




Piotr Czarnecki (Kraków)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4155-4918>

EASTERN ELEMENTS IN CATHAR DOCTRINES – AN ARGUMENT FOR THE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATION OF CATHARISM

Abstract. At present we can observe intense attempts at overthrowing all the claims concerning Catharism that had been formulated by the scholars of the 20th century, based on careful analysis of the vast source material. So called “traditional interpretation”, assuming strong influence of the Eastern dualist heresies (Bogomilism and Paulicianism) on Catharism is currently rejected by scholars such as M.G. Pegg, J.-L. Biget and R.I. Moore as outdated and not compatible with the latest research. For the construction of this false image of Catharism Pegg blames Religionsgeschichte Schule and their comparative method, which according to him is built on the assumption that “if two ideas look alike to the historian, there must be a link between them”, but in this radical criticism, he seems to ignore the fact that comparison of the Cathar and Bogomil doctrine is justified by many sources, which confirm historical relations between the adherent of these heresies. What should be underlined, not only the current deconstructionist conception, represented by the above-mentioned scholars, but all the interpretations rejecting Eastern origins of Cathar doctrines, were constructed without the analysis of the Eastern sources. Considering this, the aim of this article is to analyse various specific Cathar doctrinal conceptions, which do not have analogies in the ancient heresies, with the doctrines of the Eastern dualists (mainly Bogomils but also Paulicians), known from the Eastern sources – both polemical and written (or used) by the heretics themselves. Such comparative analysis can verify the claims of the adherents of the “new paradigm”, according to which dualist Cathar doctrine was constructed by Catholics, basing on the ancient anti-heretical scriptures, mainly anti-Manichaean writings of St. Augustine.

Keywords: dualist doctrines, Catharism, Bogomilism, Paulicianism

Traditional interpretation of Catharism, assuming its Eastern roots and dualistic character, is nowadays challenged by deconstructionists, who present it as outdated, ultimately refuted and consequently not worth further discussion. Mark Gregory Pegg and Jean-Louis Biget openly depreciate their adversaries,

claiming that they ignore new research and do not want to accept them due to their “ideological blockade”¹. Pegg, in his article from 2020, authoritatively announced a new paradigm of “Middle Ages without Catharism”, adding that all the questions concerning Catharism should be formulated in its light². Similar opinions are expressed also by Biget, who in 2001 claimed that the names “Cathars” and “Catharism” should be rejected³. This radical interpretation is shared also by R.I. Moore, in his 2012 book *The War on Heresy*, which can hardly be perceived as an academic work⁴. Nevertheless, as the author says in the introductory chapter, its main aim is *to clear away a luxuriant overgrowth of falsehood and legend that has gathered around these heretics – especially, but not only, the so-called ‘Cathars’ during the thousand years*⁵.

These falsehoods and legends include, above all, the conviction that the Cathars were dualists, and their heresy was rooted in the East. For the formulation of this conviction, Moore blames the adherents of traditional historiography of heresy, who, according to him, based their conclusions on late and unreliable sources and didn’t consider their context. Without any substantive discussion of their arguments, he claims authoritatively, that the “small body of Latin texts”, on which this interpretation was built, has been expertly questioned in the last twenty years by scholars such as M. Zerner and her collaborators, while M.G. Pegg, in his book: *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246 brought a devastating critique of the methods of his predecessors and an entirely fresh understanding of the religion of the good men*. Totally convinced by the new interpretation Moore asks rhetorically: *How could so many good scholars have got it so wrong?*⁶

But is this stunning self-confidence of the adherents of the “new paradigm” based on strong arguments? Is this rejection of the Eastern provenance of Catharism based on a deep analysis of a vast source material, which includes also the Eastern texts and on a comparative analysis of the doctrines? Not in the least. For the creation of the image of Catharism as an organised, dualistic religion, rooted in Bogomilism, Pegg blames Religionsgeschichtliche Schule and its method, which

¹ J.-L. BIGET, *L’histoire du « catharisme » occitan: un nœud de questions*, [in:] *Le « catharisme » en questions*, ed. IDEM, S. CAUCANAS, M. FOURNIÉ, D. LE BLÉVEC, Fanjeaux 2020, p. 15–16; M.G. PEGG, *Le catharisme en questions: falsifiabilité, vérité historique et une nouvelle histoire du christianisme médiéval*, [in:] *Le « catharisme » en questions...*, p. 332; IDEM, *The Paradigm of Catharism; or, the Historians’ Illusions*, [in:] *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. SENNIS, York 2016, p. 21.

² M.G. PEGG, *Le catharisme en questions...*, p. 331.

³ J.-L. BIGET, *Réflexions sur « l’hérésie » dans le Midi de la France au Moyen Âge*, *Here* 36–37, 2001, p. 29–30, 32, 38, 42.

⁴ According to Peter Biller *The War on Heresy is written for general readers, and does not proceed like a disciplined academic monograph*. Biller also criticizes Moore for relying on the opinions of other scholars, especially Pegg, which brings a danger of repeating their shortcomings, see: P. BILLER, *Goodbye to Catharism?*, [in:] *Cathars in Question...*, p. 287–288.

⁵ R.I. MOORE, *The War on Heresy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2012, p. 10.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 332–336, 343–344.

is built, as he says, on the assumption that *if two ideas look alike to the historian, there must be a link between them*⁷.

By stating this, Pegg suggests that adherents of the traditional interpretation made comparisons between Cathar and Bogomil doctrines arbitrarily. Questioning of the comparative method is not the only argument Pegg directed against the traditional interpretation. He constructed his radically deconstructionist paradigm much earlier (in 2001), based on a very limited source material – manuscript 609 from Toulouse, documenting a huge investigation led by the inquisitors Bernard de Caux and Jean de St. Pierre between 1245–1246. After the analysis of this source, he drew the conclusion concerning the whole Catharism, claiming that it was not an organized heresy, professing dualist doctrine, because the latter was almost absent in this document⁸.

This selective approach to the sources was not invented by Pegg. It was introduced in 1998 by M. Zerner and her collaborators. The manifesto of this new approach, in which, as J. Théry has put it: *deconstruction of the sources was an imperative*, was a volume entitled *Inventer l'hérésie*⁹. This hyper-critical approach to the sources, in which (as was underlined by Roquebert) it is not important what the source says, but who says it and what their hypothetical aims were, resulted in the rejection of all the sources that did not fit the previously formulated assumptions as unreliable¹⁰. Thus, the traditional interpretation, seeing Catharism as a dualist heresy rooted in the East, was replaced by a new one, in which Cathar dualism was arbitrarily constructed by the Catholic polemicists, trying to discredit the evangelical dissidents, for whom there was no place in the centralising post-Gregorian Church¹¹. Because all the Catholic authors knew St. Augustine and his anti-Manichean writings, they decided to impose the tenets of this archetypal dualist heresy on the dissidents. Uwe Brunn tried to provide evidence to support this theory, focusing on the *Sermones Contra Catharos*, written in 1163 by Eckbert of Schönau, who as the first described the Cathar dualist doctrine and

⁷ M.G. PEGG, *Le catharisme en questions...*, p. 337–343, 355; IDEM, *The Paradigm...*, p. 23–32, 48.

⁸ IDEM, *The Corruption of Angels. The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246*, Princeton 2001.

⁹ *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'Inquisition*, ed. M. ZERNER, Nice 1998; J. THÉRY, *L'hérésie des bons hommes. Comment nommer la dissidence religieuse non vaudoise ni béguine en Languedoc (XII^e – début XIV^e siècle)?*, Here 36–37, 2002, p. 107.

¹⁰ M. ROQUEBERT, *Le déconstructionnisme et les études cathares*, [in:] *Les Cathares devant l'Histoire. Mélanges offerts à Jean Duvernoy*, ed. M. AURELL, Cahors 2005, p. 110–111.

¹¹ J.-L. BIGET, *Réflexions...*, p. 30–51; IDEM, *Les bons hommes sont-ils les fils des bogomiles? Examen critique d'une idée reçue*, *SlOc* 16, 2003, p. 161; R.I. MOORE, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society. Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, Malden 2007, p. 85, 93; IDEM, *The Birth of Popular Heresy, a Millennial Phenomenon*, *JRH* 24, 2000, p. 18–20; J. THÉRY, *L'hérésie...*, p. 77, 117; M.G. PEGG, *On cathars, albigenses and good man of Languedoc*, *JMH* 27, 2001, p. 184; P. JIMÉNEZ-SANCHEZ, *Les catharismes. Modèles dissidents du Christianisme médiéval (XXI^e–XIII^e siècles)*, Rennes 2008, p. 21–24; M. ZERNER, *Introduction*, [in:] *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'Inquisition*, ed. IDEM, Nice 1998, p. 10–16.

was the first to use the name “Cathars”¹². Eckbert apparently firmly believed that the dualist Cathars are the descendants of the Manicheans and at the end of his work he added excerpts from St. Augustine’s *De heresibus*. Brunn took this as proof of the construction of the heresy and created a sophisticated hypothesis, explaining how Eckbert’s work, which survived in only one copy, became a pattern for all the other polemicists in Western Europe¹³. A similar idea was behind the paper of an Australian scholar H. Chiu, who investigated *De fide catholica contra haereticos sui temporis*, written by Alan of Lille, at the end of the 12th century. Trying to prove, against the claims of the author that he did not gain information about the Cathar doctrine from the direct conversations with the heretics, Chiu constructed a hypothesis assuming that this work was purely theoretical, which meant that the Cathar dualism described in it was constructed based on the works of the Church Fathers, and its main aim was to teach a theology student how to refute arguments contrary to the Catholic faith¹⁴.

It is indeed very surprising that neither Brunn nor Chiu, nor any other scholar who supports the theory of the construction of the heresy based on St. Augustine’s works did not verify it by comparing the Cathar dualism described by the polemicists with its alleged Manichean model contained in the writings of the bishop of Hippo. Such a verification would have demonstrated that these dualistic doctrines are similar only in terms of the most general ideas, while the more specific beliefs are radically different. Comparative analysis however is not the preferred method among the adherents of the “new paradigm” and this was also true in the past, among scholars who denied the connections between Catharism and Eastern dualism. In the 1950s, Raffaello Morghen, who argued with A. Dondaine claiming that the Cathars were the descendants of the Western evangelical reformers and not the disciples of the Bogomils, did not analyse the Eastern sources¹⁵. Neither were they analysed by the adherents of this theory, such as R. Manselli or E. Werner. The latter explained the emergence of dualism among the Cathars, saying that they created a new version of Christianity, reinterpreting the gospel of St. John exactly as Martin Luther did later, reinterpreting St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans¹⁶.

