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Sermo I

Illustrissimo rectori pontificalis cathedre in

1 Incipit liber eckeberti presbeteri contra kataros:
deleted in A
1 . . . Illustrissimo] C inserts:

ADVERSUS PESTIFEROS POEDISSIMOSQVE
Catharorum, (qui Manichaeorum haeresim
innouarunt) damnatos errores ac haereses,
ECKBERTI presbyteri, primo ecclesiae
5 collegiatae Bunnensis, Coloniensis
dioeceseos canonici, demum uero professi
monachi Schonaugiensis monasterii
utilissimi SERMONES ex penetralibus
euangelicis et aliarum diuinariarum
10 scripturarum armario deprompti. Ex quibus
procudubio fructum plurimum metet
diligens lector et candidus.

Breue ex Augustino de Manichaeis excerptum
per eundum Eckbertum.

15 IN LAVDEM BVNNENSIS OPPIDI
Hexastichon uetus.
Bunna solum felix, celebris lucus, incyta
tellus,
Florida martyrrio terra sacrata deo,
Exulibus requies et asylum mente fuisti,
20 Semper et externi te reperere suam.
Te sibi Mars pridem bene messuit imperialeu,
Vt sua Thebaeis ultro tributa feras.

(f.1r-f.1v) ECKBERTI VITA EX TRITEMII libro de
scriptoribus ecclesiasticorum

25 Eckbertus secundus abbas monasterii S. Florini,
ordinis diui patris Benedicti Treuerensis
dioecesis, natione Teutonicus, uir in diuinis
scripturis studiosus et eruditus, et non minus
conuersatione quam scientia uenerabilis, frater
sconaugiensis cenobii monachus, hoc munusculum ex meditacionibus suis. In uestra diocesi frequenter contingit deprehendi quosdam hereticos qui diebus istis plurimum notabilessunt in erroribus suis. Hi sunt quos uulgo kataros uocant, gens perniciosa nimis catholice fidei, quam uelut tinee demoliuntur et corrumpunt, ambulantes in astucia multa. Muniti sunt uerbis sancte scripture que aliquomodo secte eorum concordare uidenter et ex eis sciunt defendere errores suos et oblatrare catholice ueritati; recte autem intelligentie que in sacris uerbis latet et non sine magna discretione agnoscitur nimis expertes sunt. Ego itaque opere precium duxi errores eorum

3 sconaugiensis: Schönau, in the diocese of Trier about 20 miles southwest of Bonn and about 50 miles southwest of Cologne, site of the Benedictine foundation of St. Florianus in 1127, a double monastery. On the creation of St. Florianus, see F.W.E. Roth, Die Visionen der Heilige Elisabeth und die Schriften der Abte Eckbert und Emecho von Schönau (Brünn: 1884): vii-xxi.

9 multa, -mul inserted from above line
15 eorum, corrected from suos] eorum C
describere et annotare auctoritates scripturarum ex quibus se defendunt ac demonstrare quomodo sane intelligi debeat. Simulque eas partes fidei nostre quibus se opponunt proponere et quibus scripture auctoritatibus quibusue rationibus defendi possint, cum superno adiutorio demonstrare, et qui ista legere et in memoria habere curauerint aliquanto promtiores sint ad disceptandum cum illis si quando, ut assolet, in populo fuerint deprehensi. Valde enim linguosi sunt ac semper in proutu illis est quod aduersum nos dicere possint et est non parua uerecundia nostris qui litteras sciunt ut sint muti et elingues in conspectu illorum. Cum essem canonicus in ecclesia bunnensi, sepe ego et

unanimis meus Bertolfus cum talibus alercati sumus

---

29 bunnensi: Bonn
30 Bertolfus: Bertolfus is also mentioned in the visions of Eckbert's sister Elizabeth, a well-known mystic, whose visions Eckbert recorded and translated; see Roth, Die Visionen, xxii-160 for a study of Elizabeth's life and an edition of her works; there is also a forthcoming edition of Elizabeth of Schönau's works by Anne Clark through the Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievals.
37 mei domini hildelini: Hildelinus, first abbot of St. Florianus at Schönau (1127-1167) and Eckbert's predecessor.

---

20 quibusue rationibus] uexionibus C
31 illorum] eorum C
et diligenter attendi errores illorum ac defensiones
multa quoque mihi de illis per eos qui exierant de
conuenticalis eorum innotuerunt et resipuerant a
laqueis diaboli. Propterea et habundantius ea que
de illis sunt et que contra illos dici possunt in
hunc librum cum (f. 2r-2v) abbatis mei domini
hildelini exhortatione conessi uestreque
celsitudini antique familiaritatis causa transmisi
quatus si fortè coram uobis tales examinari
contigerit, munita sit ex his sermonibus prudentia
uestra ad obstruendum ora loquencium iniqua et ad
confirmados uacillantes animos seductibilium
hominum qui, dolosis sermonibus illorum decepti,
ambulare eos secundum ueritatem existimant.

Rogo autem ut si forte rationabilem iudicaueritis

32-33 mihi de illis per eos qui exierant de
conuenticalis eorum innotuerunt) de illis
innotuerunt per eos qui exierant de
conuenticalis eorum C
39 examinari, A reads examinari
41 obstruendum] obstruenda C
42 confirmandos, -con inserted from above line]
confirmandum C
45 forte rationabilem] rationabilem forte C
huius libri compositionem et in aliquo utilem
christiane religioni fore perspexeritis in commune
eum uenire faciatis, ut sit in scandalum generationi
illi pessime cunctis diebus. Vnam preciosam
margaritam a sponso suo christo iesu in dotem
accept irgo ecclesia. fidem catholicam, et hec
quod dolendum est insidiatores multos patitur his
diebus qui moliuntur conterere eam. Pericula
nouissimorum temporum, ut estimo, uenire ceperunt de
quibus in euangelio salvator prophatauit quando de
signis que diem iudicii essent precessura loquens ad
discipulos, sicut scribit mattheus hec inter cetera
dicebat, "Tunc si quis dixerit uobis, 'Ecce, hic
christus aut illic,' nolite credere. Surgent enim
pseudochristi et pseudoprophete et dabunt signa
magna et prodigia, ita ut in errorem ducantur si
fieri potest etiam electi. Ecce predixi uobis. Si
ergo dixerint uobis, 'Ecce, in deserto est

49 v. Matt. 13:45-46

49 . . . Vnam preciosam, C inserts the heading SERMO
DE HAERESIBVS, ADVERSVS QVOS disceptatio
assumitur and inserts in the margin Fides
catholica, pretiosa margarita.
58 dixerit uobis] uobis dixerit
59 enim, inserted by A from above line
63 in deserto est christos,' subauditur nolite] hic
est in deserto, nolite C
christus,' subauditur nolite exire, 'Ecce, in penetralibus est,' nolite credere." Et quidem si tam insane mentis adhuc quispiam uenerit qui se dicat christum esse nondum audiuimus sed de pseudo prophetis qui dicunt in penetralibus esse christum iam multa percipimus. Ecce enim latibulosi quidam homines peruersi et peruersores qui per multa tempora latuerunt et occulte fidem christianam in multis stulte simplicitatis hominibus corruperunt ita per omnes terras multiplicati sunt, ut grande periculum paciatur ecclesia dei a ueneno pessimo quod undique aduersus eam effundunt. Nam sermo eorum serpit ut cancer et quasi (f. 2v - f. 3r) lepra uolatilis longe lateque discurririt preciose


66 uenerit, inserted by A from margin
66 se, inserted by A from above line
67 pseudo, -p inserted by A from above line
68 in penetralibus esse christum] esse in penetralibus Christum C
69 latibulosi quidam] quidam latibulosi C
74 dei, inserted by A from above line
christi membra contaminans. Hos nostra germania
kataros, flandria piphles, gallia ut tesserant ab
usu texendi appellat. Sicut predixit de eis
dominus, dicunt in penetralibus esse christum, quia
ueram fidem christi et uerum christi cultum non
alibi esse dicunt nisi in conuenticulis suis que
habent in cellariis suis et textrinis et in
huiusmodi subterraneis domibus. Apostolorum uitam
agere se dicunt sed contrarii sunt fidei sancte et sane doctrine que a sanctis apostolis et ab ipso domino salutare nobis tradita est. Ipsi etenim sunt de quibus apostolus paulus in epistola ad timotheum ita locutus est, "Spiritus autem manifeste dicit, quia in nouissimis diebus discendent quidam a fide, attendentes spiritibus erroris et doctrinis demonorum, in ypocrisi loquentium mendacium et prohibentium nubere, abstinere a cibus quod deus creauit ad percipiendum cum gratiarum actione."

Prima heresis katarorum de coniugio.

Et quidem uere hi sunt ad quos pertinet hic sermo, quoniam nuptias reprobant et condempnant, ita quod non aliud quam eternam damnationem promittunt eis qui in coniugali uita permanent usque in finem.

90-95 1 Tim. 4:1-3

92 spiritibus, inserted by A from above line
93 demonorum; A reads demoniorum
94 quod] quos C
96 Prima heresis] Haeresis prima C
97 hic sermo, corrected by A from sermo hic
99 non, inserted by A from above line
Approbare quidem se dicunt quidam ex eis illorum coniugium qui uirgines conueniunt sed nec illos saluari posse dicunt, nisi ante finem uite sue abinuicem seperentur, ac pro hoc tale quoque coniugium prohibent.

ii. de esu carnium.

Carnem omnem uitant qui perfecte sectam illorum ingressi sunt, non ea causa qua monachi aut alii spiritualiter uiuentes ab ea abstinent sed idcirco uitandum esse esum carnis dicunt, quia de concubitu nata sit omnis caro et ex hoc immundam esse arbitrantur.

iii. de creatione carnium

Et hanc rationem quidem manifestius dicunt sed in occultis suis quod peius est dicunt, uidelicet omnem

104 seperentur] separantur C
106 de esu carnium] Secunda, de esu carnium uitando C
111 esse, A reads eam
113 de creatione carnium] Tertia: de creatione C
114 rationem quidem] quidem rationem C
carnem facturam esse diaboli ideoque nec in summis necessitatibus eam ullatenus gustant.

iiii. de baptismo paruulorum

De baptismo uarie locuntur. Baptismum nichil prodesse dicunt (f. 3r - f. 3v) paruulis qui baptizantur, quia per se ipsos baptismum petere non possunt et quia nullam fidem possunt profiteri.

v. de baptismo aque

Est autem aliud quod inde communius sed occultius locuntur, uidelicet quod nullus baptismus in aqua prosit ad salutem. Vnde et eos qui ad sectam illorum transierunt suo quodam occulta modo rebaptizant quem baptismum in spiritu sancto et igni fieri dicunt.

130 de animabus mortuorum.

116 esse diaboli] diaboli esse C
118 de baptismo paruulorum] Quarta, de baptismo parvulorum C
119 baptismo, A reads babtismum
123 de baptismo aque] Quinta, de baptismo aquae C
126 Unde] Inde C
127 transierunt] transeunt C
127 occulto modo, corrected by A from modo occulto
130 de animabus mortuorum] Sexta, de animabus mortuorum
De animabus mortuorum talem sententiam habent quod in hora exitus sui vel transeant ad eternam beatitudinem vel ad eternam damnationem. Non enim recipiunt quod credit universalis ecclesia, uidelicet esse quasdam purgatorias penas in quibus anime quorundam electorum ad tempus examinantur pro peccatis suis de quibus in hac uita per condignam satisfactionem ad plenum purgat non sunt. Propterea ergo arbitrantur superfluum et uanum esse orare pro mortuis, elemosinas dare, missas celebrare, et irrident pulsationes campanarum quas facimus que tamen pia ratione in ecclesia fiunt, ut uiui ad orandum pro mortuis commoneatur et ad memoriam proprie mortis excitentur. Missas que in ecclesiis celebrantur omnino spernunt et pro nichilo pro

132 in hora] in ipsa hora C  
132 transeant] transeunt C  
137-38 per condignam satisfactionem, inserted by A from margin  
141-42 quas facimus, inserted by A from margin  
142 ecclesia] ecclesiis C  
142-43 ut uiui] ut uidelicet uiui C
ducunt. Nam si forte cum populo in quo habitant ad audiendum missas siue etiam ad percipiendum eucharistiam accedunt, omnino hoc simulatorie faciunt ne infidelitas eorum possit notari.

150 vii. de sacerdotio

Ordinem quippe sacerdocii in romana ecclesia et in cunctis ecclesiis catholice fidei omnino perisse dicunt nec usquam nisi in secta eorum ueros sacerdotes inueniri.

