intention of discrediting the Cathars, through the connection of their heresy with the East. Mentions about the contacts with the East that appear in them are rather fragmentary and accidental and no author uses them to discredit the Cathars. Only combined together they give a clear image of Cathar contacts with the East. Second important thing is that the testimonies of the above-mentioned sources show clearly that the attempts of shifting the beginnings of the contacts with the East forward in time to the 13th century are unjustified. Even if we skipped Evervin’s mention about Greece, still the council in Saint-Felix and Nicetas’s visit in the West, confirmed by the *De heresi*, would remain. Besides all these sources show clearly that the contacts between the Cathars and the Bogomils cannot be perceived as meetings of equal communities, accidentally professing similar doctrines. They show that the Cathars were totally dependent from the Bogomils in religious matters. From the Bogomils they accepted the sacrament – consolamentum and episcopal ordinations (as it was in Saint-Felix) and sent their newly elected bishops to the Bogomil churches. The French Cathar bishop did not dare to solve the conflict among his Italian brothers on his own, but sent them to Bulgaria. Finally, the leader of the Italian Cathars – Mark in the time of Nicetas’ visit did not profess any independent evangelical doctrine, but was the adherent of *ordo Bulgariae*. It seems that Durand of Huesca was correct when he had said that the Cathars are obedient to the Eastern dualist heretics.

From all the above-mentioned sources undoubtedly the most important are the acts of the Saint-Felix council – a document written by the Cathars themselves, confirming their dependence from the East. As a main counter-argument against deconstructionist interpretation it was questioned by the scholars under
the leadership of Monique Zerner, who in 1999 organized a conference aimed at proving that it was a forgery\textsuperscript{33}. Their starting point was the fact that the original manuscript of this document did not survive and we know it only from the 17\textsuperscript{th} century copy made by G. Besse\textsuperscript{34}. Hypothesis proposed by Zerner that assumed it was a modern forgery was refuted by the formal analysis of this document prepared by the specialists from \textit{Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes}, who were invited to the conference\textsuperscript{35}. Slightly different approach was presented by J.L. Biget, who claimed that the document was forged in the Middle-Ages by the Catholics, trying to discredit the dissidents. According to him the forged document was intended as an incentive (\textit{excitatorium}) to the crusade against the Cathars\textsuperscript{36}. The weakness of this hypothesis lies in the fact that J.L. Biget did not explain how could the alleged Catholic forger have gained precise information concerning Cathar hierarchy in France and Italy, and the borders of the heretical dioceses, which are mentioned in this document, and are confirmed by the later inquisitorial sources. He also did not notice that this document is completely unsuitable for the \textit{excitatorium} because it was not mentioned in any polemical source and it does not contain any information that can discredit the Cathars\textsuperscript{37}. It informs about the visit of Nicetas, who administered the consolamentum and episcopal ordinations to the Cathars and delivered a sermon about the organization of the churches in the East\textsuperscript{38}. The document does not contain even a word about the dualist doctrine that according to the deconstructionists was the main tool of the Catholics in their action of the discreditation of the “dissidents”. J.L. Biget also did not consider \textit{De heresi}, which mentions Nicetas’ visit to Italy, but does not say anything about the Saint-Felix council. If indeed its author has based on the forged acts of this council it is obvious that he would have mentioned this event.

\textsuperscript{33} Materials from this conference, entitled “Revisiter l’heresie meridionale: le suppose concile cathare de Saint-Félix 1167” were published in a volume: \textit{L’Histoire du catharisme en discussion…}