As we can see, all the interpretations denying the Eastern roots of the Cathar dualist doctrine were formulated without analysing of the Eastern sources. This is their common feature, or rather a common weakness. It seems quite logical that to

¹² ECKBERTUS ABBAS SCHONAUGENSIS, *Sermones contra catharos*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CXCIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1855, col. 13–102.

¹³ U. BRUNN, *Des contestataires aux “Cathares”. Discours de réforme et propagande antihérétique dans les pays du Rhin et de la Meuse avant l’Inquisition*, Paris 2006, p. 160, 238–274, 316–348; IDEM, *Cathari, catharistae et cataphrygae. Ancêtres des cathares du XII siècle*, *Here* 36–37, 2002, p. 184–185.

¹⁴ H. CHIU, *Alan of Lille’s Academic Concept of the Manichee*, *JRH* 35, 2011, p. 496–506.

¹⁵ R. MORGHEN, *Medioevo cristiano*, Bari 1951, p. 212–224; IDEM, *Problèmes sur l’origine de l’hérésie au moyen âge*, *RH* 236, 1966, p. 1–16.

¹⁶ R. MANSELLI, *Evangelisme et mythe dans la foi cathare*, *Here* 5, 1985, p. 5–17; E. WERNER, *L’évangélie de Jean et le dualisme medieval*, *Here* 12, 1989, p. 15–24.

formulate general opinions concerning the origins of Cathar doctrines (and especially such radical opinions as described above), it is necessary to deeply analyse the Eastern sources and refer to them, as underlined by scholars acquainted with these sources¹⁷. The more general an opinion is, the larger source base it requires, therefore to formulate interpretations concerning the entirety of Catharism, one should base this on all the available source materials, both Eastern and Western, and of various provenience – heretical, inquisitorial and polemical. Considering this, I decided to verify categorical claims of the promoters of the “new paradigm” using the method, which they condemned – a comparison of doctrines. Of course, I am aware that there is truth in Pegg’s argument, that if two ideas look alike it doesn’t mean that there must be a link between them, however, I have some reservations. First, it is true that ideas which have no contact in time and space should not be compared. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to compare the Cathar doctrine with its Manichaean or Marcionite equivalents; however, in the case of Catharism and medieval Eastern dualism – Paulician and especially Bogomil – the situation looks completely different, because there are many sources confirming intense contacts between the adherents of these heresies. In 1143, Evervin of Steinfeld wrote that the dualist heretics caught in Cologne claimed that their heresy had survived since the times of the apostles “in Greece”¹⁸; in 1167, the Cathars were visited by the Bogomil bishop of Constantinople – Nicetas – who, during the heretical council at St. Felix-de-Caraman, acted as their superior, administering sacraments and ordaining their bishops¹⁹, and this visit is confirmed by the Italian sources: *De Heresi catharorum in Lombardia* and *Tractatus de hereticis*²⁰.

Shortly after that event, the newly elected bishops of the Italian Cathar churches went to the East for teachings and ordinations, to Bulgaria, Drugonthia and Dalmatia²¹. In 1190, Nazarius – the bishop of the Cathar church of Concorezzo – brought from Bulgaria the apocryphal scripture *Interrogatio Iohannis*²², which, together with the Bogomil *Vision of Isaiah*, was used by the Cathars, as we may conclude from the *explicit* of this book, which survived in the archives of the Carcassonne inquisition²³. Since the beginning of the 13th century the French Cathars

¹⁷ Y. STOYANOV, *The Debate on Medieval Western Christian Dualism through the Prism of Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, Scri 14, 2018, p. 346–347, 349–350; IDEM, *Medieval Christian...*, p. 165–166.

¹⁸ EVERVINUS STEINFELDENSIS, *Epistola CDXXXII, ad. S. Bernardum, De haereticis sui temporis*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CLXXXII, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Parisii 1879, col. 187.

¹⁹ *Charte de Niquinta, antipape des herétiques surnommés d’Albigéois*, ed. D. ZBIRAL, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares. Une histoire à pacifier?*, ed. A. BRENON, Loubatieres 2010, p. 47.

²⁰ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 19, 1949, p. 306; *Tractatus de Hereticis*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 20, 1950, p. 309.

²¹ *De heresi...*, p. 308.

²² *Summa Fratris Raineri de ordine fratrum praedicatorum, de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle. Le Liber de duobus principiis suivi d’un fragment de Rituel Cathare*, ed. A. DONDAINE, Roma 1939, p. 76.

²³ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, [in:] *Le livre secret des cathares. Interrogatio Iohannis. Edition critique, traduction commentaire*, ed. et trans. E. BOZOKY, Paris 2009, p. 86.

were commonly called “Bulgars”²⁴, and in 1223, Papal Legate Conrad of Porto was seriously concerned with the activity of the heretical “pope” from Bosnia, who had adherents in Languedoc²⁵. Finally, in the 1270s, an Italian inquisitor (probably Anselm of Alessandria), in his short account of the history of Catharism, mentioned Constantinople as the cradle of Catharism²⁶. These are the most known source arguments for the Eastern origins of Catharism that are strong enough to entitle a scholar to compare Cathar doctrine with the teachings of the Eastern dualists.

Coming back to Pegg’s argument, it is necessary to mention yet another reservation concerning the level of generality of the compared doctrines. The fact that two general ideas are similar does not prove anything; therefore, from the fact that both the radically dualistic Cathars and the Manicheans believed in two eternal gods – a good one and an evil one – we cannot conclude that the former were the descendants of the latter, because they could have formulated such general tenets entirely independently. When it comes to the more specific parts of the doctrines, the situation is different; therefore, in the comparison of the doctrines one should focus especially on these.

Catharism was internally diverse in the field of the doctrine. This means that, within the general dualistic framework, there were many doctrines, sometimes profoundly different, that were professed by independent churches. This internal doctrinal diversity was emphasised by the Catholic polemicists as evidence that the Cathars were not the true Church of God, and it is also a strong argument against the narrative of the deconstructionists, who claim that the polemicists constructed a false image of Catharism as a well-organized counter-church. Similar doctrinal diversity existed also among the Eastern dualists – the Bogomils – where several variants of the doctrine coexisted.

The first element of Catharism that is reminiscent of the Bogomil teachings is the presence of moderate dualism (assuming the existence of only one God-creator), which was unknown to the Manicheans. For the scholars, who like Pegg or Biget perceive Catharism mainly through the perspective of France, moderate dualism indeed may not be especially important, because only a few French sources confirm the existence of this kind of doctrine, which was in the minority

²⁴ See e.g.: *Accipite nobis vulpes parvulas, que demoliuntur vineas Domini*, ed. B. DELMAIRE, *Here* 17, 1991, p. 11; *Roberti Autissiodorensis Chronicon*, ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER, *MGH SS*, vol. XXVI, Hannoverae 1882, p. 260, 271; *La chanson de la croisade albigeoise*, vol. I, ed. E. MARTIN-CHABOT, Paris 1931, p. 10; MATTHAEUS PARISIENSIS, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. F. LIEBERMANN, [in:] *MGH*, SS, vol. XXVIII, Hannoverae 1888, p. 133; ETIENNE DE BOURBON, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologies*, ed. A. LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Paris 1877, p. 300.

²⁵ *Archiepiscopi Rotomagensis ad suffraganeos, quibus mandatum Conradi Portuensis episcopi & A. S. L significat conveniendi senonas adversus Bartholomeum, Albigensium episcopum*, ed. J.D. MAN-SI, [in:] *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XXII, Venetiis 1778, col. 1204.

²⁶ *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 308.

comparing to the dominant “Manichean” radical dualism. In Italian Catharism however, the situation was inverted, because moderate dualism was dominant. According to Rainer Sacconi (inquisitor and ex-Cathar perfect), writing in the middle of the 13th century, this form of dualism was professed by the largest Italian Cathar church of Concorezzo, which had 1,500 *perfecti*, and the church of Bagnolo (200 *perfecti*), while the other churches (which can be classified as more or less radically dualistic) had only 700 *perfecti* combined²⁷. As we may conclude, based on the testimony of the sources, moderate dualism must have been the first form of Cathar doctrine. The sources say that the first leader of the Italian Cathars, Mark (converted by the heretical missionaries from France), initially belonged to the moderately dualistic Bulgarian order (*ordo Bulgariae*) and later was converted by to the radical Drugunthian order (*ordo Drugonathiae*) by Nicetas – the Bogomil bishop of Constantinople²⁸.

The common point of the Cathar moderate dualism was the belief in only one God, who has the power of creation *ex nihilo*, and therefore is called the creator. He created the spiritual world and foundations of the material world in the form of four elements. Satan in this version of doctrine is only a maker (*factor*) who formed the shapeless matter into the visible world. Exactly the same can be said about the Bogomil moderate dualism, but the fact that such general ideas overlap is not a definitive evidence for the flow of the doctrine between the two dualist heresies; therefore, it seems necessary to take a more detailed look at these moderately dualistic ideas.

First, it must be stressed that in moderate Catharism there were two theological concepts – according to the first, Satan was a creature of God, an angel who had rebelled, and after the rebellion formed the material world. This is confirmed in France at the turn of the 12th and the 13th century by Ralph of Coggeshall and the anonymous *De heresibus*²⁹ and in Italy by many sources from the 13th century, presenting the doctrine of the church of Concorezzo³⁰. Exactly the same doctrine

²⁷ *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 70.

²⁸ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 306: *Et iste marcus habebat ordinem suum de bulgaria. Adveniens quidem papas nicheta nomine, de constantinopolitanis patibus in lombardiam, cepit causari ordinem bulgarie, quem marcus habebat. Unde marcus episcopus cum suis subditis hesitare incipiens, relicto ordine bulgarie, suscepit ab ipso nicheta ordinem drugontheie.*

²⁹ *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. STEVENSON, [in:] *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, vol. LXVI, London 1875, p. 124–125: *Aiunt etiam alii qui de secretis eorum investigaverunt, quod isti non credunt Deum res humanae curare, nec aliquam dispositionem vel potentiam in terrenis creaturis exercere; sed apostatam angelum, quem et Luzabel nominant...; De heresibus*, ed. A. CAZENAVE, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen: Vorstellungen im XII. u. XIII. Jahrhundert über ihr Wirken in der Heilsgeschichte*, ed. A. ZIMMERMANN, Berlin 1977, p. 383.