155 viii. de corpore et sanguine domini

Corpus domini et sanguinem nullo modo nostra consecratione fieri aut a nobis per communicationem percipi posse credunt. Se autem solos in mensis suis corpus domini facere dicunt sed in uerbis illis dolum habent. Non enim uerum illud

147 percipiendum] percipiendam C
151 quippe, inserted by A from above line
152 catholice, A reads catolice
155 de corpore et sanguine domini] octava, de corpore et sanguine domini C
156 corpus domini . . .] C inserts in margin: Cathari carnem suam corpus domini uocabant
corpus significant quod de uirgine natum fuisse credimus et quod (f. 3v - f. 4r) passum est in cruce sed sui ipsius carnem corpus domini uocant. Et in eo quod sua corpora nutriunt cibis mense sue corpus 165 domini se facere dicunt.

ix. de humanitate saluatoris

Nec intactum preteribo quod audiui a quodam uiro fideli qui, agnita eorum perfidia et secretis quibusdam turpitudinibus eorum, de societate ipsorum exiuit. Nam in domino saluatore ita eos errare affirmabat, ut dicerent eum nec uere natum ex uirgine nec uere humanam carnem habuisse sed simulatam carnis speciem nec ex mortuis eum resurrexisse sed mortem et resurrectionem 170 simulasse. Propter quod et christianis pascha

161 corpus significant] corpus Christi significant C
166 de humanitate saluatoris] None, de humanitate saluatoris C
169-70 eorum, de societate ipsorum exiuit] de societate eorum exiunt C
170 eos errare] errare eos C
172 carnem habuisse] carnem eum habuisse C
celebrantibus, uel negligenter hoc celebrant si inter ipsos sunt, uel occasiones querunt discedendi de medio eorum quibus cohabitant ne cum eis solemnizare cogantur. Celebrant autem pro eo alium quoddam festum in quo occisus est heresiarcha eorum manicheus cuius proculdubio heresim sectantur quod beatus augustinus in libro contra manicheos bema appellari dixit. Meus autem recitator ab eis quibus ipse fuerat commoratus malilosa dixit uocari autumpnali tempore celebrari.

x. de animabus humanis

Preter hec quia nouam quandam et hactenus inauditam insaniam de eis compertam habemus quam manifeste confessi sunt quidam eorum cum examinarentur a clero in ciuitate colonia, ubi et a populo feruentis zeli


182 bema, corrected by A from beina] Beina C
183 C inserts in margin: Infra, Bema uidetur esse post(modo?)
186 de animabus humanis] Decima, de animabus humanis C
187 quia] et C
16

combusti sunt. Dicebant enim animas humanas nichil
aliud esse nisi illos apostatas spiritus qui in
principio mundi de regno celorum iecti sunt et eos
in humanis corporibus posse per bona opera promereri
salutem sed hoc non nisi inter eos qui ad eorum
pertinent sectam. Talia iam longo tempore latentur
susurrauerunt, lustrantes ubique domos (f. 4r – f.
4v) seductibilium hominum et multas in his
temporibus infelices animas, ut audimus, captiuis

dicunt reciaculis susurrii pessimi. Circumeunt ut
ita dicam mare et aridam, ut faciant katarum unum et
omnem religiosam conversationem impia detractione
commaculant nec quemque saluari posse nisi ad
ipsorum transierit sectam affirmant. Itaque cum omni
diligentia euigilare necesse est omnes qui zelum dei


191 nichil] non C
199 audimus] audiuimus C
200 reciaculis susurrii] retinaculis susurri C
200-01 ut ita dicam] (ut ita dicam) C
202 detractione, corrected by A from detrectatione
203 ipsorum] eorum C
habent et exercitatos habent sensus in scripturis sanctis ad capiendum uulpeculas has pessimas que demoliuntur uineam domini sabaoth. Multi quidem sunt errores illorum, ita ut nemo omnes enumerando
prosequi ualeat sed eos qui maxime periculosi mihi
uisi sunt distinxi et in una serie disposui quoniam annuente deo specialiter aduersus eos disserere proposui.
Vnde secta hoc originem ducat.

Sciendum vero est et non celandum ab auribus uulgi quoniam indubitantrer secta eorum de quibus agimus originem accepit a manicheo heresiarcha, cuius doctrina maledicta erat et tota uenenosa et radicata est in populo isto peruerso. Multa tamen permixta
habent doctrine magistri sui que inter hereses


212-13 disserere proposui] loqui mihi propositum est C
214 Vnde secta hoc originem ducat] De origine sectae Catharorum C
illius non inueniuntur. Diuisi sunt etiam contra
semetipsos quia nonnulla que ab aliquibus eorum
dicuntur ab aliis negantur. Manicheus autem iste,
ut nunc paucae de illo loquar, a persia oriundus erat
et primo quidem manes dicebatur postea uero a
discipulis suis manicheus appellatus est, ne insanus
uidetur et dictus manes a mania quod est insanie
nomen. Sic autem insanus erat ut diceret se esse
spiritum sanctum et se missum fuisse a christo in
mundum sicut promiserat cum ascensurus esset in
celum. Ideoque et christi se apostolum dicebat
quasi missum ab ipso. Inde et discipuli eius ex hoc
gloriabantur quod in magistro (f. 4v f. 5r) ipsorum
completa fuisset promissio christi de spiritu
paraclito. Ex numero discipulorum suorum duodecim

223-28 Manicheus . . . nomen: Cf. Augustine, De
haeresibus, 46, ed. Liguori Müller, The De
Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, vol. 90 of The
Catholic University of America Patristic
Studies (Washington: Catholic University of
228-32 Sic . . . ipso Cf. Ibid. p. 94.
232-35 Inde . . . paraclito Cf. Ibid:
"Promissionem Domini Jesu Christi de
Paraclito Spiritu Sancto in suo haeresiarcha
Manichaeo dicunt esse completam."

224 ut nunc paucae de illo loquar] (ut nunc paucae
de illo loquar) C
228 esse] ipsum C
233 Inde] Vnde C
234 fuisset] esset C
235 paraclito] paracleto C
elegit quos quasi apostolos suos habebat, ut in hoc haberet formam Christi qui ex discipulis suis duodecim sibi elegit apostolos. Quem numerum imitatores eius et hodierna die observant, qui ex electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros et tertium decimum principem ipsorum, episcopos autem septuagintados qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros ac diaconos qui ab episcopis ordinantur et hi electi inter eos vocantur. Quem uero non ad tantam perfectionem peruenerunt ut electi possint dici auditores vocantur. Mittuntur autem ex omnibus qui idonei uidentur ad eorum errorem, uel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, uel ubi non est seminandum. Manichei doctrina et sequatium eius christiane fidei in


246 peruenerunt] uenerunt C
249 et] uel C
ipsa radice sua se opponit sicut nunc demonstrabo. Credimus enim et confitemur unum solum esse deum qui fecit celum et terram et omnia que in eas sunt et hec est radix fidei nostre. Illi uero duos creatores esse docent, unum bonum et alterum malum, uidelicet deum et quendam immanem principem tenebrarum quem nescio quomodo rectius uocare possimus nisi diabolum. Duas naturas fuisse dicunt ab eterno contrarias sibi inuicem, unam bonam et alteram malam et ex eas dicunt creata esse uniuersa. Animas hominum et uitalem spiritum quorumlibet animantium et uirtutem que uiuificat arbores et herbas et quelibet semina a deo originem habere dicunt et condita ex illa bona natura, immo et quendam partem dei unuquodque talium esse uolunt.

254-60 Illi . . . uniuersa: Cf. Ibid., p. 84: "Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque aeterna et coaeterna, hoc est semper fuisse, composuit; duasque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios antiquos haereticos, opinatus est." Cf. also Augustine, Contra Epistolam, 13, p. 209: "Haec, quippe, inquit, in exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae, et luminis quidem imperium tenebat deus pater in sua stirpe . . ."

260-65 Animas . . . uolunt: Cf. De haeresibus, 46, p. 86: "Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est, a natura Dei, factum confitentur . . ."

254 hec est radix] hec radix C
254 Illi uero . . . C inserts in margin: Manichaeus duo esse rerum principia dixit.
265 quendam] quandam C
Carnem uero omnium que uiuunt super terram tam hominum quam aliorum animantium ab illo immanni principe tenebrarum, id est, diabolo originem dicunt (f. 5r - f. 5v) habere et condita ex mala natura et ob hoc ut supra dictum est esum carnium uitant. Horrendus est sermo et omnino alienus ab humano sensu quem de talibus rebus filii diaboli coninxerunt ad perdicionem omnium eorum qui illis credunt et a casta ueritate que est in scripturis sanctis mentem auertunt.

Hoc quoque manifeste inter errores manichei et disicipulorum eius legitur quod dicebant filium dei nunquam uere humanum corpus suscepisse in uirgine sed similitudinem tantum humani corporis habuisse et nunquam uere passum aut mortuum fuisse aut resurrexisse, sed tantum in his omnibus eum fefellisse humanos sensus, ita ut hominibus uera

---

276-85 Hoc quoque . . . illis: Cf. De haeresibus, 46, p. 94: " Christum autem fuisse affirmant. . . nec fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur . . ."

---

267 aliorum, corrected by A from aliarum
276 manifeste] manifestum C
281 tantum, inserted by A from margin
uiderentur cuncta que dicuntur de humanitate eius et quod nulla tamen ueritas fuisset in omnibus illis.

285 Idipsum autem et ante manicheum in persia docuerant duo magi, zaroe et arfaxat. Et sicut diximus hec omnia nobis ueraciter comperta sunt de omnibus istis quos nunc kataros uocant et ipsi originem habuerunt a quibusdam discipulis manichei qui olim katariste dicebantur. Nam manicheus ille de quo totus hic error processit multos quidem discipulos habebat et sub una secta erant dum adhuc uiueret. Mortuo autem eo dissenserunt ab inuicem et diuisi sunt in tres partes et uocati quidam eorum mattarii, quidam uero katariste, quidam autem singulariter manichei dicebantur quia singularius ceteris magistrum suum secuti sunt, omnes tamen commune habeabant hoc nomen, ut dicerentur manichei quia omnium error a manicheo originem habuit.

300 Isti uero qui katariste dicebantur

286 Zaroe: Zoroaster? (ca. 660 B.C.)
286 Arphaxat: Arphaxad, king of the Medes, ca. ?, defeated by Nebuchadnezzar of Assyria; v. Judith 1:1-16

284 nulla, inserted by A from margin
284-85 in omnibus illis] in his omnibus C
285 autem et ante] autem ante C
288 hominibus] omnibus C
293 uiueret, A reads uiuerent
295 uocati quidam] uocati sunt quidam C
300 Isti] Ipsi C
omnibus ceteris turpiores habebantur propter quasdam secretas spurcicias quas specialiter ipsi (f. 5v - f. 6r) exercebant. Quorum doctrinam et uiam indubitanter sectantur isti de quibus nunc sermo nobis est. Vnde autem katariste, id est, purgatores, primo uocati sint alio loco dicere statui ne forte principium libri huius aliquid abhominetur, si statim omnes prauitates eorum enarrem. Nam que de manicheis a beato augustino conscripta sunt summatim et breuiter collegi ex

286-303 Et sicut .. exercebant: Cf. De haeresibus, 46, p. 90: "Quorum unus nomine Viator eos qui ista facint proprie Catharistas vocari dicens, cum alias eiusdem Manichaeae sectae partes in Mattarios et specialiter Manichaeos distribui perhiberet, omnes tamen has tres formas ab uno auctore propagatas, et omnes generaliter Manichaeos esse negare non potuit."

306 purgatores Cf. Ibid.: "Unde etiam Catharistae appellantur, quasi purgatores, tanta eam purgantes diligentia ut se nec ab hac tam horrenda cibi turpitudine abstineant."

302 spurcicias, corrected by A from spurcicis
305 nobis est] est nobis C
307 ne forte principium] ne principium C
309 enarrem] enarrarem C
tribus libris eius, uidelicet ex eo qui scribitur
contra manicheos et ex eo qui intitulatur de moribus
manicheorum et ex libro de heresibus et eandem
collectionem in fine libri huius annectera dispono,
315 ut qui legerint possint quasi a fundamento totam
hanc heresis plenius agnoscre et intelligant
quoniam hec heresis omnium heresum sentina est.
Produnt autem semetipsos quod sint de errore
manichei in eo quod dicere solent quod beatus
320 augustinus prodiderit secreta eorum et constat quod
ipse ante perceptionem baptismi discipline
manicheorum aliquandiu interfuit et postea errores
eorum et secreta eorum manifeste in libris quos
nominaui descripsit et confutauit.

312 contra manicheos: Contra epistolam manichaei
quan uocant fundamenti,; edited in CSEL, 25
311-12 de moribus manicheorum: De moribus ecclesiae
catholicæ et de moribus manicheorum,
written in 388 A.D.; edited in Migne, PL 32,
col. 1309-78. See also the study by J.K.
Coyle, Augustine's 'De Moribus ecclesiae
catholicæ' (Fribourg, 1978).
313 de haeresibus: The De haeresibus, written in
428 A.D., edited by Müller, op. cit., and by
R. Vander Plaetses and C. Beukers, Corpus
Christianorum, series latina, 46 (1969):
283-345.

323 secreta eorum manifeste] secreta manifeste C
Sermo II

Sermo de eo quod doctrina christiana occultanda non sit

Ad uos ergo nunc mihi sermo est, o katari, plebs angulosa, qui non alibi nisi in uestrís penetralibus christum esse querendum estimatis. Dicite mihi, Quando iniit hoc consilium dominus, ut uellet esse absconditus in angulis uestrís? Dicitis quoniam ueritas christiane fidei uobis solis sit nota et apud uos solos abscondita sed scimus quoniam dominus saluator ipse eam non abscondit, ut patet in uerbis ipsius que imminente sibi passione coram pontifice iudeorum locutus est dicens, "Ego palam locutus sum mundo, ego semper docui in sinagogis et in templo ubi omnes iudei conueniunt et in occulto locutus sum nichil." Non enim ita aliquid locutus

12-15 John 18:20

2 non, inserted by A from above line
9 scimus, inserted by A from margin
11 sibi] sua C
13-14 sinagogis et in templo ubi] synagogis ubi C
est, (f. 6r-f. 6v) ut hoc uellet occultum permanere. Nam et si aliquando disciplis seorsum a turbis aliqua loquebatur que non illo tempore conueniebat fieri manifesta, dicebat tamen illis, "Quod dico uobis in tenebris dicite in lumine et quod in aure auditis predicata super tecta." Quibus et post resurrectionem suam precepit dicens, "Euntes in mundum uniuersum, predicate euangelium omni creature." De quibus et eeuangelista subdit dicens, "Illi autem prefecti predicauerunt ubique domino cooperante et sermonem eorum confirmante sequentibus signis." Predicauerunt non in angulis, non in cellariis, aut textrinis, sed sicut scriptura dicit, predicauerunt ubique, non solum in domibus sed et in foro et plateis ciuitatum, non solum

28 textrinis: "Weaver's shops". For the association between Catharism and weaving, see chap. III, p. ??.