\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Charte de Niquinta}, p. 47–48.
The above-mentioned sources, which authenticity was not convincingly questioned by anyone are not the only proofs for the Eastern origins. Another very important arguments for it are the names used to describe the Cathars. In the anonymous sermon from Saint-Vaast d’Arras, written around 1200, the Cathars professing radical dualism are called “Bulgars”\(^{39}\). In 1201 Robert of Auxerre mentioned the heretics, professing the “heresy of the Bulgars” (\textit{heresis Bulgarorum}), and William of Tudela in his Song of the Albigensian Crusade called the Cathars “those from Bulgaria”\(^{40}\). The name “Bulgars” was also used by Alberic of Trois-Fontaines writing about the Cathars burned in 1239 by Robert le Bougre\(^{41}\). The nickname of this inquisitor “Le Bougre” – the Bulgarian was the remainder of his history before the conversion, when he professed Catharism\(^{42}\). The name “Bulgari” is also confirmed by many other sources, which do not try to convince the reader (except for the \textit{Tractatus de hereticis} to the Eastern origins of Catharism, and therefore cannot be perceived as products of the Catholic anti-dissident propaganda\(^{43}\). Obviously Eastern, precisely Greek, roots has also the name \textit{Cathari}, first mentioned in 1163 by Eckbert of Schönau, who said that it was used for the dualist heretics in Germany\(^{44}\). It is a very important argument for the Eastern origins, especially in the context of the letter of Evervin of Steinfeld saying about the Greek roots of the Cathar heresy.

Another very important argument for the Eastern origins of Catharism are the Bogomil apocryphal books, used by the Cathars – the \textit{Interrogatio Iohannis} and the \textit{Vision of Isaiah}. The first was brought from Bulgaria in 1190 by Nazarius


\(^{42}\) Earlier life of Robert was described by Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, cf.: \textit{Alberici Monachii Trium Fontium Chronicon}, p. 940.

\(^{43}\) The “Bulgars” also known as patarenes are mentioned also by Matthew of Paris, writing in the first half of the 13th century, cf.: \textit{Matthaeus Parisiensis, Chronica Maiora}, ed. F. Liebemann, [in:] MGH.SS, vol. XXVIII, Hannoverae 1888, p. 133. The name “Bulgars” was also used in relation to the Cathars by Philippe Mouskes in the 40s. of the 13th century and later by the inquisitor Etienne de Bourbon, cf.: \textit{Ex Philippi Mousket Historia Regum Francorum}, ed. A. Tobier, [in:] MGH.SS, vol. XXVI, Hannoverae 1882, p. 805; Etienne de Bourbon, \textit{Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues}, ed. A. Lecoy de La Marche, Paris 1877, p. 300.

If not Bogomilism than What? The Origins of Catharism...

– the bishop of the Italian Cathar church of Concorezzo\textsuperscript{45}. On the copy of this book from the archives of the inquisition in Carcassone we can find a significant notice: \textit{Hoc est secretum hereticorum de Concorezo portatum de Bulgaria, plenam erroribus et etiam falsis latinis}\textsuperscript{46}. Various sources confirm as well that the Cathars knew the Vision of Isaiah. It is mentioned in the works of Durand of Huesca, Moneta of Cremona, and in the registers of Jacques Fournier from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{47}. Of course for the deconstructionist scholars it is not a proof for the Eastern origins of Catharism, but rather for the fact that the Cathars established contacts with the Bogomils at the end of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century. However, even if we ignore the above-mentioned sources, which show that these contacts were established much earlier, and if we follow the deconstructionist logic, still one question will remain: why did the evangelical dissidents, who had constructed their doctrine independently, based on the Holy Scripture, accepted the teachings from the Bogomil apocrypha brought from the East?

After the verification of the first part of the deconstructionist theory, denying the Eastern roots of Catharism it is time to take a closer look at its second part, concerning the dualist doctrine. Its main assumption is (as it was said above) that the Cathars were evangelical dissidents, trying to restore the original Christianity, and their dualist doctrine was arbitrarily constructed by the Catholic authors, based on the ancient anti-heretical works, mainly anti-Manichaean writings of St. Augustine. According to the deconstructionist scholars the Catholic authors tried to create the image of Catharism as doctrinally well-defined counter-church, competitive to Catholicism, thus justifying the persecution against the dissidents\textsuperscript{48}. The starting point of this hypothesis was the fact that the Catholic clergymen very often used the name “Manichaeans” in relation to the Cathars or (as it was in the case of \textit{Tractatus de hereticis}) derived Catharism directly from the ancient Manichaism. According to U. Brunn, the pioneer of this Catholic action of construction of the heresy was German Benedictine abbot Eckbert of Schönau, who in his \textit{Sermones contra catharos}, written in 1163, presented the Cathars as modern Manichaeans and even claimed that they celebrate the Manichaean feast – Bema.