³⁰ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 310; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos et Valdeses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. RICCHINI, Roma 1743, p. 110; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos*, ed. D. BAZZOCCHI, [in:] *L'eresia catara. Appendice*, Bologna 1920, p. XVII, XXVI; SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, ed. I. DA MILANO, Ae 19, 1945, p. 314, 339; *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 76.

existed earlier in Bogomilism, where it is confirmed by Cosmas the Priest, writing in the 10th century, and by the above-mentioned *Interrogatio Iohannis*³¹. Nevertheless, the concept that Satan the fallen angel created the material world is not specific enough to Bogomilism to consider it as an argument for the Bogomil roots of the analogous Cathar doctrine. Eventually, the belief that Satan is a fallen angel is common in Christianity, and the conclusion that the material world is under his rule and was formed by him could have been drawn by the Cathars independently based on the analysis of the New Testament. That is of course possible; however, there is one element in this doctrine that is typical for the Bogomils – the identification of Satan with the unjust steward from the gospel of St. Luke (Luke 16: 1–9). This is confirmed by many Eastern sources, among which three are crucial: the above-mentioned work of Cosmas the Priest, *Panoplia dogmatica*, written by the Byzantine theologian Euthymius Zigabenus at the beginning of the 11th century and *Interrogatio Iohannis*³². The theme of Satan as the steward of heavenly hosts who decided to rebel against God appears also in the apocryphal scripture: *Sea of Tiberias* (11th–12th century), which was used by the Bogomils³³. This typically Bogomil theme of Satan – the unjust steward – was widespread in Catharism; in Languedoc, it is confirmed by the *Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium*³⁴, written around 1200, and in Italy, (where it was commonly known) is attested by many sources; among others: *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia* from the beginning of the 13th century, Peter of Verona (ca. 1235), Moneta of Cremona (1240), *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, *Brevis summula* and

³¹ COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discours against Bogomils*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450*, trans. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Manchester–New York 2013, p. 126, 128; *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 44.

³² COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discours...*, p. 126; EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, [in:] PG, vol. CXXX, ed. J.P. MIGNÉ, Parisii 1886, col. 1295; *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 48–49; *Et hoc dixit angelis et ascendebat ad illos celos usque ad tertium celum, subvertens angelos invisibilis patris et dicens singulis eorum: Quantum debes domino tuo? Et primus respondit: C chados olei. Et dixit ei: Accipe cautionem et sede et scribe L. Et alii dicit: Tu vero quantum debes domino tuo? Qui ait: C choros tritici. Et ait illi: Tolle cautionem tuam et sede et scribe cito octuaginta. Et ascendebat ad alios celos ita dicens adscenditque usque ad quintum celum seducens angelos invisibilis patris.*

³³ In this source, Satan is a steward of the heavenly hosts, but is not explicitly identified with the unjust steward from the Gospel of St. Luke, see: O Morzu Tyberiadzkim, trans. A. KAWECKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 5–6. More on this source see: *ibidem*, p. 3; F. BADALANOVA GELLER, *The Sea of Tiberias: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition*, [in:] *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition. Continuity and Diversity*, ed. L. DI TOMMASO, Ch. BÖTTTRICH, Tübingen 2011, p. 13–23; For the new edition and translation of the apocryphon see: A. MILTENOVA, *The Sea of Tiberias*, [in:] *Biblical Pseudepigrapha in Slavonic Traditions*, ed. A. KULIK, S. MINOV, Oxford 2016, p. 188–235.

³⁴ *Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, ed. A. CAZENAVE, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen...*, p. 385. In this source, Satan as a steward (*villicus*) tempts people of God in heaven to follow him into material world.

Jacob de Capellis (middle of the 13th century)³⁵. The theme of the unjust steward existed not only in moderate Catharism but also in the radical version, although it did not fit completely with the latter and destroyed its coherence; therefore, it was criticised or even ridiculed by the Catholics, as we learn from the work of Moneta of Cremona³⁶. Considering all this, Bogomil origins of this version of the moderate Cathar doctrine seems to be beyond any doubt.

The second version of the moderate Bogomil doctrine claimed that Satanael was the son of God. This did not have analogies in orthodox Christianity and was no less typical for Bogomilism than the previous one. This is confirmed at the turn of the 9th and 10th centuries by the Bulgarian author John the Exarch, then in the 10th century by Cosmas the Priest, in the 11th century by Euthymius Zigabenus, and by the treatise of Pseudo-Psellos describing the Bogomils in Thrace³⁷. According to John the Exarch, Zigabenus and Pseudo-Psellos, Satan was the first-born son of God, while according to Cosmas, he was either the elder son or the younger, depending on doctrinal version. In all cases however, the other son of God was Christ. Cosmas adds that the Bogomils, who considered Satan to be the younger son, based this on the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15: 11–32)³⁸. This typically Bogomil theological idea surely was not as popular among the Cathars as the former; nevertheless, in Languedoc its presence is confirmed by the *Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium* and Pierre des Vaux de Cernay, written at the beginning of the 13th century. These sources say that apart from the radically dualistic Cathars there are also others (although this heresy is new) who believe in only one God-creator, who has two sons – Christ and the devil – and to justify this claim, they quote the parable of the prodigal son³⁹.

³⁵ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 309: *Et dicunt, quod Lucifer est filius dei tenebrarum. [...] Et tunc transfiguravit se in angelum lucis. Angelis vero admirantibus propter formam eius et intercedentibus pro eo ad Dominum, susceptus est in celo, et ibi villicus angelorum effectus est. Unde in Evangelio Luce dicitur: 'Homo quidam erat dives qui habebat villicum'. Et in tali villicatione seduxit angelos.* See also: S. PETRUS MARTYR, *Summa contra haereticos*, ed. T. KAPELLI, AFP 17, 1947, p. 325; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 4, 44; *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, ed. I. DA MILANO, Ae 14, 1940, p. 132; *Brevis Summula*, ed. A. MOLINIER, AMi 22, 1910, p. 201; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes...*, col. VII.

³⁶ MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 39.

³⁷ JAN EGZARCHA, *Heksameron*, [in:] *Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015, p. 63; EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1294; COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discours...*, p. 126, 128; MICHAEL PSELLOS, *De daemonum energia seu operatione*, [in:] *PG*, vol. CXXII, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Parisiis 1889, col. 823. The authorship of Michael Psellos, who lived in the 11th century is questioned by the scholars, therefore also its date is uncertain. More on thus source, see: *Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła greckie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2023, p. 77–79.

³⁸ COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discours...*, p. 128.

³⁹ *Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 386: *Est autem quedam heresis que de novo prosilivit inter eos, nam nonnulli ex eis credunt, unum tantum esse deum, quem dicunt habere duos*

Another very specific theological idea, according to which the devil was the brother of God, was less popular (or rather, extremely rare) among the Cathars. Polemical anti-Bogomil sources do not confirm this, but it was quite popular in the Bogomil folklore legends⁴⁰. Its traces in Languedoc can be found in the inquisitorial registers. In the protocols of Bernard de Caux and Jean de St. Pierre from 1245–1246, certain John Vitalis testified that he had heard it from a Cathar perfect – William Audebert⁴¹.

In the inquisitorial registers we can also find another typically Bogomil concept of the Trinity. This is attested by Zigabenus, according to whom Christ had emanated from God before the beginning of his mission on Earth (exactly as the Holy Spirit), and after his ascension again united with the Father⁴². This distinctive doctrine, which has no analogies in Manichaeism or other earlier dualistic doctrines, can be found in the registers of Jacques Fournier (1318–1325)⁴³, and in the Italian *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, which says that after the final judgement the three persons of the Trinity will unite again⁴⁴.

Bogomil concepts can also be found in Cathar anthropology, in which the idea that souls were created by the good God, while the body was created by Satan, was common. As in the case of theology, we can distinguish two crucial concepts here. According to the first, human spirits are identified with the angels, who after the fall from heaven were enslaved in material bodies by Satan. This anthropological concept was confirmed in 1163 by Eckbert of Schönau, who perceived Cathars as the descendants of the Manicheans; however, apparently surprised with this doctrine, he added that it cannot be found among the Manichaean errors⁴⁵. Over time this concept became the most characteristic element of the Cathar doctrine.

filios, Christum scilicet et principem huius mundi, unde habent in evangelio: Homo quidam habuit duos filios>; et ambos credunt peccatum commisisse, sed Christum dicunt patri iam esse reconciliatum cum omni populo suo. PETRUS VALLIUM SARNAII MONACHUS, *Hystoria Albigenensis*, vol. I, ed. P. GUEBIN, E. LYON, Paris 1926, p. 11–12.

⁴⁰ *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 228, 235, 242.

⁴¹ *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux. Ms Doat XXII B. N. Paris*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, Agen–Cahors–Toulouse 1988, <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/bdecaux.pdf> [4 II 2024], p. 26: *Quadam die dum predicaret Dominus in celo gentibus suis, venit ei nuncius de terra dicens ei quod istum mundum amiserat, nisi statim mitteret illuc. Et statim Dominus misit Lucibel in hunc mundum, et recepit eum pro fratre...*

⁴² EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1294, 1302–1303.

⁴³ *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (1318–1325)*, vol. II, ed. J. DUVERNOY, Toulouse 1965, p. 504: *Item audivit a dicto heretico quod Deus pater fecit tres partes de se ipso, quarum una remansit in celo, due vero partes descenderunt in terram, ut auferrent potestatem dyabolo.*

⁴⁴ *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, p. 126: *De personarum Trinitate, male sentiunt dicentes, quod tres persone post iudicium erunt una persona tantum...*

⁴⁵ ECKBERTUS ABBAS SCHONAUGENSIS, *Sermones...*, col. 96: *De ea haeresi loquor, quia dicunt nihi 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.*

It was professed by the majority of the radically dualistic Cathars and part of the moderately dualistic groups⁴⁶. In Languedoc it is attested to have been present among the adherents of the radical dualism by the theologian Alan of Lile, (writing at the end of the 12th century), a Waldensian – Durand of Huesca in his *Liber antiheresis* (end of the 12th century), the above-mentioned Cistercian – Pierre des Vaux de Cernay⁴⁷, and by various testimonies of inquisitorial witnesses contained in the registers of Bernard de Caux and Jean de St. Pierre, of Pons of Parnac and Ranulf de Plassac (1273–1282), of Geoffroy d’Ablis (1308–1309) and of Jacques Fournier (1318–1325)⁴⁸. In Italy the same doctrine was professed by the radical dualists from the church of Desenzano. It is attested by the above-mentioned: *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, Peter of Verona, Moneta of Cremona, Jacobus de Capellis and additionally by the *Manifestatio heresis catharorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, (from the 70s of the 12th century), *Liber Supra Stella* (ca. 1235), and Rainer Sacchoni⁴⁹. This distinctive anthropology, without analogies in Manichaeism or other ancient dualistic systems that were known by the Catholic polemicists, has its source in the Bogomil *Interrogatio Iohannis*. Here, for the first time, we encounter the doctrine according to which Satan animated the bodies of Adam and Eve, imprisoning within them the good angels, which he had previously cast down from heaven as an apocalyptic dragon⁵⁰. Therefore, it is obvious that this particular doctrine was borrowed by the Cathars from the Bogomils.