19-21 Matt. 10:27
22-24 Mark 16:15
25-27 Mark 16:20

17 et si] etsi C
18 non, inserted by A from above line
19-20 dico uobis in] dico in C
30 sed et in] sed in c
coram plebe sed et coram regibus et principibus
omnium terrarum sicut scriptum est de eis, "In omnem
terram exiuit sonus eorum." Noluit doctrinam suam a
paulo celari dominus cum dicebat, "Uas electionis
mihi est iste, ut portet nomen meum coram regibus
et principibus et filiis israel." Ipse quoque paulus
a nullo genere hominum celandam esse ueritatem
euangelii estimabat, quando dixit, "Grecis ac
barbaris, sapientibus et insipientibus debitor sum,
ita sum, ita quod in me promptum est et uobis qui
rome estis euuangelizare." Sicut dixi, predicauerunt
sancti apostoli in manifesto doctrinam salutis et
signa fecerunt, mortuos suscitando, cecos
illuminando et omnem languorem pellendo in nomine
christi et sustinuerunt crucifigi et gladio necari

29-31 Acts 8:4; Luke 9:2
32-33 Rom. 10:18; Ps. 18:5
34-36 Acts 9:15-16
38-41 Rom. 1:14-15

37 celandam] zelandum C
40 sum, ita sum, ita quod] sum, ita quod C
45 crucifigi et gladio necari] crucifigi, gladio que
necari C
ac diversis passionibus deduci ad mortem pro testimonio veritatis. Uos autem si estis sic ut dicitis, apostoli christi, quare tanto tempore latuistis? Si uos estis ecclesia dei, ut dicitis, quare usque ad hec tempora semper in abscondito ambulastis? Dominus dicit in euangelio de ecclesia sua, "Non (f. 6v - f. 7r) potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita neque accendunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio sed supra candelabrum et luceat omnibus qui in domo sunt." Mons ipse christus est, ciuitas supra montem posita ecclesia est, cuius fundamentum est christus. De ea dicit dominus quod non potest abscondi.

Vos autem semper absconditi fuistis et doctrinam uestram occultastis et ita lucernam

52-55 Matt. 5:14-15

47 sic ut] sicut C
54 et] ut C
uestram quasi sub modio timoris positam habetis nec unquam eam alicui manifestatis de quo timetis quod uos faciat manifestos. Nam ab ipsis quoque qui ueniunt ad uos fidem uestram ex qua salvandos uos esse speratis et occulta opera uestra longo tempore, ut dicunt, quindecim annis occultatis donec diu eos probaueritis, ita ut sperare possitis de eis quod non prodant uos. Non hoc sancti apostoli fecerunt et successores eorum qui nobis noti sunt. Non absconderunt lucernam sub modio quia nec causa timoris nec causa commodi temporalis lucem euangelice ueritatis quam a christo acceperant celauerunt sed supra candelabrum, id est, supra ecclesiam ita manifeste eam constituerunt, ut luceret omnibus qui in domo, id est, in mundo erant.

63-68 Nam ab . . . prodant uos: Eckbert refers here to the practice of the Cathar leadership (the "perfecti") of concealing dualist doctrines from their uninitiated followers. The rite of passage from the lower level to that of "perfecti" was almost certainly accomplished by receiving a spiritual baptism involving the laying on of hands, (consolamentum), as was true of Catharist practice in France and Lombardy as well. See chap. III, pp. 4, 49-52.

61 uestrum quasi sub] uestrum sub C
63 uos faciat, corrected by A from faciat uos
66 eos] uos C
69 noti sunt] sunt noti C
72 supra] super C
Omnibus etenim tam bonis quam malis, electis et reprobis innotescere uoluit dominus qualis esset fides et religio christianorum, ut nemo per ignorantiam se posset excusare.

Forsitan ad uerbum illud confugitis quod dominus ad discipulos suos locutus est dicens, "Nolite sanctum dare canibus neque mittatis margaritas ante porcos." Rustici uiles, nolite assumere uerba hec in defensionem uestræm, quia non recte discernitis ea. Omnibus hominibus manifeste dicenda sunt uerba salutis, sine quorum agnicione saluari nemo potest nec aliquis ita canis aut porcus iudicandus est, ut occultari debeant ab eo. Nam ut (5. 7r - f. 7v) ait apostolus, "Deus omnes homines uult saluos fieri et

82-84 Matt. 7:6

79 se posset] posset se C
ad agnicionem ueritatis uenire." Quod si quis audita et agnita ueritate pertinaciter et incorrigibiliter ei contradicit et nititur commaculare ueritatem feda detractione et irrisione, debet iusta ratione a tali suspendi predicatio ueritatis, quod est subtrahi sanctum et marginas a canibus et porcis. Tales esse persenserant sancti apostoli iudeos in quibus satis laborauerant uerbo ueritatis cum nouissime eis dicebant, "Quoniam repulistis a uobis uerbum dei et indignos uos iudicasti eterne uite, ecce convertimur ad gentes." Conuersi sunt ad gentes et eis manifeste predicauerunt doctrinam salutis quos sciebant esse idolâtras et pollutos omni genere immundiciarum et uos ita canes et porcos nos iudicatis, ut nunquam manifeste inter nos

89-91 1 Tim. 2:4
99-101 Acts 13:46

95 est, inserted by A from margin
96 a canibus et porcis] et porcis a canibus C
98 ueritatis] praedicationis C
103 esse, inserted by A from margin
103 idolatras] idololatras C
104 porcos nos] porcos uos C
105 inter nos] inter uos C
predicetis doctrinam uestram, sine qua neminem
saluari posse arbitramini cum dominus dicat, "Qui me
cfessus fuerit coram hominibus, confitebor et ego
eum coram patre meo qui est in celis." Si forte
acciderit ut aliquis uestrum pro errore suo
deprehensus fuerit et deductus ante iudices
ecclesie, aut omnino negatis fidem uestram, aut tunc
primum aliquos errores uestros confitemini, cum de
uita amplius non speratis. Sed illa confessio non
est ad gloriam uobis et est quasi confessio furis
qui, cum de uita desperat, latrocinia sua impudenter
confitetur sub laqueo et sunt interemptiones quas
aliaquando a populo zelante pro lege dei sui aliqui
uestrum paciuntur, non quasi passiones apostolorum
120 sed quasi iudicia furum et latronum. Uos quippe

107-09 Matt. 10:32

109 est in celis] in coelis est C
115-16 uita desperat] uita sua desperat C
estis de quibus dominus in euangelio dicit, "Omnis quotquot uenerunt fures sunt et latrones." Non enim nisi furtiue et quasi per latrocinium acquiritis in partem uestram animas miserorum quos trahitis post uos (f. 7v - f. 8r) et omne negotium uestrum est perambulans in tenebris, quoniam sicut ait saluator, "Omnis qui male agit odit lucem et non uenit ad lucem ut non arguantur opera eius."

O quales apostoli, o quales euangeliste, quam bene impletis illud quod mandauit dominus predictoribus uerbi sui per prophetam dicens, "Supra montem excelsum ascende tu qui euuangelizas syon, exalta uocem tuam qui euuangelizas ierusalem. Exalta, noli timere." Non hoc certe impletis sed illud mandatum priscilliani obseruatis, "Iura


121-22 John 10:8
127-28 John 3:20
132-34 Isa. 40:9

129 quam] quoniam C
periura secretum prodere noli."

Dicitis modo, nondum uenit tempus nostrum ut manifestari debeamus sed iam nunc incipimus palam loqui mundo et erit adhuc tempus quando deus ecclesiam suam, id est nos, exaltet et impleatur in nobis illud quod dominus dixit de ecclesia sua, "Non potest abscondi ciuitas supra montem posita." Sed dicite mihi, si semper supra montem, id est, christum, posita fuit ciuitas ista, hoc est societas uestra, quomodo potuit fieri ut tanto tempore esset abscondita? Iam enim a tempore ascensionis dominice transierunt mille et centum anni et amplius et nunquam sublimata est religio uestra aut si sublimata est, dicite, si scitis, in quibus temporibus et sub quibus regibus terre factum est


141-42 Matt. 5:14

141 dixit] dicit C
146 ascensionis dominice] dominicae ascensionis
hoc, ut ubique in mundo audiretur predicari fides katarorum. Quando factum est hoc ut omnes principes et domini terrarum qui non essent uel pagani uel iudei essent katarii et gubernarent subditos suos secundum legem katarorum? Certe si hoc nobis demonstrare possetis, crederemus uobis quod aliquando ciuitas uestra posita fuisset in manifesto sed hoc gratia dei nunquam factum est.

155 hoc] hic C
156 crederemus] C reads cederemus
Sermo III
sermo de incremento et manifestatione
catholice fidei

Audite nunc de fide nostra quam profitemur (f. 8r - f. 8v) et quam in manifesto predicamus, quomodo peruenit in nos et quomodo ecclesia dei cuius nos per ipsius gratiam membra sumus exaltata est et posita est in manifesto. Fidem beati petri apostoli quam ipse habuit et predicauit, suscepit post ascensionem domini ciuitas magna antiochia et ipse erat docens in ea annis septem non occulte, non in subterraneis domibus sed ipse episcopus erat totius ciuitatis et ipsius causa regalis aula que erat in ciuitate per devotionem populi commutata est in ecclesiam in qua communiter populum docuit et missas celebravit et ordinavit ea que ad christia-


3 nostra] gratia C
10 docens in ea] in ea docens C
11 ipse episcopus] episcopus C
15 ordinavit] ordinabat C
nam religionem pertinebant. Ibi primum eis qui
fidem christi susceperunt impositum est hoc nomen ut
uocarentur christiani. Cum autem ibi firmasset
fidem christianam et legem diuinam beatus petrus,

ordinavit in loco suo episcopum ciuitati

beatum euodium, cuius et successor fuit ignatius
clarissimus martyr, discipulus sancti iohannis
euuangeliste et ipse inde profectus est romam,
itemque in ea fidem christianam docuit ac maximam

partem ciuitatis ad christum convirtit et per XXV
annos ecclesiam christi ibi gubernauit. Ibi
manifeste confessus est coram nerone imperatore

16-26 Cum . . . gubernavit: v. Herigeri et Anselmi
Gesta, I.4, col. 1009D-1010A: "Annus erat
Claudii cesaris secundus,qui erat passione
dominica undecimus, cum Petrus, caput
Antiocham pro se ordinate Evodio, venit Romam,
ubi per 25 annos Christum annuntians, id est
usque ad annum Neronis 13." v. also
Cassiodorus, Historia Ecclesiastica
Tripartita, X.9, W. Jacob, ed., CSEL, 71
(Vienna: Tempsky, 1952): 596; and Liber
Pontificalis, I.1, p. 50.

21 evodium: Evodius, d. ca. 64 A.D., considered by
tradition to be installed as the first bishop of
Antioch by Peter.

21 ignatius: Ignatius, second bishop of Antioch,
d. ca. 115 A.D.

16-18 Acts 11:26

17 hoc nomen] nomen hoc C
20 loco suo] suo loco C
21 successor, A read successor
fidem christi et uxorem eius libiam et uxorem agripppe prefecti agrippinam ad fidem convertit et ob eius fidei predicationem nero crucifiigi eum preceptit et paulum simul cum ipso ibidem predicantem gladio necari iussit.

Ex illo igitur tempore semper fides christianana creuit in urbe roma nec unquam defecit in romana ecclesia fides quam habuerat et quam predicauerat petrus, sicut et ei promiserat dominus quando imminente passione (f. 8v - f. 9r) sua dixit ad eum, "Ego rogaui pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, hoc est fides ecclesie quam tibi commisi." Beatus autem petrus cum sciret appropinguare sibi passionem suam,


Innumerabiles enim populi dum conuertenentur ad dominum per praedicationem Petri, contigit etiam uxorem Neronis Luiiam et Agrippae praefecti coniugem homine Agrippinam ita converti, . . ."

28 libiam: Livia, wife of Nero
29 agripppe: Praetorian Prefect under Nero
29 agrippinam: Agrippina, wife of the Prefect Agrippa


28 libiam] Libyam C
30 eius] eiusmod C
30 crucifigi eum] eum crucifiigi
sanctum clementem, quem ad fidem conuerterat et
baptizauerat, ordinauit in episcopum eiusque
gubernationi sedem suam et ecclesiam quam ipse
rexerat commisit et ita successor beati petri factus
45 est in sede illa et ad ultimum ipse quoque pro
testimonia fidei christianae martyrium passus est.
Nama quod linus et cletus, successores petri, fuisse
leguntur, ita intelligendum est quod adhuc episcopo
uiuente coadiutores eius extiterunt in gubernando
50 populum dei rome et ad hoc ab ipso erant in
episcopos ordinati, ut scribit quidam apostolicorum
patrum episcopis germanie et gallie. Qualem autem

39-52 Beatus . . . gallie: Cf. Rufinus of Aquil.,
Prologus in Clementis Recognitiones. B. Rehm,
ed., CCSL, 20, p. 282: "... quod Linus et
Anencletus fuerint quidem ante Clementem
episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superstite Petro,
uidelicet ut illi episcopatus curam gererent,
ipse uero apostolatus inpleret officium . . . "
v. also Irenaeus, Contra haereses, III.3,3; Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, ed.,
Contre les Hérésies, 2, no. 211, Sources
Chrétiennes (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf,
41 clementem: Clement I, d. ca. 99 A.D.; bishop of
Rome, ca. 91-99.
47 linus: Linus, considered by tradition the second
bishop of Rome, ca. 67-76 A.D.; perhaps the Linus
in 2 Tim. 4:21.
47 cletus: Cletus (Greek "Anacletus"), third bishop
of Rome, ca. 76-91 A.D.

48 intelligendum, A reads inteligendum
48 episcopo] ipso C
fidem a beato petro clemens susceperat, talem et
successores eius habuerunt et predicauerunt in
romana urbe et eam predicari fecerunt in aliis
terris per eos quos ad predicandum miserunt.