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Summa Fratris Raineri}, p. 76; \textit{Tractatus de Hereticis}, p. 311.

\textsuperscript{46} More on \textit{Interrogatio Iohannis}, it’s origins and it’s use by the Cathars cf.: E. Bozoky, \textit{Le livre…}, p. 17–27, 176–197.


Moreover – at the end of his work he added an excerpt from the *De haeresibus* of St. Augustine⁴⁹. So at first glance it seems that some foundations for the hypothesis assuming the construction of the heresy indeed exist, the problem is that they are not based on a deeper analysis of the sources. To verify the probability of the deconstructionist hypothesis we should check if the Cathar doctrines described in the sources, are indeed so similar to the doctrines of St. Augustine's Manicheans, and at the same time, so different from the Bogomil teachings known from the Eastern sources. And finally, if the image of Catharism contained in the Catholic sources can be considered as the image of a counter-church.

Problems with the deconstructionist concept appear when we take a look at the most general issue that is the type of dualism. St. Augustine in his *De heresibus* says clearly that the Manicheans are radical dualists – they believe in two eternal, opposite principles – the good one, which is the source of all the spiritual beings, and the evil one, which is the source of the 5 elements of darkness that are the fabric of the material world⁵⁰. Meanwhile in Catharism the radical dualism, similar to that of the Manicheans was only one of two options – the second was the moderate dualism. The latter is confirmed by various sources, beginning with the 12ᵗʰ century, for example Radulf of Coggeshall for France or *Vita haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus* for Italy⁵¹. From the later sources we know that this type of dualism was professed by the biggest Italian Cathar church from Concorezzo and the church of Bagnolo, and in France its traces can be found in the inquisitorial registers from the second half of the 13ᵗʰ and beginnings of the 14ᵗʰ century⁵². Main assumptions of this type of dualism – the existence of only one God-creator and Satan, who is his creature, a rebelled angel, who forms the visible world and human bodies from the matter created by his father, are exactly the same as in the Bogomil doctrines known from the Eastern sources and the *Interrogatio*
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Iohannis53. Of course one might say that these assumptions are too general and therefore cannot be a convincing proof for the theory, but the same argument cannot be used against the doctrine described by Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium from the beginnings of the 13th century and Pierre des Vaux de Cernay writing in the times of Albigensian crusade. According to these sources, moderate French dualists believed in the existence of only one God who had two sons – Christ and the devil. This doctrine, is characteristic for the Bogomils, it was described by Cosmas the Priest or Euthymius Zigabenus, and for sure the Catholic polemists could not have found it in the scriptures of St. Augustine54.

The theory assuming the construction of the heresy based on anti-Manichaean works of St. Augustine is unsustainable, also when we consider the Cathar radical dualism. Catholic authors usually do not focus on the opposition of light and darkness that was typical for the Manichaeans, although sometimes there are exceptions to this rule, as it is in case of Eckbert of Schönau or Alan of Lille55. In the majority of the texts, two co-eternal and opposite principles are characterized, through their relation to the time. Both the French and the Italian sources beginning from the 12th century, mention the opposition between the good, spiritual being, which is eternal and不变的, and the evil being, which is changeable and transient56. This opposition: eternal-transient, so typical for the radical