⁴⁶ By “part” I mean the some Italian moderate Cathars from the church of Banolo, see: *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 310–311.

⁴⁷ ALANUS DE INSULIS, *De fide catholica contra Haereticos sui temporis*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CCX, ed. J.P. Migne, Parisiis 1855, col. 316: *Quidam autem praedictorum haereticorum suae ignorantiae quaerentes auxilium, negant singulis diebus animas creari, et corporibus infundi; asserentes solos angelos apostatas qui de coelo ceciderunt corporibus humanis infundi Dei permissione ut ibi valeant poenitentiam agere*; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, [in:] *Die ersten Waldenser. Mit Edition des Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, vol. II, ed. K.V. SELGE, Berlin 1967, p. 236; PETRUS VALLIUM SARNII MONACHUS, *Hystoria Albigensis*, vol. I, p. 13.

⁴⁸ *Depositions contre Pierre Garcias du Bourguet-Nau de Toulouse*, ed. C. DOUAIS, [in:] *IDEM, Documents pour servir à l’histoire de l’Inquisition dans le Languedoc*, vol. II, Paris 1900, p. 93, 100; *Edition and Translation of Doat 25–26*, [in:] *Inquisitors and Heretics in Thirteenth-Century Languedoc*, ed. et trans. P. BILLER, C. BRUSCHI, Leiden–Boston 2011, p. 308; *Registre de geoffroy d’Ablis. Ms Latin 4269 Bibliotheque Nationale Paris*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, 1980, http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/geoffroi_d_ablis.pdf [6 II 2024], p. 121; *Le registre d’inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, vol. I, p. 228, 241, 472; vol. II, p. 33–34.

⁴⁹ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 309–310; S. PETRUS MARTYR, *Summa contra haereticos*, p. 325–326; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 4, 39, 110–111, 115, 129; SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, p. 313; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes...*, col. VII; *Brevis Summula*, p. 201, 208; *Vita Haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CCIV, ed. J.-P. Migne, Parisiis 1855, col. 775; *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 71.

⁵⁰ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 58: *Et cogitavit [Satanas] facere hominem in servitio sibi et tulit limum de terra et fecit hominem similem sibi. Et precepit angelo secundi celi introire in corpus luti et tulit de eo et fecit alium corpus in forma mulieris precepitque angelo primi celi introire in ilium.*

The doctrine identifying human spirits with the angels was not the only anthropological concept in Bogomilism. An alternative concept, professed by the Bogomils from Constantinople, assumed the cooperation of God with the Devil in the creation of Man, and was attested to by Zigabenus at the beginning of the 11th century, and in the 13th century by the letter of patriarch Germanus II (1222–1240). According to this, when Satanael could not animate the body of Adam, which he had previously formed, he decided to send his emissaries to God, asking for help. Satan proposed a deal, according to which, if God would animate Adam's body, all the people would belong to him, and their spirits would take the places in heaven that were left empty after Satan's rebellion. God agreed, and placed soul in the body of the first man⁵¹. And again, this distinctly Bogomil theme can be found in Cathar sources, although undoubtedly it was not as popular as the previous one. It is attested to in French Catharism by Ralph of Coggeshall, writing around 1180, who says that the human body was formed by Luzabel, while its soul was created by God, who placed it in this body⁵². Other French polemical sources do not mention this; however, it appears in various inquisitorial registers. It was first attested to by a certain Raimund Centoullh, questioned by Bernard de Caux and Jean de St. Pierre. He presented an interesting version of the anthropological myth, in which Satan formed Adam's body of clay and then asked God to place a soul in it. God advised Satan to form the body of Adam out of the sea mud in order not to make him too powerful, and when Satan had done it, God placed the soul inside⁵³. The myth in which God places a soul in the body created by Satan appears also in the testimonies of two women, questioned by the inquisitors Pons of Parnac and Ranulf of Plassac (1273–1282)⁵⁴. In Fournier's registers, it appeared in several testimonies, but in the version recorded by Peter Maurin and Raimond Centoullh, man was formed by Satan from the sea mud, but the soul was placed inside it not by God, but by Christ⁵⁵. The Bogomil idea of cooperation between God and Satan in the creation of man also appears in the Italian sources. It is mentioned in the middle of the 13th century by the Franciscan Jacobus de Capellis, who says that there are many concepts concerning the animation of Adam's body among the heretics – some of them claim that he was animated when Lucifer imprisoned an angel inside his body, while others maintain that he was animated by God⁵⁶.

⁵¹ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1298; *Letter of the Patriarch Germanus to those in Constantinople and against the Bogomils*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in...*, p. 273.

⁵² *Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum*, p. 124–125; *Corpus a diabolo dicunt formari, animam vero a Deo creari et corporibus infundi...*

⁵³ *Cahiers de Bernard de Caux*, p. 50.

⁵⁴ *Edition and Translation of Doat 25–26*, p. 264, 306.

⁵⁵ *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, vol. II, p. 407–408; vol. III, p. 223.

⁵⁶ JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes...*, col. XXVIII.

Of course, in this case one might say that the concept of cooperation of God with the devil in creation of man is too general, and Cathars could have formulated it entirely independently of the Bogomils. And again, it would be quite possible if the similarities were limited only to this general idea. However, they go much further than that. In moderate Cathar doctrines we can find explanation of this curious cooperation that is similar to the one found in Bogomilism. According to both Zigabenus and *Interrogatio Iohannis*, the saved souls of people are supposed to take places in heaven left empty after the fall of the angels⁵⁷. The same theme also appears in the Bosnian legend on the beginnings of the world⁵⁸, while in Catharism it is confirmed by the polemical Italian sources presenting the doctrine of the church of Bagnolo: the *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia* and Jacob de Capellis⁵⁹.

Another typically Bogomil element in the Cathar anthropological doctrines is the concept of heavenly robes, crowns and thrones that await the saved spirits (or angels) in heaven. It also does not have analogies either in Manichaeism nor in other ancient dualistic doctrines known to the Catholic writers. It appears in the Bogomil *Interrogatio Iohannis*, where it is said that the heavenly robes, thrones and crowns were taken by God from the rebellious angels who followed Satan⁶⁰. *Interrogatio Iohannis* however is not the source of this doctrine, because it appeared earlier in a much older apocryphal writing used by the Bogomils – the *Vision of Isaiah*, where God shows to the prophet robes, crowns and thrones that await in heaven for the just⁶¹. In Catharism this theme is attested to in Italy by the *Brevis Summula*, and in Languedoc by Durand of Huesca, in his *Liber contra manichaeos* (1220s)⁶². As we can see, Cathar anthropological doctrines are brimming with themes typical to and characteristic of only the Bogomils, and present in their apocryphal writings, which is another strong argument for the Eastern origins of Catharism.

The *Vision of Isaiah* inspired not only Cathar anthropology but also cosmology. Durand of Huesca in his *Liber contra manichaeos* says that, according to some radically dualistic Cathars, there are seven worlds of the good God, while

⁵⁷ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1298; *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 76.

⁵⁸ J. IVANOV, *Livres et legendes bogomiles (Aux Sources di Catharisme)*, Paris 1976, p. 285; *Początki świata*, trans. A. JAKIMISZYN, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 28.

⁵⁹ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 311; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes...*, col. XXXVIII: *...credunt quod Deus initio mundi post casum angelorum tot spiritus creavit simul quot fuerunt illi qui ceciderunt...*

⁶⁰ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 52: *Tunc precepit pater angelis suis dicens: Tollite vestimenta eorum. Et tulerunt vestimenta eorum angeli et thronos eorum et coronas eorum omnibus angelis qui eum audierunt.*

⁶¹ *The Vision of Isaiah*, [in:] *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, trans. W.L. WAKEFIELD, A.P. EVANS, New York–London 1969, p. 453, see also *Ascensio Isaiae*, ed. R.H. CHARLES, [in:] IDEM, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, London 1900, p. 120.

⁶² *Brevis Summula*, p. 208; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, ed. Ch. THOUZELLIER, [in:] IDEM, *Une somme anti-cathare: le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, Louvain 1964, p. 300, 304.

Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium says that Lucifer also had his own seven worlds⁶³. Seven kingdoms of God were also mentioned by the brothers Maurin, interrogated by Fournier, who said that they had heard about it from the perfect Guillaume Belibaste⁶⁴. As was noticed by A. Acerbi and A. Cazenave, this concept of the seven worlds of the good God was also borrowed from the *Vision of Isaiah*, in which we can find the seven heavens⁶⁵. The theme of seven worlds or seven heavens was very popular among the Bogomils. It is attested in the polemical work of Euthymius of the Periblepton (11th century), but what is more important, it also appears in other apocryphal scriptures used by the Bogomils – not only in the *Vision of Isaiah* but also in the Slavonic *Apocalypse of Baruch* (10th–11th century) and the Slavonic Book of Enoch⁶⁶.

Another Bogomil theme that can be found in the moderately dualistic Cathar cosmologies is the idea that the material world was created by Satan with the permission of God. We cannot call this cooperation between God and Satan, as it was in case of the creation of man, but nevertheless God does not oppose the creation of the world by Satan, and even enables him to do so with his decision. Rainer Sacconi, describing the doctrine of the Italian Cathars from Concorezzo, says openly that the devil created all visible things with the permission from God⁶⁷. The *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia* and *Liber Supra Stella* claim that according to the secret doctrine professed by the *perfecti* of this church, God directly contributed to the formation of the visible world by sending, to Lucifer and the mysterious evil four-faced spirit, the good angel that was necessary to divide the four elements⁶⁸. Furthermore, *Tractatus de hereticis* from the 1270s says that, according to the

⁶³ DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, p. 256: ...notant esse materialiter aliam terram super firmamentum celi, secundum quid ab ipsis audivimus, et non solum unam sed etiam septem, iuxta quod in quodam libro suo secreto, quem vidimus et legimus, continetur, quem nugatorie sub nomine Ysaye prophete intitulant. *Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 385.

⁶⁴ *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, vol. III, p. 245: Audivit tamen a dicto Guillelmo Belibasta heretico quod erant septem celi, et quolibet erat proprius dominus et proprie gentes...; *ibidem*, vol. II, p. 488.

⁶⁵ A. CAZENAVE, *Bien et mal dans un mythe cathare languedocien*, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen...*, p. 368; A. ACERBI, *La Visione di Isaia nelle vicende dottrinali del catarismo lombardo e provenzale*, CS 1, 1980, p. 103–107.