Et paulatim quidem creuit ecclesia in ea fide
et magis ac magis de die in diem promouebatur
quamuis multi reges et principes grauibus eam
persecutionibus opprimere niterentur usque ad
tempus beati siluestri pape sub quo pax magna et
libertas data est ecclesie et exaltari cepit et ad
summos honores promoueri fides et religio
christiana. Ipse etenim sicut antiquata nobis
scripta commemorant, predicatione uerbi dei et
magnorum ostensione miraculorum constantinum
imperatorem filium helene regine que crucem

57-64: Et . . . christianae: v. Irenaeus, Contra
haereses, I, 10, 1-2, Rousseau, pp. 154-60.
61 siluestri pape: Pope Sylvester I, 314-335 A.D.
67 helene regine: Helena, (ca. 250-ca. 330 A.D.),
  mother of Constantine the Great

64 antiquataj antiqua C
65 commemorant, A reads commomorant
dominicam inuenit, conuertit ad fidem, ita ut
imperator de regali solio suo descendens in eo
collocaret beatum siluestrum et ad pedes eius se
humiliaret. Ipse quoque in equo suo consedere (f.
9r - f. 9v) eum fecit et ad modum servii ei minis-
truit, pedester incedens ante eum et freno eum
deducens et consignans ei dominium urbis. Insuper et
regale palatinum illic ei construxit et omnem regium
honorem et potestatem quam habebat rome et in
partibus occidentis ipsi et successoribus eius

64-68 Ipse . . . fidem: v. Das Constitutum
Constanti, 9, H. Fuhrmann, ed., vol. 10 of
Fontes Juris Germanici Antiqui (Hannover:
Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1968): 74-77, 83-84;
Cassiodorus, Historia Tripartita, I.5,
Jacob, pp. 17-18; On Helen's finding of the
cross, v. Rufinus, Historia ecclesiasticae
libro duo, I.8, PL 21, col. 476-78; v. also
Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum, I.36,
Bruno Krusch, ed., Gregorii episcopi
Turonensis Historiarum MGH, Scriptores rerum
Merovingicarum, 1, pt. 1 (Hannover: Bibliopolii
Hahniani): 27. v. also Gesta Treverorum.
Georg Waitz, ed., MGH, SS, 8, p. 152: "Bea-
tissima vero mater eius Helena cum magno
exercitu Jerusalem perrexit, ibique cum Dei
adiutorio lignum sanctae crucis invenit."

67-68 que crucem dominicam inuenit} (que crucem
dominicam inuenit) C
73 incedens, -in inserted by A from above line
75 illic, -c inserted by A from above line
77 ipsi et} ipsi ac C
concessit et totius senatus honorem clero qui cum ipso erat tradidit et ipse cum senatoribus omnibus de urbe egrediens bizantium transmigrauit et urbem nominis sui constantinopolim edificauit, solum autem nomen imperatoris sibi ac successoribus suis retinuit. In hunc modum creuit et confortata est et usque ad summos honores permota est in romana urbe et sub romana potestate ecclesia dio et fides quam beatus petrus docuit et quam successores eius ab ipso tuerunt et usque ad ista tempora perduxerunt.

Simili modo et per alios apostolos in alis regnis per totum mundum fides christi dilatata et sublimata est. Ad has autem cisalpinas partes hoc ordine peruenit. Beatus petrus, dum ecclesiam dei rome gubernaret, misit tres ex discipulis suis, 


84 in, inserted by A from above line  
87 ipso] eo C
uidelicet eucharum, ualerium, et maternum.

95 predicare teuthonice genti euangeliun christi. Qui uenientes in ciuitatem treuerim predicauerunt in ea et cum dei adiutorio conuerterunt eam ad fidem christi et baptizauerunt omnem populum in flumine ciuitatis qui dicitur oleuia. Primus eorum


94 eucharium, valerium, et maternum: According to legends which were widely accepted by the twelfth century, Eucharius, Valerius, and Maternus were disciples of St. Peter sent to evangelize Gaul. The Vita, I (p. 918) of the saints claimed that Peter consecrated Eucharius a bishop, Valerius a deacon and Maternus a subdeacon. Eucharius is mentioned as the first bishop of Trier in the earliest episcopal lists, Valerius as his successor, and Maternus third. Maternus is also cited as the first bishop of Cologne. The actual period of their activity can be placed in the late third and early fourth centuries.


96 treuerim: Trier

99 oleuia: The Mosel River, named "oleuia" due to the great amount of holy oil utilized for the many baptized in the river by the three saints. v. Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta, I.10, col. 1016B.
episcopus urbis erat Eucharius, quo defuncto, 
ualerius ei in episcopatum successit, quo etiam 
defuncto, maternus qui, de morte per baculum petri 
suscitatus fuerat, episcopus factus est non solum 
in treuiri sed et in colonia que antiquitus 
agrippina dicebatur simulque in ciuitate tungerensi 
que honorum persecutione deleata est. Ipsam ergo (f. 

99-101 Primus . . . successit: v. Goldscherus, Vita, 
IV, p. 921: "Cumque B. Eucharius per viginti 
et tres annos Pontificatum Treuericae vrbis 
tenuisset, . . . Ad Beatum vero Valerium 
dixit: 'Commendo tibi, carissime frater, 
sponsam Christi, Ecclesiam videlicet eius." 
v. also Gesta Treverorum, XV, p. 147: "Post 
cuius obitum beatus Valerius in ministerium 
sacerdotale successit, illudque per 15 annos 
sancte vivendo et verbum vitae praedicando 
probatissime rexit."

101-05 quo . . . tungerensi: v. Gesta Treverorum, 
XV, p. 147: "Post cuius decessum beatus 
Maternus pontificalem suscipiens apicem, 40 
annis talentum sibi creditum fideliter 
multiplicavit. Hic Tungrenses et Colonenses 
ad fidem Christi convertit, et his tribus 
civitatibus pontificali iure praesedit . . . " 
v. also Golscherus, Vita, IV, p. 921.

103-04 maternus . . . fuerat: The resurrection of 
Saint Maternus after having the staff of St. 
Peter placed on his body, is described in 
Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta, I.6, col. 1011C-
1013A; and in Goldscherus, Vita, I, p. 918: 
"Sanctus vero Eucharius . . . ad sepulchrum 
fratris accedens, dilectissimumque thesaurum 
effodiens, baculum funeri superposuit: et dum 
Apostoli verba, quae mandauerat, retulisset, 
statim Maternus resumpto spiritu resedit."

105-06 tungerensi que honorum persecutione deleata 
est: Tongres was destroyed by the Huns in 451 
A.D.; v. Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta, I.26, 
col. 1013C.

105 dicabatur] uocabatur C
fidem beati petri quam hi tres predicauerunt in ecclesiis quas ipsi gubernauerunt ipsorum quoque successores tenuerunt et predicauerunt usque in hodiernum diem. Eandem quoque fidem predicavit in ciuitate moguntia crescens, discipulus apostoli pauli. Beatus quoque

106-10 Ipsam . . . diem: Eckbert presumably knew pieces of the ecclesiastical history of the Rhineland after the deaths of Eucharius, Valerius, and Maternus. See, e.g., Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta, I.15-16, col. 1020C-1021D, which contain a list of the eight bishops who succeeded Maternus at Tongres; see also Golscherus, Vita, VI, p. 922:

Haec de gestis Sanctorum Patrum, post excidium Treuericae vrbis relictos cineres diligentius perfructantes, sparsim in chartulis scripta inuenimus . . . credendum sine dubio est multas virtutes, dum adhuc in corpore viuerent, per eos Dominum exercuisse.


111 moguntia: Mainz
112 crescens: Crescens, Paul's disciple, considered the first bishop of Vienna; later added to the episcopal list of Mainz as its first bishop, probably in the twelfth century. See L. Duchesne, Fastes Episcopaux de l'Ancienne Gaule (Paris: Boccard, 1915), 2, p. 178; v. 3, p. 156.
bonefacius, uir eximie sanctitatis, qui primus in ea
archiepiscopous fuit et martirium pro christo
susceptit, et successores eius usque in hodiernum
diem hanc fidem tenuerunt et docuerunt in ecclesia
mogunciens et ipsa in omnibus ecclesiis ei subditis
usque nunc tenetur et predicatur. Ecclesie metensis
primus episcopus fuit sanctus paciens, discipulus
sancti iohannis euangeliste, et ipse in ea fidem
nostram docuit et firmauit et permanet in ea usque
in presentem diem.

Sanctus clemens, successor apostoli petri,
beatum dionisium uirum clarissime sanctitatis qui

112-15 Beatus . . . suscept: v. Gesta Treverorum,
p. 162.
113 bonefacius: Boniface, ca. 680-754 A.D., sent in
718 A.D. to evangelize Germany by Pope Gregory
II, made regional bishop of Germany in 722 A.D.
118 metensis: Metz
119 paciens: Patiens, fourth bishop of Metz (d. ca.
480 A.D.)
118-22 Ecclesie . . . diem: The earliest sources for
the bishops of Metz list Clement as the first
bishop and Paciens as fourth. v. L. Duchesne,
Fastes Episcopaux, vol. 3, pp. 44-54;
124 dionisium: St. Dionysius, (or St. Dénis) of
Paris, d. ca. 258 A.D. Sent with six other
bishops to Gaul in about 250 A.D., beheaded
during persecutions of Decius, ca. 258 A.D.;
by the eleventh century Dionysius of Paris was
commonly identified as Dionysius the Areopagite,
considered to have been the first bishop of
Athens, after having been converted there by
Paul. See R.I. Loenertz, "La Légende parisienne
de S. Denys L'Aréopagite," Analecta Bollandiana,

117 mogunciensi] Moguntinensi C
predicatone apostoli pauli athenis converusus fuerat, in galliam misit predicare uerbum dei et cum eo tres illustres uiros, marcellinum, et saturninum, et lucianum, qui cum ad portum arelati peruenissent, beatus dionisius sanctum marcellinum in hispaniam direxit, sanctum saturninum in equitaniam, sanctum uero lucianum ad beluacensem


125-26 qui . . . fuerat: For Dionysius the Areopagite's conversion see Acts 17:34.

127: marcellinum: Marcellinus, a companion of St. Dionysius of Paris, sent to preach in Spain; in Sermo XI, p. 258, l. 322; he is referred to as "marcellum".


131 qui . . . beluacensem: v. Passio . . . Luciani, IX, Plantin, p. 92; also Passion anonyme de saint Lucien, IV, Plantin, p. 75.

127 marcellinum] Marcellum C
129 marcellinum, corrected by A from marcellum
131 equitaniam] Aquitaniam C
ciuitatem quorum singuli regiones et ciuitates sibi destinatas repleuerunt doctrinis fidei que usque in presens tempus ibidem tenetur et predicatur. Ipse uero sanctus dionisius, cum duobus sociis rustico et eleutherio, parisium adiit ibique fidem quam per beatum paulum apostolum didicerat predicauit et per totam franciam dispersit et pro eadem fide martyrium pertulit simulque socii eius rusticus et eleutherius cum eo. Martyrium uero ipsius

135 rustico: Rusticus, a priest and companion of Dionysius, martyred with him and Eleutherius; v. Acta Sanctorum, October 4 (1865): 865-87;
136 eleutherio: Eleutherius, deacon and companion of Dionysius; martyred with Dionysius ca. 258 A.D.

135 sanctus dionisius, corrected by A from dionisius sanctus
137 parisium] Parisios C
137 paulum apostolum didicerat] Paulum didicerat
singulari et inaudito miraculo deus (f. 10r - f. 10v) honorauit in eo quod post decollationem suam ipse propriis manibus caput suum a loco martyrii per spacium miliarii usque ad locum in quo humatum est corpus eius deportauit. Testimonium hoc grande erat perfectissime sanctitatis eius et recte fidei ac sanctae religionis quam ibi docuerat atque fundauerat.

Ipsam fidem quam beatus dionisius in gallia reliquit sanctus hilarius pictauiensis episcopus egregius doctor et nobilissima lucerna ecclesie dei tenuit et docuit uerbis et scriptis et exemplis.

150 hilarius: Hilary, (ca. 315 - ca. 367 A.D.), bishop of Poitiers
Ipsam fidem tenuit et docuit et omnibus modis promouit beatus martinus turonensis episcopus, cuius sanctitas per omnes fines mundi usque in presentem diem clarissime splendet et in summa ueneratione habetur. Cuius fidei atque doctrine testimonium perhibuit divina uirtus in trium mortuorum suscitatione aliorumque ualde mirabilium operum exhibitione. Eandem quoque fidem beatus remigius remensis ciuitatis archiepiscopus tenuit et docuit et insignibus miraculis confirmavit.

Hoc clodoueum inclitum regem francie et cum eo copiosissimam multitudinem gentis francorum


160-62 Eandem . . . confirmavit: v. Historia Francorum, II.31; also Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta, I.19, col. 1032C: "Tandem ad hoc sancto Remigio caelitus praenuntiato, et per promissionem nato, ut eam gentem ad Dei vivi cultum converteret et Galliae populus in unitate fidei catholice conveniret . . . ."

161 remigius: Remigius, ca. 437-530 A.D., bishop of Rheims, ca. 459-530 A.D., considered apostle of the Franks.

157 atque] et C
164 copiosissimam] copiosam C
conuertit ad fidem christi et baptizauit in remensi ciuitate misso ei chrismate de celo. Ex illo ergo tempore reges francorum et principes gallie ceperunt esse christiani et cepit communiter per totam franciam publice coli religio christiana et per omnes ciuitates in ueneratione haberi fides christiana eademque usque in presentem diem in tota gallicana ecclesia predicatur. De genere clodouei processit karolus magnus qui inter reges francorum summus atque gloriosimus erat. Hic in (f. 10v - f. 175 Hr) eadem fide baptizatus est quam a beato remigio rex clodoueus acceperat et quam ceteri reges tenuerunt qui a clodoueo processerunt. Hic a beato

---

163 clodoueum: Clovis, ca. 465-511 A.D., King of the Franks, 481-511 A.D.
165-66 baptizauit . . . chrismate de celo: Eckbert's source is not identifiable, although he may have been using a version of the Vita sanctae Chrothildis, VII, Bruno Krusch, ed., MGH, Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 2 (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1888): 344: "Cumque chrisma defuisset, Dei nutu in specie columbe venit Spiritus sanctus, portans duas ampullas oleo et chrismate plenas, quas beatus Remigius devote suscepit . . ."
173 karolus magnus: Charlemagne, Frankish king, 771-814 A.D.