---


56 This “time dualism” was mentioned in 1178 in the letter of the Cardinal Peter of Pavia, cf.: Epistola Petro tituli Sancti Chrysogoni praebytleri cardinalis, apostolicae sedis legati, [in:] Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene, vol. II, ed. W. STUBBS, London 1869, p. 158; at the end of the 12th century by Alan of Lille, cf.: ALANUS DE INSULI S, PL, vol. CCX, col. 308–312; in 1200 in Accipite nobis, p. 12; at the
Cathars (later developed in their theological Treatise, the so-called Manichaean Treatise) does not appear in the works of St. Augustine, but strongly resembles the Paulician radical dualism with its opposition between the good God – the lord of the future and the evil one – the ruler of present times identified with St. Paul’s god of this age (*deus huius saeculi*). The Cathar author of the Manichaean Treatise identifies matter, which through its changeability tends to nothingness with *nihil* from the prologue of the Gospel of St. John that emerged without God (*sine ipso factum est nihil*). So when this matter, tending to nothingness will finally pass than in the future only one principle will survive – the good God, exactly as it is in the Paulician doctrine.

The Paulician origins of the Cathar radical dualism seem to be quite probable, especially in the light of the conception proposed by B. Hamilton, who argued that it appeared under the influence of the Bogomil church of Drugonthia, which in turn was formed under Paulician influence. It is noteworthy especially when we consider the fact that the famous Nicetas, who presided over the Cathar council of Saint-Felix, and earlier tried to convert the Italian Cathars from *ordo Bulgariae* to *ordo Drugonthiae*, was ordained by Simon – bishop of Drugonthia.

No analogy, or even similarity to the Manichaean doctrines known from St. Augustine’s scriptures, can be found in the Cathar cosmology or anthropology presented by the Catholic authors. In their works (including Eckbert of Schönau) we would not find anything about five elements of darkness and opposed elements of light. The elements mentioned in the polemical works are classical – earth, water, fire and air. In case of anthropology, no polemical source mention the lords of smoke, who according to St. Augustine’s *De haeresibus* were the parents of Adam beginning of the 13th century in: EBRARDUS BETHUNENSIS, *Trias scriptorum adversus Valdensium sectam*, ed. M. DE LA BIGNE, [in:] *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. XXIV, Lugduni 1677, col. 1540; in the chronicle of William of Nangis: GUILLAELMUS DE NANGIACO, *Chronicon*, ed. M. BOUQUET, [in:] *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. XX, Paris 1840, p. 741. Similar characteristics of two opposed principles appears also in the Italian sources, cf.: MONETA DE CREMONA, p. 3; *Brevis Summula*, ed. A. MOLINIER, AMi 22, 1910 (cetera: *Brevis Summula*), p. 200; *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, ed. I. DA MILANO, Ae 14, 1940 (cetera: *Disputatio inter catholicum*), p. 130.


58 The characteristics of two opposed principles through their relation to time can be found in many chapters of the *Manichaean Treatise*, cf.: *Tractatus manicheorvm*, [in:] *Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIIe siècle d’après le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. C. THOUZELLIER, Louvain 1961 (cetera: *Tractatus manicheorvm*), p. 89–90, 98–99, 110. Finally, the author identifies the material being – transient and deprived of love with nothingness (*nihil*), cf.: *Tractatus manicheorvm*, p. 102–103: *Si omnes mali spiritus et mali homines, que possunt videri in hoc mundo, nichil sunt, quia sunt sine caritate, ergo sine Deo facta sunt. Non ergo Deus fecit ea, quia sine ipso factum est nichil*.

59 Cf. note 2.
and Eve. Eckbert of Schönau said that the Cathars identified human souls with the angels fallen from heaven and honestly added that this doctrine (as many other Cathar ideas) cannot be found in the works of St. Augustine. This remark is especially noteworthy because it shows that Eckbert, who obviously firmly believed that the Cathars were the descendants of the Manichaean, was honest and did not try to create the false image of this heresy. The angelic origin of the human souls, unknown to the Manichaean, appears in many Cathar doctrines – both radical and moderate. Its roots again can be found in the Bogomil teachings – precisely in the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, but the fact that Eckbert mentioned it in 1163, shows that the Cathars knew it long before this secret Bogomil book arrived to the West. So as we can see, it is another strong argument for the Bogomil origins of Catharism.