⁶⁶ EUTHYMIUS OF THE PERIBLEPTON, *A letter*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in...*, p. 152; *The Vision of Isaiah*, p. 449–458, see also *Ascensio Isaiae*, p. 104–133; *Księga Henocha słowiańska*, [in:] *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. RUBINKIEWICZ, Warszawa 1999, p. 200–201; J. IVANOV, *Livres et legendes bogomiles...*, p. 180, 190–191; *Słowo o widzeniu Barucha, kiedy to anioł, posłany na świętą górę zwaną Syjonem, płakał nad zniewoleniem Jerozolimy*, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 45–52.

⁶⁷ *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 76: Item confitentur quod deus ex nihilo creavit angelos et quatuor elementa, sed errant credendo quod diabolus de licentia dei formavit omnia visibilia sive hunc mundum.

⁶⁸ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 310: Et dicunt, quod Lucifer, et ille alius nequam spiritus volebant distinguere elementa nec poterant. Sed inpetraverun a Deo bonum angelum coadiutorem, et ita concessione Dei, et auxillio illius boni angeli ac virtute et sapientia sua distinxerunt elementa; see also: SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, p. 339.

Italian moderate Cathars, the devil created the world with his natural power, given to him by God, or alternatively with the permission from God, who gave to him this power for 6 days, when he had cried with the words of the Unforgiving Servant (Matt 18: 21–35) *have patience with me, and I will repay you all!*⁶⁹.

These two concepts mentioned in the latter source overlap perfectly with two Bogomil cosmological ideas. The first is attested by Euthymius Zigabenus, who says that Satanael – the first-born son of God, after the rebellion against God – did not lose his power of creation and using it formed the Earth⁷⁰. The second is directly taken from the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, where Satan (this time an angel), after he had fallen to the yet unformed Earth, started to ask God for mercy with the words of the unforgiving servant. God agreed and let him do whatever he wanted for seven days⁷¹. These cosmological ideas were not typical to Catharism; they are confirmed only by several sources, and we may suppose that they were limited only to some Cathar communities. However, in their specificity, they certainly provide clear evidence of some exchange between the Eastern and Western heresies.

Another cosmological – or rather ontological – idea that was professed by the radically dualistic Cathars was much more widespread than the above-mentioned doctrines. It is a concept of ontological dualism in which the good being – eternal and incorruptible – is opposed by the evil material one, which is temporary and corruptible. This specific ontological dualism focused on time is attested by many sources, both French and Italian, from various periods. In France, we can find it at the end of the 12th century in the letter of cardinal Peter of Pavia from 1178 and in the work of William of Nangis, in the summa of Alan of Lille, in the works of Durand of Huesca, in the anonymous sermon *Accipite nobis vulpes parvulas* (ca. 1200), in the work of Ebrard of Bethune (ca. 1200), and then in the inquisitorial sources – the sentences of Bernard Gui (1307–1323) and Fournier's registers⁷². In Italy, it is confirmed by the *Liber Supra Stella*, Moneta of Cremo-

⁶⁹ *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 312: ...*diabolus habuit potentiam, quam habuit naturaliter a prima condicione a Deo, vel quando diabolus, secundum eos dixit Deo: Pacientiam habe in me etc, tunc Deus dedit diabolo potentiam formandi omnia.*

⁷⁰ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1295.

⁷¹ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 54: *Et descendens de celo Sathanas in firmamentum hic nullam requiem poterat facere neque hii qui cum eo erant. Rogavitque patrem dicens: Peccavi, patientiam habe in me; omnia reddam tibi.* The theme of cooperation of God with the devil in creation of the world appears also in other apocryphal writings used by the Bogomils, for ex. In *The Sea of Tiberias*, see: O Morzu Tyberiadzkim, p. 5.

⁷² *Epistola Petri tituli Sancti Chrysogoni praesbyteri cardinalis, apostolicae sedis legati*, [in:] *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, vol. II, ed. W. STUBBS, London 1869, p. 158: *duo dii existerent, alter bonus et alter malus: bonus [qui] invisibilia tantum, et ea quae mutari aut corrumpi non possunt fecisset; malus qui coelum, terram, hominem, et alia visibilia condidisset.* GUILLELMUS DE NANGIACO, *Chronicon*, ed. M. BOUQUET, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. XX, Paris 1840, p. 741: *Eodem tenangiampore multi haeretici combusti sunt in Flandria a Guillermo Remensium archiepiscopo apostolicae sedis legato, et a Philippo Flandrensium comite. Hi dicebant omnia aeterna a Deo creata,*

na, *Brevis Summula, Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, and its traces can also be found in the Cathar theological treatise from the middle of the 13th century – the *Liber de duobus principiis*⁷³. What is more important, this idea is also attested to by the Cathar anonymous treatise (or Manichaean treatise, as Durand of Huesca called it), in which it is one of the most important themes. The Cathar author of this work, in his exposition of dualism, distinguishes not only two worlds – that of the good God and that of the evil one – but also two times, two ages (*saecula*)⁷⁴, and identifies temporary and transient being with the *nihil* from Saint John's gospel, which emerged without God (...*sine ipso factum est nihil*). These two opposite beings are so radically different that they cannot be described together by the word *omnia* (the same idea of two different *omnia* was later presented in the *Liber de duobus principiis*)⁷⁵. This characterisation of two opposed beings through their relation to time is particular to the radically dualistic Catharism. It is not the Manichean opposition of light and darkness or simply of matter and spirit but the opposition of the being, that is eternal and unchangeable, and on the other hand, the one that is transient. The only analogy for this particular opposition can be found in the Paulician doctrine, where the evil god of the present times, identified with the God of this age (*deus huius saeculi*), mentioned in St. Paul's letter to Corinthians (2Cor 4: 3–4) is opposed by the good God of the future⁷⁶. As Durand of Huesca says in his polemics with the author of the Manichaean treatise, the Cathars perceived Satan as the god of the present times⁷⁷, exactly as the Paulicians did.

corpus autem hominis et omnia transitoria a Luciabelo create...; see also: ALANUS DE INSULIS, *De fide catholica...*, col. 308–309; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, p. 209; *Accipite nobis vulpes parvulas*, p. 12; EBRARDUS BETHUNENSIS, *Trias scriptorum adversus Valdensem sectam*, ed. M. DE LA BIGNE, [in:] *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. XXIV, Lugduni 1677, col. 1541; BERNARD GUI, *Les sentences. Texte et traduction*, ed. A. PALES-GOBILLIARD, [in:] *IDEM, Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui: 1308–1323*, vol. I, Paris 2002, p. 778, 846–848; *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, vol. I, p. 227–228, 230.

⁷³ SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, p. 324–325; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 3; *Brevis Summula*, p. 200; *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, p. 130; *Liber de duobus principiis*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle...*, p. 110–115.

⁷⁴ See the chapters: *De duobus mundis* and *De duobus seculis* in: *Tractatus manicheorum*, [in:] *Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIII^e siècle d'après le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. Ch. THOUZELLIER, Louvain 1961, p. 90–93.

⁷⁵ *Tractatus manicheorum*, p. 98–99, 101–103. See also: *Liber de duobus principiis*, p. 110–115.

⁷⁶ PETRUS SICULUS, *Historia utilis et refutatio atque eversio haeresos Manichaeorum qui et Pauliciani dicuntur*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1886, col. 1254; PETRUS SICULUS, *Sermones adversus Manichaeos*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1886, col. 1307.

⁷⁷ DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, p. 175: *Credunt enim diabolum fecisse omnes dies, quibus presens vita vel seculum volvitur ab inicio huius mundi...*; *ibidem*, p. 114: *Nulla ergo auctoritas suffragatur, bene intellecta, vel amminiculatur demencie catharorum, qua asserunt Deum malignum presens seculum creavisse.*

At this point, an obvious question arises: what do the Paulicians have in common with the Bogomil influence on Catharism? As Bernard Hamilton demonstrated in his paper: *The Origins of the Dualist Church of Drugunthia*, the Bogomil church of Drugunthia emerged as a result of the transmission of ideas between the Paulicians and the Bogomils that had been taking place in the fortress Philippopolis, inhabited by the members of both heresie⁷⁸. The Eastern sources documenting the radical Bogomil dualism did not survive, but thanks to the Western sources we know that there were two main branches of Bogomism – the Bulgarian and the Drugunthian (*ordo Bulgariae* and *ordo Drugunthiae*) – and the Cathars belonging to the latter always professed radical dualism, which usually included the above-mentioned time-focused dualism. Because it is highly likely that the Bogomil radical dualism emerged under Paulician influence, and the Paulicians could not have had a direct influence on Catharism, this characteristic time-focused Cathar dualism must have been formed under the influence of the representatives of the Bogomil church of Drugunthia, whose presence in the West is confirmed by the sources. The best-known representative of this community was the above-mentioned Nicetas from Constantinople. Drugunthia was also the place where the first bishop of the radically dualistic Cathar church of Desenzano was sent for ordination⁷⁹. As we can see, we are dealing here with a widespread element of a radically dualistic Cathar doctrine which, once again, has its only analogue in the East – in the Paulician doctrine that was accepted and then transmitted to the West by the radically dualistic Bogomils.

Are there any ideas in the Cathar cosmologies which have no direct analogy in Bogomilism? At first glance, it seems that an example of such an idea is the doctrine of the two worlds, professed by the Cathar author of the Manichaean treatise. This is attested to in France at the end of the 12th century by Durand of Huesca and then by the *Manifestatio heresis Albigensium et Lugdunensium* in Italy by Moneta of Cremona, Rainer Sacchoni and *Liber de duobus principiis*⁸⁰. Based on the key quotation from the book of Sirach (Sir 42: 25): *Omnia duplicia – unum contra unum*, this doctrine assumed that everything in the spiritual world has its analogies in the material world; as there are four spiritual elements, by analogy on earth

⁷⁸ B. HAMILTON, *The Origins of the Dualist Church of Drugunthia*, ECR 6, 1974, p. 115–124.

⁷⁹ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 308: ...*quidem de diszennzano, facta congregatione elegerunt quendam sibi episcopum nomine Johannem bellum, et eum miserunt ultra mare in drugunthiam ut ibi ordinaretur episcopus.*

⁸⁰ *Tractatus manicheorum*, p. 90–95, 100, 105–110; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, p. 121, 134, 137, 144, 183; *Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 385–386; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 3; *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 73–74; We may assume that the author of the *Liber de duobus principiis* professed the doctrine of the two worlds based on the information provided by Rainer Sacchoni and on his attitude towards the Old Testament, see: *Liber de duobus principiis*, p. 124–125.

there are four material ones⁸¹. The good world of God, called the land of the living (*terra viventium*) and the evil world of Satan in which we live are almost identical; the world of Satan looks like the world of the good God, because Satan made it in the image of the good world from his imperfect and transient elements⁸². To support this doctrine, the Cathars quoted many biblical passages – from the books of Sirach, Isaiah, or the Revelation of St. John⁸³; therefore it is possible that they constructed it independently.