---

167 reges francorum] Francorum reges C
174 gloriosimus] gloriosissimus C est aduocatus
leone papa romanum uocatus est et consecratus in imperatorem et factus romane ecclesie et

180 fidelissimus defensor totius christiani populi. Et uehementer per eum aucta est religio christiana et dilatata est atque confortata et per ipsius diligentiam fides romane ecclesie per multas terras que ignorabant dominum dispersa est. Ipsam fidem

185 quam professus est karolus imperator romanus tenuerunt et confessi sunt omnes imperatores, siue reges romani et omnes reges francorum qui fuerunt post ipsum et principes eorum usque in presens tempus friderici imperatoris romani et lodewici

190 regis francorum.


178 leone papa: Pops Leo III, 795-816 A.D.

189 friderici imperatoris romani: Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, 1152-1190 A.D.

189-90 lodewici regis francorum: King Louis VII, 1137-1180 A.D.

181 aucta est religio] aucta religio C
188 ipsum] eum C
Ipsam ergo fidem, quam primum beatus petrus rome plantauit et quam tuerunt successores eius in romana urbe et quam docuerunt in omnibus terris sancti episcopi aliique sancti patres qui obedientes erant romane ecclesie et quam ab illis acceperunt imperatores et reges et principes terrarum cum populis sibi subjectis, tenemus atque confitemur nos, uidelicet clerici et monachi et laici qui in ecclesia christi baptizati. Et in ecclesiis deo sacrificatis conuenimus ad orandum et laudandum deum et ad communicandum corpori et sanguini domini nostri iesu christi cum fide non ficta et spe salutis animarum nostrarum.

In eo autem certi sumus nos habere eandem fidem quam habuerunt sancti patres ante nos quoniam eadem

191 primum] primo C
euangelista christi, eadem scriptura apostolica que et illi habuerunt et publice in ecclesia docuerunt, habemus et nos et credimus eis. Ipsorum quoque sancta scripta habemus in quibus declarauerunt qualis esset fides eorum et qualem intellectum haberent in libris ueteris legis (f. llr - f. llv) et prophetarum et in euangelis et in apostolicis scriptis et in eadem intelligentia sequimur eos. Manifestum est itaque ex his que dicta sunt quoniam fidei nostre fundamentum est doctrina petri qui fuit christi, qui fuit dei, immo et deus. Uestri autem erroris fundamentum doctrina manichei qui non fuit dei sed diaboli, non christi sed antichristi, et ex hoc scire potest quisque sensatus obediendum esse nostre catholice fidei potius quam uestre abscondite infidelitati que cum suo fundamento a cunctis qui amant ueritatem maledicatur et sub eterna clausura dampnetur.

206 euangelista] euangelia C
206 que] quam C
209 sancta, inserted by A from margin; A reads sancti
210 intellectum, corrected by A from intellectum
217 qui, corrected by A from que
218-19 et ex hoc] et hoc C
Sermo IV

Sermo de eo quod scriptum est, "Fides sine operibus mortua est."

Fortassis o sancti kathari, qui peccare non potestis, improperatis nobis peccata nostra et dicitis sicut legimus, "'Fides sine operibus mortua est.' Uos autem opera ad fides pertinentia non habetis et idcirco fides uestra mortua est. Et quoniam fides uestra mortua est, nulla est. Et idcirco sacramenta uestra nullum effectum habent et non potestis baptizare et corpus domini consecrare nec aliquid huiusmodi in ecclesia facere quod uobis aut aliis prosit." Hec est obiectio uestra adversum nos. Ite primum et interrogantes discite qua de causa deus interfecit ozam, qui extendit manum suam ut sustentaret archam dei quando nutabat, ita ut

5-6 James 2:18

9 idcirco] C reads idcrico
casura putaretur in tempore illo quo eam reducere uolebat dauid de bethsamis in ierusalem et cum hoc didiceritis, struite reprehensiones uestras aduersum ecclesiam dei. Non oportebat nos respondere uobis aduersus ea que nobis obicitis de fide nostra quoniam extra fidem catholicam estis, sicut deo uolente comprobabimus. Non oportebat nos uobis respondere de operibus nostris malis (f. 11v - f. 12r) que obicitis nobis quoniam peiora et sceleratiora sunt uestra opera sed alius erit locus dicendi de eis. Respondebimus tamen hoc loco ne propter ignorantiam dimittere uideamur.

Fatemur quidem quod peccatores sumus quoniam ut ait iacobus apostolus, "In multis delinquimus

13-19 2 Sam. 6:6-11

16 reducere] reducem C  
17 hoc] haec C  
22 deo] domino C  
22 oportebat] oportet C  
23 uobis respondere] respondere uobis C  
25 uestra opera] opera uestra C  
27 tamen hoc] tamen uobis hoc C
omnes." Verumtamen est differentia inter delinquentes. Multi quidem in minoribus peccatis uenialiter cottidie delinquunt et cottidiana satisfactione dominum placant et agunt opera laudabilia que pertinent ad fidem quam profitemur. De talibus ut spero non potestis aliqua rationabili causa dicere quod fides eorum mortua sit et quod sacramenta talium presbyterorum inania sint. Et tales per gratiam dei et nunc sunt in ecclesia nec unquam a principio in ea esse desierunt. Sunt uero, quod ingemiscimus, nonnulli qui, in maioribus peccatis que capitalia vocantur, delinquunt et super his non condigna penitentia satisfaciunt deo. De talibus fatemur quod fides quam habent mortua est quia sine operibus iustificationis est apud ipsos.

30-31 James 3:2

36 aliqua] aliquid C
39 et nunc] nec C
Mortua, inquam, est, non ita ut id quod credunt adnichillatum sit propter ipsos aut nullius utilitatis sit, sed ipsis fides eorum mortua est et eis non prodest ad salutem nisi resipiscant ab operibus malis que in ipsis mortificant fidem.

Quod autem dicitis de presbyteris nostris, qui tam male conversationis sunt, ut fides eorum mortua possit dici quod sacramenta eorum nullius utilitatis sint, hoc omnino contradicimus et plane falsum est.

Fides eorum dicitis mortua est et ideo nec ipsis prodesse potest nec aliis. Falsum est hoc quia aliis prodest. Fides quam ipsi manifeste confitentur per ipsorum ministerium aliis prodesse potest et effectum bonum in aliis habere potest quamuis non in ipsis.
Per si-(f. 12r - f. 12v)-militudinem hoc uobis demonstro. Contigit aliquociens quod medicus sapiens in infirmitatem grauissimam cadit et habet sapientiam qua scit curare se ipsum; habet medicinam que valet contra morbum suum sed ita est delicatus quod non potest gustare de antidotis suis et prebet ea alii eandem infirmitatem habenti et ille curatur. Ipse autem in sua infirmitate permanet usque ad mortem. Vere de tali medico dicere possumus quod ipsi mortua est sapientia sua, alii autem uiuit. Ita dico ubi de presbyteris ecclesie qui male uiuunt. Credunt quidem sed credere eis non prodest ad salutem, si permanserint iniquitatibus suis. "Nam demones crebunt et contremiscunt," ut dicit scriptura, credebant nimirum demones qui, ut ait.

74 James 2:20

61 hoc] haec C
62 aliquociens] aliquoties C
72 credere eis] eis credere C
73 permanserint iniquitatibus] permanserint in iniquitatibus C
74 Nam demones] Nam et daemones C
euangelista, dicebant domino iesu, "Quid tibi et nobis fili dei? Venisti ante tempus torquere nos?"

Credunt, inquam, et fidem habent presbyteri. enormes sed, sicut dixi de sapientia egri medici, sibi ipsis mortua est fides eorum, aliis autem uiuit dum in nomine christi baptizant et alia sacramenta execuntur secundum quod a sanctis patribus statutum est. Talis erat ille de quo lucas euangelista refert dicens, "Respondens autem iohannes dixit, 'Magister, uidimus quendam in nomine tuo eicientem demonia et prohibuimus eum quia non sequitur nos.' Et ait ad illum iesus, 'Nolite prohibere eum. Nemo est qui faciat uirtutem in nomine meo et possit cito male loqui de me. Qui enim non est aduersum uos pro uobis est.'"

76-77 Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24, 5:7; Luke 4:34
84-90 Mark 9:38-40; Luke 9:49-50

80 fides eorum] eorum fides C
Certe quisquis erat ille mortuam quidem sibi ipsi fidem habebat cum non sequeretur iesum, sed aliis uiuebat fides eius, a quibus eiciebat demonia in nomine iesu quod quidem nequaquam facere potuisset (f. 12v - f. 13r) si nullam omnino fidem in nomine eius habuisset. Ita proculdubio etiam presbyteri mali demonia in nomine christi eiciunt quando in nomine eius, id est, secundum hoc quod ipse instituit, baptizant et prodest baptizatis fides quam uerbis quidem sed non operibus profitentur. Sed alio loco latius de hac re differendum est. Et nunc ad loquendum de uestra abscondita fide et de angulosa doctrina uestra, sermonem conuerto.

98 eius] ipsius C
Sermo V

Sermo contra primam heresim de coniugio

Uobis loquor doctoribus et perfectis, non in sanctitate quidem, sed in errore et peruersitate. Animaduertite et uidete quod non homines sed demones uos appellat apostolus in eo testimonio quod in principio sermonis induxi, "In nouissimis," inquit, "temporibus discendent quidam a fide, attendentes spiritibus erroris et doctrinis demoniorum, loquentium in hipocrisi mendatium, prohibentium nubere et cetera." Vos estis demonia hec de quibus loquitur et qui uobis attendunt a fide recta discedunt. Nam doctrina uestra prohibet nubere in eo quod dicitis neminem posse saluari, qui cum coniuge sua permaneat usque in finem.

O demones, unde uobis est ista doctrina? Ex

6-10 1 Tim. 4:1-3

1 Sermo contra primam heresim de coniugio] Sermo V: Sermo quintus C
2 perfectis] praefectis C
14 finem, corrected by A from fidnem
15 uobis est ista] uobis ista C
euangeliis christi non est, ex scriptis apostolorum non est sed plane ex spiritibus erroris est.
Intuemini euangeliun matthei quod per uniuersum orbem in ecclesiis legitur et si non creditis grecis et latinis codicibus, ite ad inimicos nostros iudeos et inspicite hebraicam scripturam in qua euangeliun matthei scriptum habent et inuenietis in eo scriptum hoc modo, "Accesserunt ad iesum pharisei, temptantes eum et dicentes, 'Si licet homini dimittere uxorem quamcunque ex causa? ' Qui respondens ait eis, 'Non legistis quia qui fecit ab inicio, masculum et feminam fecit eos? Propter hoc reliquet homo patrem et matrem (f. 13r - f. 13v) et adherebit uxori sue et erunt duo in carne una.

18-23: Intuemini . . . modo: Eckbert's reference to a Hebrew version of Matthew's gospel should not be suprising, given the given the growing interest of Christian exegetes in France and the Rhineland in rabbinic scriptural exegesis during the twelfth century. Among Eckbert's contemporaries, Peter of Comester and Hugh of St. Victor availed themselves of the biblical commentaries of Rashi (d. 1105), and the glosses on Rashi and his sons-in-law and grandchildren. See Herman Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian Scholars (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), pp. 103-33.

26-27 Gen. 1:27
27-29 Gen. 2:24

18 matthei, quod] Matthaei apostoli, quod C
20 nostros] uestros C
Itaque iam non sunt duo sed una caro. 'Dicunt ei, 'Quid ergo moyses mandauit dari libellum repudii et dimittere?' Ait illis, 'Quoniam moyses ad durician cordis uestri permisit uobis dimittere uxores uestras, ab initio autem non fuit sic.'" Certe si quid recte intelligentie habetis, hoc animaduertere potestis in hac responsione quod non approbat dominus ut omnes uiri ab uxoribus suis discedant, sicut uos docetis esse faciendum.

Si enim non posset saluari quisquam cum coniuge sua manens, suffecisset ei breuis responsio ita, ut interrogantibus illis si licet homini dimittere uxorem suam quacumque ex causa, dixisset, 'Licet et bonum est et aliter saluari non possunt.' At non hoc dixit, sed conprobauit potius diuina auctoritate stabilius esse debere uinculum societatis, quod est

23-34 Matt. 19:3-9

30 caro] carna C
35 adimaduertere, A reads adnimaduertere
35 hoc] hic C
36 non, inserted by A from above line
39 Si enim non] Si non C
per legem dei inter uirum et coniugem suam quam illud quod a natura est inter uirum et parentes suos. Vos autem abinuicem separandos esse uirum et mulierem dicitis et aliter eos non posse saluari et ipse contra ait, "Quod deus coniunxit, homo non separat." Uirum et mulierem coniungit deus, qui, secundum institutiones diuinarum legum, coram ecclesia ineunt fedus coniugale et tales per hominem separandi non sunt.

Fit quidem nunc nonnunquam ut tales migrent pariter ad monasticam uitam et separatas abinuicem mansiones eligant quatinus deo liberius seruire possint, sed talem separationem deus operatur, non homo. Et quidem tales non omnino abinuicem discedunt neque rumpitur inter eos uinclulum

50-51 Mark 10:9

50 contra: A reads econtra] contra C
51 coniungit] coniunxit C
55 quidem nunc nonnunquam] quidem nonnunquam C
57 quatinus] quatenus C
coniugale quia indiuisa in eis manet unitas mentium. 
Nam quanto liberius divinae dilectioni vacant, tanto 
purius atque firmius se invicem diligere possunt. 
Nos uero huiusmodi separationem nullis ut uos 
facitis coniugibus suademus, ea (f. 13v – f. 14r) 
ratione quod non possint saluari simul permanentes 
in seculo et in uita coniugali. 