In case of the doctrine of the fall, crucial for the dualists, the situation is analogical as in anthropology. In many polemical works describing both the radical and the moderate Cathar doctrines, Satan is identified with the unjust steward from the Gospel of St. Luke (Lc 16: 1–8), so again we are dealing with a theme that is absent in the Manichaean teachings, but characteristic for Bogomilism. It is mentioned by Cosmas the Priest and *Interrogatio Iohannis*, where Satan – a rebelled angel, acts exactly as the evangelical unjust steward, reducing the duties of the angels to God. The Cathars were so deeply bound with this idea that they did not dare to abandon it even when they accepted radical dualism, where it completely does not make sense, which was noticed by their Catholic opponents.

---

60 Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, p. 89, 95.
61 Eckbertus Abbas Schonaugensis, *PL*, vol. CXCV, col. 96: *De ea haeresi loquor, quia dicunt nihil aliud esse animas humanas, nisi illos apostatas spiritus, qui in principio mundi ceciderunt a regno Dei; et hos posse in corporibus humanis promereri salutem: non autem nisi inter eos qui sunt de secta eorum.* Hoc autem non legitur inter errores Manichaei; Eckbertus Abbas Schonaugensis, *PL*, vol. CXCV, col. 16: *...indubitanter secta eorum, de quibus agimus, originem accepit a Manichaeo haeresiarcha, cujus doctrina maledicta erat et tota venenosa, et radicata est in populó istó perversó.* Multa tamen permista habent doctrinae magistri sui, quae inter haereses illius non iniunctur.
63 *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 52–59.
64 Manifestatio haeresis albigenorum et lugunensium, p. 385; *De Heresi*, p. 309; *Moneta de Cremona*, p. 4, 110; S. Petrus Martyr, p. 325; *Disputatio inter catholicum*, p. 132; *Brevis Summula*, p. 201; *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 312.
65 Cosmas the Priest, p. 126; *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 42–50.
In addition, another Cathar concept – reported by the polemical sources, according to which the fall was caused by the carnal sin – has its analogy in Bogomilism. It appears most often in the moderate doctrines, where Satan has carnal intercourse with Eve, which leads to the enslavement of the angelic element in the material body, but sometimes we can find it also in the radical dualism, where carnal sin is committed by the bodiless angels or spirits (which is illogical). Such a conception was mentioned by Durand of Huesca in the 13th century and later in the 14th by the witnesses interrogated by Jacques Fournier. Also, St. Augustine says that the Manichaean connect carnal desire with matter and avoid procreation, but he never mentions the idea that the fall of human beings or angels was caused by the carnal sin.

An exact analogy to this specific Cathar doctrine can be found in the Bogomil teachings – not only in the Interrogatio Iohannis, but also in the Panoplia Dogmatica of Euthymius Zigabenus from the beginning of the 12th century. In both sources the carnal sin was originated by Satan (in Panoplia it was Satanael – the son of God), who had carnal intercourse with Eve; later Eve had carnal intercourse with Adam and so people started to reproduce thus enslaving the spiritual element in material body. The significance of this sin is especially underlined in the Panoplia, where Satanael, for his sexual intercourse with Eve, was punished with the loss of his angelic shine and the power of creation, although he had not lost them after the rebellion against God. This repulsion to the carnal sin and strict observance of chastity by the Cathar perfecti is honestly mentioned by almost all the Catholic polemists, which is another strong argument against the hypothesis assuming the construction of Cathar heresy based on St. Augustine’s works. Bishop of Hippo in his most commonly known De heresibus accused Manichaeans of debauchery, claiming that during their obscene rituals they consume Eucharist mixed with semen and rape their female adepts. So if the Catholic authors indeed have constructed Cathar heresy to discredit the dissidents, then why have they not used these themes? Why have they not used another shocking Manichaean doctrine contained in the De heresibus, according to which Christ was identified with the serpent from paradise?