It should be noted, that even this doctrine has its analogue in Bogomilism. We can find it in the apocryphal text used by the Bogomils: the *John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael*, where it is said that Satanael, trying to become equal with God, created his own world, modelled on the world of God but imperfect, with the dark sun, dark moon and dark stars⁸⁴. This similarity obviously cannot be a convincing evidence for the Bogomil origins of this doctrine, especially since the Slavonic text is probably no older than the 13th century; however, it shows that there is a possibility that the doctrine, that seemed to be an original Cathar invention, could also have been borrowed from the East⁸⁵.

Bogomil themes also appear in other elements of the Cathar doctrine. They can be seen especially clearly in Mariology, in the idea that the Mother of God was an immaterial angel sent by God from heaven. This belief was spread among the Italian Cathars from various churches, which is confirmed by numerous sources, such as: the *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, Moneta of Cremona, Rainer Sacconi, Jacobus de Capellis, *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum, Liber supra stella*, Peter of Verona and *Brevis Summula*⁸⁶. In France, this theme was apparently not as popular as in Italy but, nonetheless, the belief that Mary did not have a material body but a celestial one, or that she was an angel, is confirmed by Alan of Lille, Durand of Huesca and *Summula contra hereticos* from the beginning

⁸¹ DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, p. 160: "Omnia dupplicia sunt, unum contra unum", – non sic debet intelligi, ut sint et alia quatuor invisibilia elementa, ad quorum similitudinem hec visibilia sunt creata, ut tu heretice, opinaris.

⁸² DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, p. 214: *Ipsi enim credunt [...] diabolium fecisse omnia que sunt in hoc mundo, exceptis animabus et spiritibus qui salvantur, ad similitudinem aliarum creaturarum quas in alio seculo, ut asserunt, fecit Deus.*

⁸³ *Tractatus manicheorum*, p. 91–95.

⁸⁴ *Słowo Jana Złotoustego jak Michał zwyciężył Satanaela*, trans. A. MICHAŁOWSKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 13–14.

⁸⁵ For more on the state of research on this text and the ideas concerning its origins, see: G. MINCZEW, *John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael – a Bogomil text?*, SCer 1, 2011, p. 23–54.

⁸⁶ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 311: *...credunt, quod filius Dei, scilicet Ihesus Christus, et Iohannes Evangelista et Maria fuerunt tres angeli apparentes in carne.* MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 232–233; *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 76; JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes...*, col. CXIII, CXII; *Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, p. 135–136; SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, p. 313; S. PETRUS MARTYR, *Summa contra haereticos*, p. 323: *delirant namque blasphemantes ipsam <Mariam> esse angelum nomine Marinum*; *Brevis Summula*, p. 204.

of the 13th century⁸⁷. No analogies for this doctrine can be found either in Manichaeism or in other ancient dualist heresies, and is found only in Bogomilism, in *Interrogatio Iohannis*⁸⁸.

We can find further typically Bogomil themes in a single Italian source, the abjuration of heresy by Bonacursus of Concorezzo from the 1170s. The first theme is borrowed from *Interrogatio Iohannis* and concerns Enoch, who, according to this scripture, was taken to the visible, material heaven by Satan, who ordered him to write down everything he saw there. Enoch did so and after his return to Earth convinced people that there is no other God but Satan⁸⁹. It seems that this theme was older than *Interrogatio Iohannis* and was borrowed by the Bogomils from the Slavonic Book of Enoch, where God (this time not Satan) took the prophet to heaven and ordered him to write down everything he saw there and then had him returned to Earth to spread this information among the people⁹⁰. From the abjuration of Bonacursus we learn that the Italian Cathars professing *ordo Bulgariae* were familiar with this theme⁹¹. In the same source, we can also find a distinctive interpretation of the flood from the Book of Genesis, according to which the giants – offspring of demons and mortal women – revealed to the people that Satan created the material world. Satan, who did not want this knowledge to spread among the people, decided to destroy mankind in the flood – he only saved Noah, because the latter did not have a daughter and consequently a demonic son-in-law and did not possess this secret knowledge⁹². The origins of this particular dualistic exegesis of the flood can be found in Bogomilism, this time, however, not in the *Inerrogatio Iohannis* but in the work of Euthymius Zigabenus, where it is said that the giants rebelled against Satanael and fought against him on the side of people⁹³.

If two above-mentioned Bogomil ideas appear in only one source, which was presenting the doctrine of the Italian church of Concorezzo, confirming its strong bounds with Bulgaria, the other typically Bogomil theme – the negative attitude

⁸⁷ ALANUS DE INSULIS, *De fide catholica...*, col. 335 writes, that Mary had celestial body, DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, p. 239: *Teotochon non fuisse de genere Adam terrigene qui peccavit, set angelum Domini...*; *Summula contra hereticos. Un traite contre les cathares du XIII^{eme} siecle*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/summula.pdf> [6 II 2024], p. 49.

⁸⁸ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 68: *Quando cogitavit pater meus mittere me in mundum istum, misit ante me angelum suum per spiritum sanctum ut reciperet me qui vocabatur Maria mater mea.*

⁸⁹ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 60: *Et < Sathanas > misit ministrum suum et assumpsit eum supra firmitamentum et ostendit illi deitatem suam et precepit illi dari calamum et atramentum; et sedens scripsit septuaginta VI libros. Et precepit ei eos deferri in terram. Detulit autem Enoc libros et tradidit filiis et docuit eos facere formam sacrificiorum et locum sacrificiorum.*

⁹⁰ *Księga Henocha słowiańska*, p. 203–205.

⁹¹ *Vita Haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, col. 776.

⁹² *Vita Haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, 776: *Ex filiabus Eve et demonibus dicunt natos esse gigantes, qui cognoverunt per demones, patres suos, diabolus omnia creasse. Unde diabolus dolens eos ista scire, dixit: 'Poenitet me, fecisse hominem'. Unde quia Noe, hoc ignoravit, a diluvio liberatus est...*

⁹³ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1306.

to John the Baptist – was widespread among the Cathars. Its origins can be found again in the *Interrogatio Iohannis*, where John the Baptist was presented as the emissary of Satan (identified with the prophet Elijah), who came to this world with the mission to draw the people away from the only true baptism of Christ (the baptism with the Holy Spirit), with his false baptism with water⁹⁴. This negative attitude of the Bogomils towards John the Baptist, generally quite uncommon in the history of Christianity, is also confirmed by Cosmas the Priest, who says that he was considered the herald of the Antichrist⁹⁵. In France, this theme appears in the polemics of Alan of Lille and Durand of Huesca, who claim that according to the heretics, John the Baptist was condemned because he doubted Christ⁹⁶, Ermengaud of Beziers, who says that according to the Cathars a demon announced his birth, while in the *Manifestatio heresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, Peter des Vaux de Cernay, and in the testimony of Peter Garcias, it is said that John the Baptist was one of the worst demons⁹⁷. Similar characterisation of this figure can also be found in the Italian sources; the *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, Moneta of Cremona, Peter of Verona and Rainer Sacchoni repeat the version known from *Interrogatio Iohannis* that John the Baptist was a messenger of the devil, who came on Earth to draw away people from Christ. *Liber Supra Stella* and *Tractatus de Hereticis* identify him with Elijah, and Bonacursus claims that the devil announced his birth⁹⁸.

This common negative attitude towards John the Baptist among the Cathars cannot be surprising. It was a consequence of the fact that all of them, no matter what doctrine they professed, accepted only one sacrament that was the sole guarantee of salvation – the baptism with the Holy Spirit established by Jesus Christ, which looked the same in Catharism and in Bogomilism⁹⁹. In the Cathar attitude towards John the Baptist we are dealing again with the element of the doctrine which was unknown in the West and obviously could not have been formulated

⁹⁴ *Interrogatio Iohannis*, p. 70: *Et scivit Sathanas princeps huius mundi quod ego veni querere et salvare quod perierat et misit angelum suum Elyam prophetam baptizantem in aqua qui vocatur Iohannes Baptista.*

⁹⁵ COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discours...*, p. 123.

⁹⁶ ALANUS DE INSULIS, *De fide catholica...*, col. 319; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, p. 17; DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, p. 239.

⁹⁷ ERMENGAUDUS, *Contra haereticos*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CCIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1855, col. 1242; *Manifestatio haeresis albigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 386; PETRUS VALLIUM SARNAII MONACHUS, *Hystoria Albigensis*, vol. I, p. 10, 27; *Depositions contre Pierre Garcias*, p. 93.

⁹⁸ *De Heresi Catharorum in Lombardia*, p. 311; *De Iohanne Baptista dicunt, quod fuit missus a diabolo cum baptismo aque ad impediendam predicationem Christi*; MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 225–227; S. PETRUS MARTYR, *Summa contra haereticos*, p. 323; SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, p. 318; *Summa Fratris Raineri...*, p. 71; *Tractatus de Hereticis*, p. 311; *Vita Haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, col. 777.

⁹⁹ The most detailed description of the Bogomil baptism with the Holy Spirit can be found in: EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1311.

based on the alternative exegesis of the New Testament. Its presence in the sources about the Cathars on the one hand and the earlier sources about the Bogomils on the other confirms the flow of ideas from the East to the West.

As to the Cathar attitude towards the figures of the New Testament, Saint Paul is especially worth mentioning. In a distinctive and rare version of the doctrine of the two worlds, which appears only in the French *Manifestatio heresis abigensium et lugdunensium*, it is said that there are two Christs – the good one, who lived in the land of the living, and the evil one, who existed on the Earth. The good Christ, after his death in the land of the living descended to hell (it means to this world), where he lived in the body of Saint Paul¹⁰⁰. Furthermore, the Italian Cathars from Desenzano appreciated Saint Paul – according to Moneta of Cremona, they claimed that his mother was Heavenly Jerusalem¹⁰¹. This attitude towards Saint Paul in the same way as time-focused dualism has analogies in Paulicianism, where Saint Paul, as the only apostle, preserved the true (that is, dualistic) teachings of Christ¹⁰². Traces of this Paulician concept are another argument for the influence of the radically dualistic Bogomil church of Drugunthia.