Vnam autem separationis causam qua potest uir, 
si uult, ab uxor discere et rumpere uinculum 
coniugale quo alligatus est ei determinavit dominus 
quando, post respondionem supra memoratam, ita 
subiunxit dicens, "Dico autem uobis quia quicumque 
dimiserit uxor uam nisi ob fornicationem et aliam 
duxerit, mechantur." Ubi ergo adiunxit "nisi ob 
foricationem," dedit intelligi quoniam sola 

72-74 Matt. 5:32 

69 discere] discedere
fornicationis causa diuorcium fieri potest. Quod si
non recte nos intellexisse uerba domini que predicta
sunt arbitramini, audite apostolum paulum quomodo
concordat nobiscum in intelligentia eorundem

80 uerborum ubi ad chorinthios loquitur, dicens, "His
autem qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, precipio non ego
sed dominus, uxorem a uiro non discere. Quod si
dissererit manere innuptam aut uiro suo
reconciliari et uiro uxorem non dimittat."

85 Et subiungens ex auctoritate propria ait, "Nam
ceteris ego dico, non dominus, si quis frater uxorem
habet infidelem et hec consentit habitare cum eo,
non dimittat illam. Et si qua mulier habet uirum
infidelem et hic consentit habitare cum illa, non
dimittat uirum. Sanctificatus est enim ui

________
80-84 1 Cor. 7:10-12

________
81 autem] iam C
82 discere] discedere C
83-84 uiro suo reconciliari] uiro reconciliari C
85 subiungens ex auctoritate] subiungens auctoritate C
infidelis per mulierem fidelem et sanctificata est
mulier infidelis per uirum fidelem. Alioquin filii
uestri immundi essent, nunc autem sancti sunt. Quod
si infidelis discedit, discedat." In tempore
primitiue ecclesie, frequenter hoc accidit ut uir
esset fidelis et mulier infidelis et contra ut uir
esset infidelis et mulier fidelis et suadebat
apostolus ut etiam tales abinuicem non discederent
quod utique non fecisset, si sciret utrosque simul
in tali coniugio perituros. Multum ergo a doc-
trina ipsius uestra doctrina dissentit
que eos qui, utrique legibus diuinis subditi sunt,
discere abinuicem cogit, dum eos saluari non posse
predicatis si permaneant simul.

Audite et petrum apostolum similia ad coniugatos

85-94 1 Cor. 7:12-15

92 Alioquin] alioqui C
96 contra, A reads econtra] contra C
98 etiam] et C
101 ipsius] sua C
101 uestra doctrina] doctrina uestra C
103 discere] discedere C
loquentem in epistola sua. "Mulieres," inquit, "subdite uiris suis sint, ut et si qui non credunt uerbo per mulierum conversacionem sine uerbo lucrifiant, considerantes in timore dei castam conversacionem uestram." Item subiungit, "Viri similiter cohabitantes secundum scientiam, quasi infirmiori uasculo muliebri impercientes honorem, tanquam coheredibus gratie." Dicitis forte, "Possunt quidem aliquomodo saluari uir et mulier simul manentes, sed non aliter nisi abstineant ab opere coniugali." Hypocrite, quid est quod dicitis? Si sciebat dominus saluator et si sciebant sancti apostoli neguquam posse saluari uirum et mulierem qui exequentur opus quod ad coniugium pertinet, nonne plena perfidie et fallacie erant uerba eorum

106-10 1 Peter 3:1-2
110-13 1 Peter 3:7

107 ut et si] ut si C
112 impercipientes: Vulgate reads impartientes
113 coheredibus, -re inserted by A from above line
116 quod dicitis] quod uos dicitis C
quibus tam diligentem suaserunt coniugatis, ut non separarentur abinvicem? Absit autem hoc. Nota certe illis erat humana fragilitas et sciebant non omnes uiros et mulieres tam ferreos esse, ut possent cohabitare simul et continentiam obseruare. Vnde non illos sed vos in hac quoque parte fallacie pessime arguendos esse nueritis.

Illud mihi forte oblicitis, o katare, quod apostolus ait, "Bonum est homini mulierem non tangere." Concedo quod bonum est homini mulierem non tangere, non tamen idcirco necessae est me concedere quoniam malum est et illicitum homini mulierem tangere. Nam similiter propter cauendas temptationes bonum est homini mulierem non uidere,

nunquid ergo necessario concedendum est quoniam

129-30 1 Cor. 7:1

123 certe illis erat] certe erat illis C
124 ut possent] ut non possent C
128 mihi forte, corrected by A from forte mihi
128 oblicitis] oblicitis C
129-30 mulierem non tangere, corrected by A from non tangere mulierem
135 necessario concedendum] necessarium contendendum C
malum est homini mulierem uidere? Si concedis quod malum est tangere mulierem pro eo quod bonum est (f. 14v - f. 15r) mulierem non tangere, concede etiam quia malum est mulierem uidere pro eo quod bonum est mulierem non uidere et si concedis quoniam malum est mulierem uidere, erue oculos tuos ut nunquam uideas mulierem. Hypocrita, licitum est homini tangere mulierem suam quia licitum est ut unusquisque habeat suam, secundum uerba eiusdem apostoli et quia licitum est, malum non est.

Bonum autem magis homini est et magis expediens ad salutem mulierem omnino nec habere nec tangere. Ad illud item fortasse confugies quod idem apostolus ait, "Tempus breue est; reliquum est, ut qui habent uxores tamquam non habentes sint." Ecce, inquis,

149-50 1 Cor. 7:29

147 hec habere] non habere C
148 idem] ibidem C
dicit ut si et maneant simul abstineant tamen ab opere coniugali. Et ego dico quod si hoc facere possunt bonum est illis, non tamen hoc quisquam sensatus eis precipit, sed suadet. Potest tamen fieri ut uir cum uxor e habitet et opus coniugale operetur, ita ut sit quasi non habens uxor. Hoc sit si sobrie et temperanter cum illa est et per omnia dei reverentiam in ipsa custodit. Quod qualiter fieri debeat, nout quisque sensatus. Si autem opus coniugale ad damnationem esset omnibus coniugatis, nequaquam apostolus dixisset, "Vxori uir debitum reddat, similiter autem et uxor uiro. Mulier sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed uir. Similiter autem et uir sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed mulier. Nolite fraudare inuicem nisi

151 si et] et si C
159 nout quisque sensatus] sensati homines scint C
163 Mulier sui] Mulier autem sui C
165 fraudare, corrected by A from fradare
forte ex consensu ad tempus ut uacetis orationi et iterum reuertimini in idipsum, ut non temptet uos sathanas propter incontinentiam uestram. Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium."

170 Scio autem quoniam et in hoc uerbo eres quod dicit, "hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam." Dicis enim, "Si indulgentia, id est, uenia, pertinet ad hoc quod sibi inuicem debitum reddant, ergo opus (f. 15r - f. 15v) coniugale malum est. Si enim non esset malum, non ei uenia necessaria esset." Si hoc dicis, iam in hoc ipso aliquid lucratus sum quod operi coniugali ueniam ab apostolo dari confiteris. Nam si ueniam ei dat apostolus, ueniale est. Et si ueniale est, non pro eo damphnantur omnes qui cum coniugio permanent, sicut uos predicatis. Distincius tamen

161-69 1 Cor. 7:3-6

179 cum] in C
considerandum est quod dicit apostolus "Hoc dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium."

    Et sciendum est quoniam in tribus
significationibus hoc nomen indulgentia poni solet.

185 Nam significat absolutionem qua peccatori debita
pena relaxatur et secundum hoc uenie nomen ei
adaptatur. Significat et concessionem qua minora
conceduntur bona his qui exequi maiora non possunt
et secundum hoc non ad eam pertinet nomen uenie.

190 Significat et permissionem qua minora mala fieri
sinuntur, ut maiora uitentur et secundum hoc quoque
uenia dici potest. De maioribus bonis est
continentia quam quia omnes seruare non possunt,
conceditur quod minus bonum est, uidelicet

195 coniugium. Conceditur, inquam, non precipit tur quia

181 hoc dico] hoc autem dico C
188 qui] que C
189 non ad eam pertinet nomen uenie] ad eam non
pertinet ueniae nomen C
191 maiora uitentur] maiora fieri uitentur C
si preciperetur transgressor haberetur quicumque in coniugio non esset. De maioribus malis est homicidium quod, ut uitaretur, permissum est olim iudeis minus malum, uidelicet redditio talionis et repudiatio mulierum, ut ab homicidii se flagitio temperarent. Nunc et opus coniugale distinguendum nobis est, ut evidentius fiat ad qualem concubitum qualis indulgentia pertineat.

Coniugalis concubitus qui sit simpliciter intentione generande ac deo educande prolis per se peccatum non est, quia, ut peccatum non sit, defendunt nuptialia bona que sunt spes prolis et fides et sacramentum et est de minoribus bonis que indulgentiam habent (f. 15v - f. 16r) que concessio dicitur. Quod autem fieri possit sine peccato,
intelligi potest ex eo quod apostolus ait, "Et si nupserit uirgo non peccat." Per se dixi, peccatum non est quia accidere potest nonnunquam ut preter bonam illam intentionem aliquid peccati suboriatur, excedente rationabilem modum carnali delectatione que tunc quidem peccatum est sed leue et excusatur per predicta bona coniugii. Quod si ob huiusmodi peccatum fugiendum euitari deberet officium coniugii, sicut uos susurare soletis, tunc ob eandem causam et officium comedendi ac bibendi omnino uitari deberet in quo simile peccatum aliquando etiam sapientibus surripere solet. Ille uero coniugalis concubitus qui sit non cum intentione generande prolis sed tantum causa explende libidinis, per se quidem peccatum est, sed ueniale,
quia per cetera bona coniugii excusatur et habet indulgentiam quae permissio dicitur, quoniam permittitur hoc malum ut euitetur maius malum, id est, fornicatio. De tali igitur concubitu

230 intelligatur dictum illud apostoli, "Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium."

Scio unum ex susurriis uestris, noui uerbum occulte sapientie uestre quod est fundamentum heresis uestre quam de coniugio habetis. Innotuit autem mihi per quosdam uiros qui exierunt de societate uestra et resipuerunt a uerbis mendacii per uerbum dei et per ministerium serui eius. Dicitis enim quod fructus ille de quo precepit deus primo homini in paradiso ne gustaret ex eo, nichil aliud fuit nisi mulier quam creauerat. De ipsa

230-31 1 Cor. 7:6
dicitis ade precepti dominus ut non commiseretur ei et commixtus est ei contra preceptum dei, quod erat gustare de uetito ligno. Ex hoc ergo probatis omne genus humanum quod de (f. 16r - f. 16v) eis propagatum est natum esse ex fornicatione et neminem posse saluari nisi purgatus fuerit per orationes et sanctificationes eorum, qui inter uos perfecti uocantur. Hec ergo causa est pro qua soletis culpare coniugium et dicitis quod omnes qui in coniugio sunt et coniugale opus exercent fornicantur et rei sunt eiusdem inobedientie per quam cecidit adum et idcirco omnes dampnantur, nisi discendant abinuicem et uobis iungantur et purgentur per uos. Hinc et hoc nomen sibi assumperunt primi magistri uestri, ut se uocarent kataristas, id est,

---


---

242 deij domini C
246 posse saluarij saluari posse C
248 ergoj autem C
purgatores et kataros, id est, mundos. Et ecce iusto iudicio dei hoc ipsum nomen quod uobis assumpsistis ad gloriam uestrum uersum est in ignominiam uobis in populari sermone.

Et nunc domini mei purgatores et mundi tamquam sepulcra dealbata, pergo respondere ad occultam sapientiam uestram. Dicite mihi, Vbi nam legistis quod dominus uetuerit primum hominem commedere de ligno scientie boni ac mali? Puto in libro geneseos; rustici, redite ad eundem librum, aperite oculos uestros, si legere scitis, et inspicite recapitulationem operis sexti diei et legite quod dicit, "Formauit igitur dominus hominem de limo terre et inspirauit in faciem eius spiraculum uiue et factus est homo in animam uiuentem." Post hec

260-61 Matt. 23:27
268-70 Gen. 2:7-8
subiungit de eo quod factum fuerat ante formationem hominis et dicit, "Plantauerat autem dominus paradysum uoluptatis a principio in quo posuit hominem quem formauerat." Post hec subiungit descriptionem paradysi et qualem eum fecisset deus ostendit, dicens, "Produxitque dominus deus de humo omne lignum pulcrum uisu et ad uescendum suaue, lignum etiam uite in medio paradisi, lignumque scientie boni et mali."

Post hec descriptis (f. 16v - f. 17r) etiam quatuor fluminibus paradisi nouissime addit, "Tulit ergo dominus deus hominem et posuit eum in paradiso uoluptatis, ut operaretur et custodiret illum preceptique ei dicens, 'Ex omni ligno paradisi commede, de ligno autem scientie boni et mali ne

272-74 Gen. 2:8
276-79 Gen. 2:9
Nonne ecce ex his uerbis intelligitis quoniam et antequam creatus fuisset adam plantatus fuerat paradisus uoluptatis cum omni ornatu suo et duo ligna in ipso, uidelicet lignum uite et lignum scientie boni et mali? Si ergo lignum scientie boni et mali creatum fuerat antequam adam deus formasset et in paradiso collocasset, manifestum est quoniam et antequam euam creasset deus, creatum fuit lignum scientie boni et mali quod deus prohibuit ade. Et si illud fuit ante creationem eue, consequens est quod illud non fuit eua. Illud etiam attendite quo ordine loquatur scriptura de ligni prohibitione et de mulieris formatione. Precepit, inquit ei, id est, ade dicens, "Ex omni ligno paradisi commede, de ligno autem scientie boni et mali ne commedas; in

281-86 Gen. 2:15-16

286 ecce, inserted by A from above line
287 fuisset] esset C
297 loquatum] loquatur C
quacumque die commederis ex eo morte morieris," et subiungit, "Dixit quoque deus, 'Non est bonum hominem esse solum; faciamus ei adiutorium simile sibi.'" Et post hec addit qualiter formauerit illam de costa eius. Ex hoc quoque ordine locutionis datur nobis intelligi prohibitum fuisse ade lignum scientie boni et mali antequam eum deus formasset. Et quomodo tam preceps in mandato suo erat deus, ut non expectare potuerit quoadusque mulierem formatam adduxisset ad adam et tunc ei interdixisset concubitum eius?