---


68 Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, p. 93, 97.


70 Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, p. 89–91.

71 Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, p. 95.
Confronted with the sources, the deconstructionist hypothesis assuming the construction of Cathar heresy, based on St. Augustine works seems to be highly improbable\textsuperscript{72}.

Equally improbable in the light of the sources is also another deconstructionist conception, according to which the Catholic polemists have created the image of Catharism as a well-organized and doctrinally defined counter-church. Even Eckbert of Schönau says that the Cathars are internally divided and profess various doctrines\textsuperscript{73}. Such an opinion is confirmed later in France, by the anonymous *Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium* and Durand of Huesca, and in Italy by Rainer Sacchoni and Salvo Burci\textsuperscript{74}. In the polemical sources we can find many various doctrines – moderately dualistic, radically dualistic, and mixes of these two types. Besides, the Catholics willingly emphasized the divisions among the heretics to prove, that their faith (in the opposition to Catholicism) does not come from God. Considering this, it is really hard to talk about the image of a strong, doctrinally well-defined Cathar church.

The analysis of the sources shows that the deconstructionist interpretation of Catharism cannot be treated as a serious alternative to the traditional one, assuming Eastern, Bogomil roots of this heresy. The latter is based on an extensive source material, confirming both the contacts of the Cathars with the East since the first half of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century and striking doctrinal similarities between Catharism and Bogomilism. The deconstructionist theory is not based on any new discoveries of the sources that could change our perception of Catharism, but rather on a new methodology, proposed by M. Zerner and her collaborators. This methodology rejects all the Catholic sources as unreliable, which is a consequence of the arbitrary assumption that their authors were hostile towards the Cathars and their main aim was to discredit them and justify their persecution. This assumption is presented almost as a dogma, beyond any discussion, and leads to another dogma formulated by Julien Thery, who said that the deconstruction of a clerical

\textsuperscript{72} As C. Taylor and Z. Zlatar point out, the use of the term “Manichaeans” by the Catholic authors in relation to the Cathars was caused by the similarities of general dualist assumptions in both heresies and the lack of the term “dualists” at that time, cf.: C. Taylor, *Evidence*…, p. 329–330; Z. Zlatar, *What’s in a Name?*…, p. 559–561.

\textsuperscript{73} Eckbertus Abbass Schonaugensis, PL, vol. CXC, col. 17: *Multi quidem sunt errores illorum, ita ut nemo omnes enumerando prosequi valeat […] Divisi sunt etiam contra semetipsum, quia nonnulla quae ab aliquibus eorum dicuntur, ab alis negantur.*

\textsuperscript{74} *Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 386: *Et sicut sunt diversi ac divisi fide et habitu a certis hominibus ita inter se diversas sentiunt heresies; Durandus de Huesca, Liber contra manichaeos, p. 138–139; Salvo Burci, Liber supra stella, ed. I. Da Milano, Ae 19, 1945, p. 309: Contra Catharos, qui appellantur Albahenses et Concorricii, qui inter se valde discrepant, videlicet quia unus alterum ad mortem condempnatur, dicentes Albanenses adversus Concorricios, se esse ecclesiam Dei, et dicentes, illos fuisse ex ipsis, et a nobis secessi sunt; et e converso Concorricii vero dicunt illud idem, Summa Fratris Raineri, p. 77.*
discourse should become an imperative. The scholars following this “imperative” focus on questioning the sources, which do not fit to their theory, including the sources of Cathar provenience, as it was in the case of the acts of St-Felix or the so called Manichaean Treatise. While the traditional interpretation of Catharism, assuming its Eastern origins and dualistic character, is based on the analysis of the sources of various provenance – both Western (Cathar and Catholic) and Eastern, in case of the deconstructionist interpretation the conclusions are formed a priori, based on selected and usually very limited source material. Considering this, it seems that the deconstructionist interpretation cannot be perceived as an equal alternative to the traditional one assuming the Bogomil roots of Catharism.
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