This comparative analysis of Cathar and Bogomil doctrines leads to some important conclusions. First, it seriously challenges the deconstructionist hypothesis, assuming the construction of the Cathar doctrine by the Catholic polemicists, based on the scriptures of Church Fathers, especially Saint Augustine, because it shows that many crucial Cathar ideas (such as the identification of human spirits with the angels, time-focused dualism, identifying of Satan with the unjust steward or condemnation of John the Baptist) have no analogies in either Manichaeism or other ancient dualistic heresies but instead are rooted in the Bogomil doctrines and partly in Paulicianism. In Manichaeism, we will also not find the moderate dualism, in which Satan is considered the son of God, the idea of cooperation between God and the devil in creation of man, or the identification of Mary with a heavenly angel. All these themes have well-established Bogomil analogies, and they are too specific to could have been independent creations in heterodox Christianity, and are altogether too numerous and attested in too many different texts that they could mean anything other than actual historical communication between the Eastern and Western heterodoxies.

Obviously, not all the Bogomil themes were equally popular in Catharism. Some of them, such as the identification of Satan with the son of God or the particular interpretation of the flood, appear only in a few sources and consequently are not strong arguments for the Bogomil influence. Strong arguments are the above-mentioned popular themes that were common among the Cathars across

¹⁰⁰ *Manifestatio haeresis abigensium et lugdunensium*, p. 385: *Dicunt enim in suo secreto quod Christus, per quem sperant salvari, non fuit in hoc mundo nisi spiritualiter infra corpus Pauli; unde Paulus ipse ait: <An experimentum eius queritis, qui in me loquitur Christus?>*.

¹⁰¹ MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos...*, p. 52.

¹⁰² EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, col. 1190–1191.

the regions and are confirmed by many independent sources. These are not general ideas that could have been formulated by the Cathars entirely independently based on the particular interpretation of the Bible, and it is equally improbable that they were invented by the Catholic polemicists who were not acquainted with the Bogomil doctrines.

This comparative analysis also shows the weakness of the deconstructionist interpretation which, as its critics (such as P. Biller, M. Roquebert, Y. Stoyanov, and C. Taylor) correctly pointed out, is based on selective attitude to the sources and rejection of those that do not fit with the previously formulated theory¹⁰³. Such an approach to the sources means that the deconstructionists are not entitled to formulate general conclusions concerning the entirety of Catharism, because such conclusions should be based on the entirety of the available source material. Therefore, the so called “new paradigm” promoted by Pegg cannot be treated seriously. His revolutionary claim that Catharism was not a dualistic heresy (or rather, that it did not exist) is based on the analysis of selected and very specific inquisitorial registers which are not representative, as they document a mass investigation during which the inquisitors interrogated thousands of people from various locations who very often didn't have anything in common with Catharism¹⁰⁴. Besides, for a person who is familiar with the inquisitorial sources, low awareness of the dualist doctrine among the simple believers (*credentes*), that was emphasized by Pegg, is not surprising. One might say that it was rather a rule and a direct consequence of their relations with the Cathar religion, to which they were attracted mainly by the example of the saintly lives of the Cathar *perfecti* and not by the doctrinal speculations. It was also a result of the secrecy of the dualist doctrines, of which most the controversial parts were revealed only to the most trusted disciples¹⁰⁵. Such weak arguments, drawn from one specific source, surely are not convincing enough to prove that Catharism was not a dualistic heresy or that it did not exist. Similarly, all the radical claims of the deconstructionists

¹⁰³ P. BILLER, *Goodbye to Catharism?...*, p. 281–282; Y. STOYANOV, *Medieval Christian Dualist Perceptions and Conceptions of Biblical Paradise*, SCer 3, 2013, p. 165; M. ROQUEBERT, *Le déconstructionnisme...*, p. 114, 130–131; C. TAYLOR, *Heresy in Medieval France. Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000–1249*, Woodbridge–Rochester 2005, p. 116–138; J.H. ARNOLD, *The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem*, [in:] *Cathars in Question...*, p. 72–73.

¹⁰⁴ See. J. DUVERNOY, *Le manuscrit 609 De la bibliothèque municipale de Toulouse*, vol. I, http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/ms609_a.pdf [6 II 2024], p. 2; J.H. ARNOLD, *Inquisition and Power. Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc*, Philadelphia 2001, p. 48. Contrary to this what Pegg wants to prove, dualism was present in the inquisitorial registers see: C. TAYLOR, *Evidence for Dualism in Inquisitorial Registers of the 1240s: A Contribution to a Debate*, H 3, 2013, p. 319–345.

¹⁰⁵ On the secrecy of Cathar doctrines see: F. ZAMBON, *Dissimulation, secret et allégorie dans le dualisme chrétien du Moyen Age: paulicianisme, bogomilisme, catharisme*, ASRel 4, 2011, p. 176–187; Y. STOYANOV, *Aspects of Doctrinal and Cultic Secrecy in Bogomilism and Catharism and the Problem of their Provenance*, BMD 1, 2016, p. 474–478.

denying the Bogomil influence on Catharism are not convincing, as they were formulated without any reference to the Eastern sources.

In summary a comparison of specific, well-defined doctrines, rather than only some general dualism, shows that in every part of the Cathar teachings we can encounter distinctly Bogomil themes. Considering this, it is really difficult to accept the “new paradigm” of the deconstructionists as a dogma, or even a probable hypothesis. It also becomes clear why its main advocate – M.G. Pegg – has so fiercely attacked the comparative method.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Accipite nobis vulpes parvulas, que demoliuntur vineas Domini*, ed. B. DELMAIRE, “Heresis” 17, 1991, p. 11–15.
- ALANUS DE INSULIS, *De fide catholica contra Haereticos sui temporis*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina*, vol. CCX, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1855, col. 303–428.
- Archiepiscopi Rotomagensis ad suffraganeos, quibus mandatum Conradi Portuensis episcopi & A. S. L significat conveniendi senonas adversus Bartholomeum, Albigensium episcopum*, ed. J.D. MANSI, [in:] *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. XXII, Venetiis 1778, p. 1204–1206.
- Ascensio Isaiae*, ed. R.H. CHARLES, [in:] R.H. CHARLES, *The Ascension of Isaiah*, London 1900, p. 1–82.
- BERNARD GUI, *Les sentences. Texte et traduction*, ed. A. PALES-GOBILLIARD, [in:] A. PALES-GOBILLIARD, *Le livre des sentences de l’inquisiteur Bernard Gui: 1308–1323*, vol. I, Paris 2002, p. 176–867.
- Brevis Summula*, ed. A. MOLINIER, “Annales du Midi” 22, 1910, p. 197–211.
- Cahiers de Bernard de Caux. Ms Doat XXII B. N. Paris*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, Agen–Cahors–Toulouse 1988, <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/bdecaux.pdf> [4 II 2024].
- La chanson de la croisade albigeoise*, vol. I, ed. E. MARTIN-CHABOT, Paris 1931.
- Charte de Niquinta, antipape des heretiques surnommés d’Albigeois*, ed. D. ZBIRAL, [in:] *1209–2009 Cathares: une histoire à pacifier?*, ed. A. BRENON, Loubatieres 2010, p. 47–48.
- COSMAS THE PRIEST, *The discourses against Bogomils*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450*, trans. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Manchester–New York 2013, p. 114–134.
- De heresibus*, ed. A. CAZENAVE, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen: Vorstellungen im XII. u. XIII. Jahrhundert über ihr Wirken in der Heilsgeschichte*, ed. A. ZIMMERMANN, Berlin 1977, p. 383–384.
- Depositions contre Pierre Garcias du Bourguet-Nau de Toulouse*, ed. C. DOUAIS, [in:] C. DOUAIS, *Documents pour servir à l’histoire de l’Inquisition dans le Languedoc*, vol. II, Paris 1900, p. 90–114.
- Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, ed. I. DA MILANO, “Aevum” 14, 1940, p. 125–140.
- DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber antiheresis*, [in:] *Die ersten Waldenser. Mit Edition des Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, vol. II, ed. K.V. SELGE, Berlin 1967, p. 3–257.
- DURANDUS DE HUESCA, *Liber contra manicheos*, [in:] *Une somme anti-cathare: le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. Ch. THOUZELIER, Louvain 1964, p. 66–336.

- EBRARDUS BETHUNENSIS, *Trias scriptorum adversus Valdensium sectam*, ed. M. DE LA BIGNE, [in:] *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, vol. XXIV, Lugduni 1677, p. 34–218.
- ECKBERTUS ABBAS SCHONAUGENSIS, *Sermones contra catharos*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CXCIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1855, col. 12–102.
- Edition and Translation of Doat 25–26*, [in:] *Inquisitors and Heretics in Thirteenth-Century Languedoc*, ed. et trans. P. BILLER, C. BRUSCHI, Leiden–Boston 2011, p. 173–980.
- Epistola Petri tituli Sancti Chrysogoni praesbyteri cardinalis, apostolicae sedis legati*, [in:] *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, vol. II, ed. W. STUBBS, London 1869, p. 155–160.
- ERMENGAUDUS, *Contra haereticos*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CCIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1855, p. 1235–1274.
- ETIENNE DE BOURBON, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues*, ed. A. LECOY DE LA MARCHE, Paris 1877.
- EUTHYMIUS OF THE PERIBLEPTON, *A letter*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c.1450*, trans. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Manchester–New York 2013, p. 143–164.
- EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia dogmatica*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CXXX, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1886, col. 9–1362.
- EVERVINUS STEINFELDENSIS, *Epistola CDXXXII, ad. S. Bernardum, De haereticis sui temporis*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CLXXXII, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1879, col. 676–680.
- GUILLELMUS DE NANGIACO, *Chronicon*, ed. M. BOUQUET, [in:] *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. XX, Paris 1840, p. 725–765.
- Interrogatio Iohannis*, [in:] *Le livre secret des cathares. Interrogatio Iohannis. Edition critique, traduction commentaire*, ed. et trans. E. BOZOKY, Paris 2009, p. 42–93.
- JACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos*, ed. D. BAZZOCCHI, *L'eresia catarra. Appendice*, Bologna 1920.
- JAN EGZARCHA, *Heksameron*, [in:] *Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015, p. 59–60.
- Księga Henocha słowiańska*, [in:] *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. RUBINKIEWICZ, Warszawa 1999, p. 197–214.
- Letter of the Patriarch Germanus to those in Constantinople and against the Bogomils*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450*, trans. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Manchester–New York 2013, p. 272–274.
- Liber de duobus principiis*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle. Le Liber de duobus principiis suivi d'un fragment de Rituel Cathare*, ed. A. DONDAINE, Roma 1939, p. 81–147.
- Manifestatio haeresis albigenensium et lugdunensium*, ed. A. CAZENAVE, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen: Vorstellungen im XII. u. XIII. Jahrhundert über ihr Wirken in der Heilsgeschichte*, ed. A. ZIMMERMANN, Berlin 1977, p. 384–387.
- MATTHAEUS PARISENSIS, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. F. LIEBERMANN, [in:] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. XXVIII, Hannoverae 1888, p. 107–389.
- MICHAEL PSELLOS, *De daemonum energia seu operatione*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CXXXII, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1889, col. 849–872.
- MONETA DE CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. RICCHINI, Roma 1743.
- O Morzu Tyberiadzkim*, trans. A. KAWECKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 5–11.