Dicite mihi et si illud lignum quod adam contra preceptum dei gustauit nichil aliud fuit quam mulier, quod lignum fuit quod mulier commedit et dedit uiro? (f. 17r - f. 17v) Dicitis forte, "Mulier

__________

299-304 Gen. 2:15-16

__________

301 quacumque die] quacumque autem die C
304 formauerit] formauit C
313 dei] domini C
commedit de ligno uetito in eo quod uirum
concupiuit" et uultis quod, sicut uiro mulierem
prohibuerat ita et mulieri deus prohibuerat uirum.
Sed adhuc interrogo uos, quid fuit quod mulier prius
ex parte commedit et postea uiro dedit commedendum,
sicut dicit scriptura? Non habetis ni fallor quid
respondeatis, nisi absurdam aliquam stulticiam
respondere uelitis. Et nunc quando quidem ex
scriptura geneseos firmatis aciem uestram contra
nos, respondere etiam de ea nobis debetis.

Dicite mihi, quale adiutorium uoluit deus
exhiberi ade per mulierem quando dixit, "Non est
bonum hominem esse solum; faciamus ei adiutorium
simile sibi"? Ad quam rem indigebat adiutorio eius?
Nunquid indigebat ut caput eius lauaret et pecteret?

327-29 Gen. 2:18

324 firmatis] firmastis C
Nunquid indigebat ut seruili more alimenta ei prepararet et administraret? Nunquid necesse habebat ut uestimenta ei nendo, texendo, formando, consuendo, lauando, resarciendo? Nichil certe horum aut talium dicere potestis si aliquid sane mentis habetis, quia nullum tale adminiculum homini in paradiso necessarium erat, ubi nullum paciebatur defectum.

Forsitan ut eum adiuuare laudare creatorem suum,  

fecit ei mulierem in adiutorium. Poterat certe adam sine eua satis alta voce cantare laudes domino, ita ut nunquam fieret lassus aut raucus. Aut si nolebat deus ut solus ille homo laudaret deum sed alius aliquis cum eo, non oportebat ut propter laudes ei decantandas fecisset mulierem, quia poterat alios

---

333 ei nendo] ei procuraret, nendo C
339 eum adiuuaret] adiuuaret eum C
343 laudaret dominum] deum laudaret C
344 propter] C reads porpter
uiros sufficienter creasse, qui cum ipso deum laudarent. Dicitis forte, "Sciebat deus quod adam in peccatum erat casurus et corporales (f. 17v f. - 18r) defectus passurus et ideo mulierem fecit ei in adiutorium, ut post lapsum suum talia ei exhiberet adminicula qualia nunc dicta sunt. Sed dico quod in eisdem rebus potuisset ei homo sui sexus, si opus haberet adiutorium ferre. Cur ergo fecit ei mulierem in adiutorium et non alium uirum qui ministraret ei? Oportet nunc, si uultis uideri sapientes et intellectores scripture sancte, ut aliquod tale officium nominetis in quo indiguisset adam adiutorio mulieris et in quo non possit eum adiuvare alius uir. Certe non inuenietis quid racionabiliter hic dicere possitis, nisi idipsum
quod dicturus sum mecum senciatis.

Uolebat deus creare genus humanum ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui, sed non ita ut angelicam fecerat creaturam. Omnes enim angelicos spiritus creauerat simul, ita ut nullus angelus ex alio nasceretur. Humanum uero genus ita creare disponebat ut sibi inuicem succederent homines et nascerentur alii ab aliis, quatinus causa consanguinitatis firmior esset inter eos connexio karitatis. Omnes autem unum caput et unam originem habere uoluit, primum hominem uere, uidelicet ab ipso propagaretur omne genus humanum, essetque ei in hoc quedam similitudo cum deo, qui est caput et principium omnis creature. Non autem talem fecerat adam ut ab ipso solo posset generacio humana
prouenire. Non, id est, dederat ei deus aptitudinem
talem ut posset parere aut lactare. Fecit itaque ei
mulierem ut ex ea haberet adiutorium augendi et
multiplicandi genus humanum, ut uidelicet ipse

380
generaret ex ea filios ut pater; ipsa ei pareret et
lactaret filios ut mater.

Adhuc dicite mihi, popule stulte et insipiens,
si, sicut docti estis, uiro prohibuit deus mulierem
et mulieri uirum, quomodo fieri potuit illud quod

385
dixit ad eos, "Crescite et (f. 18r - f. 18v)
multiplicamini et replete terram"? Quid debuerunt
aut potuerunt facere ut crescerent et
multiplicarentur, si debeant omnino abinuicem
abstinere? Si uoluit deus ut adam filios ex eu

390
generaret et sic per eos multiplicaretur genus uel

385-86 Gen. 1:28

376 id est] enim C
376 dederat ei] ei dederat C
382 dicite mihi] mihi dicite C
388 debeant] debebant C
eorum humanum et replerent terram et iuxta hoc ei prohibuit tangere mulierem, contrarius erat sibi ipsi in sua voluntate et in preceptis suis et argui potuit insipiencie quod dicere nefas est.

Si ego agricole meo omnino interdicerem officium seminandi et tamen ei dicerem, "Uide ut bene fructificet ager meus et per te multas fruges habeam," nonne mihi ipsi contrarius essem et insipiencie argui possem? Vtique possem. Item de noe, qui tempore diluuii per archam saluatus est, similia dicere possum. Si ita, ut uos dicitis, deus abominatur coniugium et opus coniugale, quare, cum uellet saluare noe et filios eius ne perirent in diluvio, simul cum ipsis saluauit et uxores eorum?

Nam cum precepisset noe ut faceret archam, dixit ad
eum, "Ingredere archam tu et filii tui et uxor tua
et uxoribus filiorum tuorum." Et rursum cum
condidisset archam dixit ei, "Ingredere tu et domus
tua. Te enim uidi iustum coram me in generatione
ista." Ecce peribet deus testimonium uiro habenti
uxorem et filios tres, quoniam iustus sit coram eo
et qua audacia uos condempnatis omnes uiros habentes
uxores? Et quare ut dixi seruauit pariter cum uiris
etiam uxoribus eorum? Si molestum erat deo omne
conjugium, melius solos uiros saluasset et omnes
mulieres in aquas submersisset aut solas mulieres
saluasset et omnes uiros perdidisset. Et si erat
contra voluntatem dei ut uiri miscerentur uxoribus
suis, quare celabat hoc a noe quem diligebat et a
filiis eius, cum eos eduxisset de archa? Quare, si

406-07 Gen. 7:1

406 Ingredere] Ingredietis C
408 condidisset, corrected by A from condisset
409 generacione, -ne inserted by A from above line
410 ista, corrected by A from hoc
410 peribet deus testimonium] testimonium perhibet
deus C
412 audacia os condempnatis] audacia condemnatis C
413-14 Et quare ut dixi seruauit pariter cum uiris
etiam uxoribus eorum?, inserted by A from
margin
415 saluasset] seruasset C
416 aquas] aqua C
419 suis, inserted by A from margin
419 celabat hoc] hoc celauit C
eos diligebat, non dixit, "Peccavit in me adam in eo quod concubuit cum muliere quam interdixeram ei; peccavit in me filius eius seth quia habuit uxorem et genuit filios et filias; peccaverunt in me omnes qui post illos duxerunt uxorles et filios genuerunt et ideo perdidi eos; uos autem nolite (f. 18v - f. 19r) facere malum hoc neque misceamini uxoribus uestris ut non similiter deleam uos." Nichil autem tale dixit ad eos sed ait, "Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram." Quod qualiter fieri posset nescio, nisi cum uxoribus suis miscerentur, aut si uos scitis quomodo aliter possent crescere et multiplicari et replere terram, dicite nobis.

Item et hoc miror quomodo deus, si ita

429-30 Gen. 1:28

421-22 in eo quod, inserted by A form margin] in eo quia C
423 eius, inserted by A from above line
428 non similiter] similiter non C
abhominatur coniugium, ut dicitis, potuerit tam familiarem se exhibere sanctis patriarchis, uidelicet abraham et ysaac et iacob, ut ipse loqueretur cum eis et mitteret ad eos sanctos

\[\text{440}\] ængelos et tanta eis promitteret in futurum de propagacione generis eorum, qualiter illud uellet multiplicare et dilatare et benedictionibus replere. Scimus ex scriptura quod primus illorum erat trigamus, secundus monogamus, tercius tetragamus, et tamen deus non est abhominatus in eis sed seruos suos eos frequentissime rappellauit et propter merita eorum multas ac magnas benedictiones contulit generacioni eorum et imitatoribus fidei sancte quam habebant ad deum.

\[\text{450}\] Ueniam et ad illud quod musitant quidem uestrum,

\[\text{442-49}\] Examples of bigamy among the patriarchs include Abraham (Gen. 16:1-3), Esau (Gen. 28:8-9), and Jacob (Gen. 30:26 and 31:17).

\[\text{436}\] potuerit tam] potuerit se tam C
\[\text{441}\] propagacione, -ga inserted by A from above line
\[\text{443}\] replere.] replere? C
\[\text{445}\] est abhominatus] hoc abhominatus est C
\[\text{446}\] suos eos] suos dilectos eos C
\[\text{446}\] rappellauit, corrected by A from nominauit] appellauit C
\[\text{449}\] habebant ad deum] haberent ad dominum C
uidelicit sequaces hartuuini, quod illud coniugium
solum iustum est in quo uirgines coniunguntur et
quod unam tantum prolem ginnere debent et postea
statim abinuicem discedere nec unquam postea

deinceps ad coniugalem thorum conuenire. Per omnia
stultos uos esse et indiscretos considero, tum quia
error uester non sibi ipsi concordat, tum quia id
quod dicitis nec racione nec aliqua auctoritate
sancte scripture potestis confirmare. Non sibi
ipsi concordat error uester, quia, si primo homini
mulierem, ut dicitis, deus interdixit et adhuc eadem
interdictio manet, tunc nec coniugium uirginum nec

451 sequaces hartuuini: Hartwinus was apparently
the leader of one of the sects into which the
Cathars were still divided in 1163; he
presumably was a Cathar "perfecti", one of
those qualified to administer spiritual baptism
and to gain access to secret dualist teachings.

454-55 unquam postea deinceps] unquam deinceps C
455 conuenire, -re inserted by A from above line
456 uos esse et indiscretos considero] et
indiscretos uos esse uideo C
459 ipsi, inserted by A from above line
460 uester] uere C
461 ut dicitis, deus, inserted by A from margin
461 dicitis, deus interdixit] dicitis, interdixit
C
eorum qui, post violatam virginitatem coniuncti sunt, licitum aut iustum est.

Item ex eo stultos uos iudico, quia manifestis sancte scripture testimoniis contraitis. Nam paulus apostolus ait, "Que sub uiro est mulier, uiuente uiro (f. 19r - f. 19v) alligata est legi. Si autem mortuus fuerit uir eius, soluta est a lege uiri."

Igitur uiuente uiro vocabitur adultera si fuerit cum alio uiro. Si autem mortuus fuerit uir eius, liberata est a lege uiri, ut iam non sit adultera cum si fuerit alio uiro. "Cui uult," inquit, "nubat, tantum in domino. Beacior autem erit si sic permanserit secundum consilium meum." Item ait, "Volo adolescentulas uiduas filios procreare, matres familias esse." Quod de mulieribus ait idem et de uiris intelligendum est. Si ergo licitum est, ut apostolus ait, ut mulieres uiduate uiris iterum aliis nubant et uiri uiduati uxoribus alias ducant,

467-69 Rom. 7:2
473-75 1 Cor. 7:39-40
476-77 1 Tim. 5:14
constat plane quoniam non solum coniugia virgum licita et iusta sunt, sed eorum quique qui ante coniugium suum virgines non fuerunt.

Scio autem quoniam uerba iohannis crisostomi nobis opponitis, quibus dixit quod "Secundum coniugium honesta fornicacio sit." Gratias ago deo si iohannis crisostomi scripturas recipitis, quia eandem quoque causa qua illum recipitis, oportet ut et alios orthodoxos patres recipiatis, uidelicet gregorium, ambrosium, augustinum, hilarium, ieronum, bedam, et alios eiusmodo, quorum scripta in autoritate habentur per uniuersam ecclesiam dei, quia per omnia concordabat et uita et doctrina eorum sanctis euangeliis et apostolicis scriptis. Quod si hos recipitis, tunc nobiscum estis in his que de

485-86 Eckbert's source is an anonymous commentary on Matthew spuriously attributed to John Chrysostom, the "Eruditi Commentarii in Evangelium Matthaei," edited in PG 56, col. 801D, homilia 32: "Nam secundam quidam accipere secundum praecipsum Apostoli est: secundum autem veritatis rationem vere fornicatio est."

487-88 quia eandem quoque causa qua illum recipitis, inserted by A from margin
492 ecclesiam, inserted by A from margin
484-520 uerba iohannis . . . Ad hoc iterum\] C inserts the following:

. . . et in hac parte nobis contraitis, et obijcitis nobis quaedam uerba Iohannis Chrysostomi, quae in expositione Matthaei
sacramentis ecclesie sencienda sunt et neque primas

484-520 uerba iohannis . . . Ad hoc redo] C inserts the following (cont.):

scribit dicens, "Secundam quidem uxorem

accipere, secundum consilium apostoli, est
secundum ueritatis rationem, uere
fornicatio est."