- PETRUS SICULUS, *Historia utilis et refutatio atque eversio haeresos Manichaeorum qui et Pauliciani dicuntur*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CIV, ed. J.P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1886, col. 1246–1304.
- PETRUS VALLIUM SARNAII MONACHUS, *Hystoria Albigensis*, vol. I, ed. P. GUEBIN, E. LYON, Paris 1926.
- Początki świata*, trans. A. JAKIMISZYN, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 26–29.
- Radulphi de Coggeshall Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. STEVENSON, [in:] *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, vol. LXVI, London 1875, p. 1–208.
- Registre de geoffroy d'Ablis. Ms Latin 4269 Bibliotheque Nationale Paris*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, 1980, http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/geoffroi_d_ablis.pdf [6 II 2024].
- Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (1318–1325)*, vol. I–III, ed. J. DUVERNOY, Toulouse 1965.
- Roberti Autissiodorensis Chronicon*, ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. XXVI, Hannoverae 1882.
- S. PETRUS MARTYR, *Summa contra haereticos*, ed. T. KAPELLI, “Archivum fratrum praedicatorum” 17, 1947, p. 320–335.
- SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra stella*, ed. I. DA MILANO, “Aevum” 19, 1945, p. 307–341.
- Słowo Jana Złotoustego jak Michał zwyciężył Satanaela*, trans. A. MICHAŁOWSKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 13–25.
- Słowo o widzeniu Barucha, kiedy to anioł, posłany na świętą górę zwaną Syjonem, płakał nad zniewoleniem Jerozolimy*, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 46–52.
- Summa Fratris Raineri de ordine fratrum praedicatorum, de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, [in:] *Un Traité Neo-Manicheen du 13 siècle. Le Liber de duobus principiis suivi d'un fragment de Rituel Cathare*, ed. A. DONDAINE, Roma 1939, p. 64–78.
- Summula contra hereticos. Un traite contre les cathares du XIII^{eme} siecle*, ed. J. DUVERNOY, <http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/summula.pdf> [6 II 2024].
- Tractatus de Hereticis*, ed. A. DONDAINE, “Archivum fratrum praedicatorum” 20, 1950, p. 308–324.
- Tractatus manicheorum*, [in:] *Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIII^e siècle d'après le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, ed. Ch. THOUZELLIER, Louvain 1961, p. 87–113.
- The Vision of Isaiah*, [in:] *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, trans. W.L. WAKEFIELD, A.P. EVANS, New York–London 1969, p. 449–457.
- Vita Haereticorum quam fecit Bonacursus*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, vol. CCIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Parisiis 1855, col. 775–792.

Secondary Literature

- ACERBI A., *La Visione di Isaia nelle vicende dottrinali del catarismo lombardo e provenzale*, “Cristianesimo nella Storia” 1, 1980, p. 75–122.
- Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006.
- ARNOLD J.H., *The Cathar Middle Ages as a Methodological and Historiographical Problem*, [in:] *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. SENNIS, York 2016, p. 53–78, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781782048176-004>

- ARNOLD J.H., *Inquisition and Power. Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc*, Philadelphia 2001, <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812201161>
- BADALANOVA GELLER F., *The Sea of Tiberias: Between Apocryphal Literature and Oral Tradition*, [in:] *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition. Continuity and Diversity*, ed. L. DI TOMMASO, Ch. BÖTTRICH, Tübingen 2011, p. 13–157.
- BIGET J.-L., *Les bons hommes sont-ils les fils des bogomiles? Examen critique d'une idée reçue*, "Slavica Occitania" 16, 2003, p. 133–188.
- BIGET J.-L., *L'histoire du « catharisme » occitan: un nœud de questions*, [in:] *Le « catharisme » en questions*, ed. J.-L. BIGET, S. CAUCANAS, M. FOURNIÉ, D. LE BLÉVEC, Fanjeaux 2020, p. 13–36, <https://doi.org/10.3406/cafan.2020.2422>
- BIGET J.-L., *Réflexions sur « l'hérésie » dans le Midi de la France au Moyen Âge*, "Heresis" 36–37, 2001, p. 29–74, <https://doi.org/10.3406/heres.2002.1964>
- BILLER P., *Goodbye to Catharism?*, [in:] *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. SENNIS, York 2016, p. 274–313, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781782048176-015>
- BRUNN U., *Cathari, catharistae et cataphrygae. Ancêtres des cathares du XII siècle*, "Heresis" 36–37, 2002, p. 183–200, <https://doi.org/10.3406/heres.2002.1970>
- BRUNN U., *Des contestataires aux "Cathares". Discours de réforme et propagande antihérétique dans les pays du Rhin et de la Meuse avant l'Inquisition*, Paris 2006.
- CAZENAIVE A., *Bien et mal dans un mythe cathare languedocien*, [in:] *Die Mächte des Guten und Bösen: Vorstellungen im XII. u. XIII. Jahrhundert über ihr Wirken in der Heilsgeschichte*, ed. A. ZIMMERMANN, Berlin 1977, p. 344–387.
- CHIU H., *Alan of Lille's Academic Concept of the Manichee*, "Journal of Religious History" 35, 2011, p. 492–506, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9809.2011.01138.x>
- DUVERNOY J., *Le manuscrit 609 De la bibliothèque municipale de Toulouse*, vol. I, http://jean.duvernoy.free.fr/text/pdf/ms609_a.pdf [6 II 2024].
- HAMILTON B., *The Origins of the Dualist Church of Drugunthia*, "Eastern Churches Review" 6, 1974, p. 115–124.
- Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'Inquisition*, ed. M. ZERNER, Nice 1998.
- IVANOV J., *Livres et légendes bogomiles (Aux Sources di Catharisme)*, Paris 1976.
- JIMÉNEZ-SANCHEZ P., *Les catharismes. Modèles dissidents du Christianisme médiéval (XXI^e–XIII^e siècles)*, Rennes 2008, <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pur.3688>
- MANSELLI R., *Evangelisme et mythe dans la foi cathare*, "Heresis" 5, 1985, p. 5–17, <https://doi.org/10.3406/heres.1985.955>
- MILTENOVA A., *The Sea of Tiberias*, [in:] *Biblical Pseudepigrapha in Slavonic Traditions*, ed. A. KULIK, S. MINOV, Oxford 2016, p. 188–235.
- MINCZEW G., *John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael – a Bogomil text?*, "Studia Ceranea" 1, 2011, p. 23–54, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.01.03>
- MOORE R.I., *The Birth of Popular Heresy, a Millennial Phenomenon*, "The Journal of Religious History" 24, 2000, p. 8–25, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9809.00098>
- MOORE R.I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society. Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, Malden 2007, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470773987>
- MOORE R.I., *The War on Heresy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2012, <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065376>

- MORGHEN R., *Medioevo cristiano*, Bari 1951.
- MORGHEN R., *Problèmes sur l'origine de l'hérésie au moyen âge*, "Revue historique" 236, 1966, p. 1–16.
- PEGG M.G., *Le catharisme en questions: falsifiabilité, vérité historique et une nouvelle histoire du christianisme medieval*, [in:] *Le « catharisme » en questions*, ed. J.-L. BIGET, S. CAUCANAS, M. FOURNIÉ, D. LE BLÉVEC, Fanjeaux 2020, p. 331–371, <https://doi.org/10.3406/cafan.2020.2439>
- PEGG M.G., *On cathars, albigenses and good man of Languedoc*, "Journal of Medieval History" 27, 2001, p. 181–195, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4181\(01\)00008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4181(01)00008-2)
- PEGG M.G., *The Corruption of Angels. The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246*, Princeton 2001, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400824755>
- PEGG M.G., *The Paradigm of Catharism; or, the Historians' Illusions*, [in:] *Cathars in Question*, ed. A. SENNIS, York 2016, p. 21–52, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781782048176-003>
- ROQUEBERT M., *Le déconstructionnisme et les études cathares*, [in:] *Les Cathares devant l'Histoire. Mélanges offerts à Jean Duvernoy*, ed. M. AURELL, Cahors 2005, p. 105–134.
- STOYANOV Y., *Aspects of Doctrinal and Cultic Secrecy in Bogomilism and Catharism and the Problem of their Provenance*, "Bulgaria Mediaevalis" 1, 2016, p. 467–478.
- STOYANOV Y., *The Debate on Medieval Western Christian Dualism through the Prism of Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, "Scrinium" 14, 2018, p. 334–350, <https://doi.org/10.1163/18177565-00141P23>
- STOYANOV Y., *Medieval Christian Dualist Perceptions and Conceptions of Biblical Paradise*, "Studia Ceranea" 3, 2013, p. 149–166, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.03.11>
- Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła greckie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2023.
- TAYLOR C., *Evidence for Dualism in Inquisitorial Registers of the 1240s: A Contribution to a Debate*, "History" 3, 2013, p. 319–345, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.12011>
- TAYLOR C., *Heresy in Medieval France. Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000–1249*, Woodbridge–Rochester 2005.
- THÉRY J., *L'hérésie des bons hommes. Comment nommer la dissidence religieuse non vaudoise ni béguine en Languedoc (XIF – début XIV^e siècle)?*, "Heresis" 36–37, 2002, p. 77–117, <https://doi.org/10.3406/heres.2002.1965>
- WERNER E., *L'évangile de Jean et le dualisme medieval*, "Heresis" 12, 1989, p. 13–26, <https://doi.org/10.3406/heres.1989.1060>
- ZAMBON F., *Dissimulation, secret et allégorie dans le dualisme chrétien du Moyen Age: paulicianisme, bogomilisme, catharisme*, "Annali di Scienze Religiose" 4, 2011, p. 157–189, <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.ASR.1.102572>
- ZERNER M., *Introduction*, [in:] *Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'Inquisition*, ed. M. ZERNER, Nice 1998, p. 7–14, <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.CEM-EB.5.105915>

Piotr Czarnecki

Jagiellonian University
Institute for the Study of Religions
ul. Grodzka 52
31-044 Kraków, Polska/Poland
piotr.czarnecki@uj.edu.pl