Si secundum permittentem deum publice et
licenter committitur, honesta fornicatio est

et ego uobis dico, si credendum est
doctrinae Iohannis Chrysostomi, certe
credendum est et doctrinae sancti
Augustini, et Hieronymi, et aliorum
sanctorum patrum, quorum uita sancta erat,
et quorum doctrina cum sanctis euangeliis et
scriptis apostolorum concordabat, et in
Romana ecclesia ad quam religionis
Christianae respectum habemus, autoritatem
firmissimam habet.

20 Audite quod et isti de secundis nuptijs
dicant. Augustinus in libro de uiduitate
scribit hoc modo: "Secundas nuptias omnino
licitas concedit Apostolus. De tertijs
autem, et de quartis et de ultra pluribus
nuptijs, solent homines mouere
quaestionem." Sed quis audeat diffinire,
quod nec Apostolum audio diffinisse? Ait
enim: "Si dormierit uir eius, cui uult
nubat, tantum in domino." Non dicit primus,

30 non secundus, uel tertius, uel quotuslibet,
nec nobis diffiniendum est. Vnde, ut
breuiter respondeam, nec uillas nuptias debeo
damnare, nec eis uerecundiam numero sitatis
auferre. Idem et Hieronymus testatur,
dicens: "Ego nunc libera uoce exclamo, nec
damnari in ecclesia digamiam, imo nec

28-29 Rom. 7:2

4-7 This commentary on Matthew, was
spuriously attributed to Chrysostom.
See above, p. 33, ll. 485-86.
22-26 De bono uiduitatis, XII.15; edited
edited in Migne, PL 40, col. 439:
neque secundas nec etiam tercias nec quatroslibet

484-520 uerba iohannis . . . Ad hoc redeo] C inserts the following (cont.):

trigamiam, et ita licere quinto et sexto, quemadmodum secundo marito nubere." Sufficient nunc testimonia istorum duorum, que affirmant secundas nuptias licitas esse, quod certe nequaquam facerent, si scirent in eis esse turpitudinem fornicationis. Et quia isti in uerbis quae inducta sunt concordant cum uerbis apostolicae doctrinae, magis quam illa Chrysostomi Graeci doctoris, ista quidem recipiuntur, illa uero non approbantur neque recipiuntur in autoritate. Ipsi animaduertite: Nunquid uobis rationabile uidetur quod dicit secundum consilium esse fornicationem et ipsum esse secundum consilium Apostoli? Certe omnem fornicationem dissuadet Apostolus, et absterret homines ab ea, cum dicit: "Fornicatores et adulteros iudicabit dominus." Quomodo (f. 21r - f. 21v) ergo conuenit, ut dicatur aliqua fornicatio esse secundum consilium eius? Laudamus certe Chrysostomum illum et aureum os eius, sed non in his uerbis eum laudamus; aestimo tamen quod non in uerbis illis haeresim sapiebat Iohannes, quam uos tenetis, ut uidelicet secunda coniugia omnino illicita esse iudicaret, quemadmodum fornicationem. Sed ob hoc forte dicebat hoc quod nobis obijcitis, quoniam in secundis nuptijs disceditur a sacramento unitatis, quae debet esse inter deum et animam hominis, cuius significatio in monogamia est et forte ob hoc quoque quod secunda coniugia magis extra pudicitiam sunt, quam prima et nimis uehementer hanc persuadere cupiebat eis, quibus praedicabat.

54-55 Hebrews 13:4

nupcias damnumare debitis, quas illi damnumare non
presumpserunt sed uenerati sunt eas.

500    Crisostomus ille, cuius nobis uerba obicitis,
grecorum episcopus fuit et forte eos quibus
predicabat, arguabant uerbis illis quibus dicebat
quod secundum coniugium eorum honesta fornicatio
esset. Potuit enim esse quod non legime obseruarent
secunda coniugia, sicut adhuc quidam ex uestris qui,
cum uiduati fuerint legitimis uxoribus, assumunt
concubinas sibi ancillas suas, siue alias quaslibet,
cum quibus legitimum matrimonium palam uestre
uerecundantur atque illegitime eas tenent usque in
finem. Quod si tales sibi (f. 19v - f. 20r) inuicem
fidem seruant fornicatio quidem est, sed quoddamo
honesta, cum nec ille per alias nec illa per alios
illicita commixtione uagatur. Si nondum sufficiens
uobis uidetur ista responsio ad inductam
510 obiectionem, audacter uobis dico quoniam uerba

513 nondum, inserted by A from above line
iohannis crisostomi qualitercumque intelligenda
fuit, non preuidicant auctoritati apostoli pauli et
aliorum orthodoxorum patrum quos supra memoriaui, qui
omnes secunda coniugia licita esse arbitrantur.

Ad hoc iterum redeo quod dicitis, unam tantum
prolem debere generare coniuges qui uirgines
conuenerunt. Vnde hoc habetis? Que uobis hoc
scriptura determinauit? Nonne ex uerbis apostoli
que nunc induxi patet quoniam non solum monogamos
sed etiam bigamos licet plures filios generare? Et
debent, ut dicitis, statim abinuicem separari
postquam unam habuerint prolem. Interrogo quare, si
ut dicitis, hoc coniugium solum est iustum, quare

522-23 hoc scriptura] scriptura hoc C
524 solum] solos C
525 filios, inserted by A from above line
525 generare] procreare C
528 solum est iustum] iustum est solum C
528 quare, obscured in A by a circular mark. On
folios 20r and 20v, the text is obscured by a
circular mark, each measuring 2" in diameter,
approximately in the middle of each folio,
evidence of the folios having been pressed or
pasted together at this point. A duplicate of
folio 20r, apparently a photocopy, also appears
with a complete text, without any obscuring
marks, although there is no such duplicate
version for f. 20v. Whatever the cause of these
marks, they were apparently made after B was
copied from A, since B gives no indication that
its text was obscured. On each of the two
folios affected, one or two words in each of
three or four lines is obscured. For the
obscured text of f. 20r, I have utilized the
duplicate version, and for the obscured text of
f. 20v, I have followed B.
solvendum est? Aut si solui necesse est ut salutem consequi possint coniuges illi, quomodo iustum est coniugium eorum? Si ergo omne coniugium, ut dicitis, solui debet, qui sunt qui debent observare illud mandatum apostoli, "Alligatus es uxor? Noli querere solucionem"? O insensati kathari, quis uos fascinuit non credere ueritati tot testimoniorum diuini eloqui, ut destruere uelitis omnia legitima coniugia que a principio mundi usque in hodiernum diem in honore fuerunt per uniuersum mundum, in omni genere hominum, et fidelium et infidelium? Puto quod ex amore castitatis hec omnia dicitis. Puto ex amore castitatis hanc consuetudinem inter uos habetis, ut in conuenticulis uestrís, sicut ab uno heresiarcha uestro audiui, pariter dormiant duo uiri in lecto itemque due mulieres in lecto uno, quatinus uicissim se custodiant et unusquisque testimonium

____________________

533-34 1 Cor. 7:27

____________________

530 consequi possint, obscured in A
530 coniuges] homines C
531 omnem coniugium, obscured in A
533 mandatum apostoli, obscured in A
535 testimoniorum, -ni inserted by A from above line
539 hominum, et, inserted by A from margin
540 Puto ex] Puto quod ex C
543-44 lecto itemque] lecto uno itemque C
544 itemque due mulieres in lecto uno, inserted by A from margin
545 uicissim se] se uicissimse C
545 testimonium] testimonia C
sue castitatis ab alio habeat. Magne religioni deputabat consuetudinem hanc qui narrabat hec mihi, sed indubitanter a consilio maligni est religio hec, et non a deo. Frenatum est os meum pudore, ut loqui non possim ea que de uestra misera (f. 20r - f. 20v) castitate dicuntur ab eis qui experti sunt eam. Vos coniugalem copulum reprobatis, quam instituit deus et que cum lege nature concordat; attendite uobis ne forte ob hanc temeritatem iusto dei iudicio traditi sitis in ignominiam, que a lege nature discordât. Et actenus quidem de his dixisse sufficiat. Nunc de ea sanctitate uestra colloquimur, qua ab esu carnium abstinetis.

548 hec] hoc C
556 quidem, inserted by A from margin
556-57 Et actenus quidem de his dixisse sufficiat] Hactenus de coniugio nos disputasse sufficiat
557 Nunc de] Nunc autem de C
Sermo VI

Contra secundam heresim de esu carnium

Vobis loquor electis quos, sicut dixi, non homines sed demones apostolus uocat cum dicit, "Attendentes doctrinis demoniorum, loquencium in ypocrisi mendacium, prohibencium nubere," et subauditur, "docencium abstinere a cibis quos deus creauit ad percipiendum cum gratiarum actione fidelibus et his qui cognouerunt ueritatem, quia omnis creatura dei bona et nichil reiciendum quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur. Sanctificatur enim per uerbum dei et oracionem." Dicite mihi, de quo genere ciborum locutus est apostolus hoc loco? Si ignoratis, dicam uobis. Carnes significauit et de uobis locutus est, qui in ypocrisi loquimini mendacium, uidelicet non esse licitum hominibus ut

4-11 1 Tim. 4:1-5

2 loquor electis quos] loquor, quos C
7 actione] actiane C
8 cognouerunt] nouerunt C
9 omnis, inserted by A from margin
14 locutus est, qui, obscured in A
nubant et ut carnes manducent. Hoc in ypocrisi
loquimini, quia in hoc casti et sancti coram
hominibus uultis apparere sed est mendax hec uestra
doctrina. Nam et nubere licet, sicut apostolus bene
in hoc ipso demonstrat quod eos abominatur et
demones uocat, qui hoc prohibent et carnes eis edere
licet, quia uotum non habent abstinendi ab eis.
Racio uestra est quare edende non sint carnes, quia
de coitu nascitur omnis caro et ideo immunda est et
coinquinat manducantem. Miror si dominus, creator
omnium rerum, quando hominibus concessit ut ederent
carnes, ignorabat hanc uestram sanctam racionem,
uidelicet immundos fieri omnes qui ederent carnes
pro eo quod omnis caro ex concubitu nasceretur.
Heu, quod non habebat katharum unum qui ei hanc

27-28 quando . . . carnes: Gen. 1:30; 9:1-4

15 licitum hominibus ut n-, obscured in A
17 -mini, quia in hoc c-, obscured in A
18-19 hec uestra doctri-, obscured in A
19-20 apostolus bene in] Apostolus in C
20 demonstrat, -nstrat, obscured in A 18
21 hoc] haec C
21-22 eis edere licet] edere licet eis C
24 immunda, A reads in munda
28 immundos, A reads in mundos
sapienciam in aurem susurrasset in illa hora quando
dedit (f. 20v - f. 21r) potestatem edendi carnes noe
et filiis eius, dicens, "Crescite et multiplicamini
et terror uester ac tremor sit super cuncta animalia
terre et super omnes uolucres celi cum uniuersis que
mouentur in terra. Omnes piscis maris manui uestre
traditi sunt et omne quod mouetur et uiuit erit
uobis in cibum. Quasi olera uirencia tradidi uobis
omniam, excepto quod carnem cum sanguine non
comedetis." Nonne ecce patet ex his uerbis quod
deus fecit homini licitum comedere carnes? Et qua
fronte, qua audacia, uos dicitis esse illicitum?
Certe si sciebat omnem carnem ita pollutam ut non
posset quisquam gustare ex ea quin pollueretur, non
satis fidelis erat deus quando concessit homini

33-40 Gen. 9:1-4

34 ac tremor, inserted by A from above line
38 olera] holera C
41 comedere] manducare C
44 gustare ex ea] ex ea gustare C
talem cibum, quem sine pollucione sua non potuit manducare. Si uero hoc deus nesciebat et uos scitis, puto uos sapienciores estis deo et magis amatores mundicie. Sed quam falsum hoc sit, uos ipsi scitis si aliquid scitis.

50 Nunquid et sapienciores et sanctiores estis sanctis patriarchis qui licitum estimabant esum carnium et ipsi ex eis uescebantur? Sanctus patriarcha abraham, qui dignus est habitus ut familiariter cum deo loqueretur, legitur hospicio suscepisse angelos dei, in forma trium uirorum, quibus et prandium fecit et uitulum tenerrimum et optimum quem coxerat eis apposuit ad manducandum. Quod utique non fecisset uir sanctus et sapientissimus, si sciret in tali cibo immundiciam

53-58 Gen. 18:1-8

47 hoc] haec C
48 estis] esse C
48 magis] magnos C
54 est habitus] habitus est C
55 cum deo loqueretur] loqueretur cum deo C
55-56 hospicio suscepisse] suscepisse hospitio C
57-58 et optimum, inserted by A from margin
esse. Sed et filius eius ysaac pulmentum de
uenacione a filio suo esau peciit et edulium de
hedis oblatum a iacob manducauit. Sacerdotes quoque
populi israelis et omnes qui de genere sacerdotum
erant, carnes legalium hostiarum in loco sancto
manducare iussi sunt. Quod, si ita immunda esset
omnis caro, ut uos arbitramini, nunquam tot
sacrificia de carnibus animalium deus sibi super
altare suum offerri precepisset, nunquam in sancta
lege sua de commestione earum sacerdotibus suis
aliquid mandasset, neque per eas sanctitatem eorum
pollui permisisset.

Ad hec (f. 21r - f. 21v) forsitan respondetis
quoniam multa in tempore ueteris legis licita erant
que licita non sunt in hoc tempore euanglice legis

---

61-63 Gen. 19:25, 29-34
63-72 The scriptural passage to which Eckbert
refers is not clear, but he was probably
writing of the sin offering; see Lev. 6:26, 29
and Lev. 10:17. The priests were also allowed
to eat of the ram of ordination, according to
Ex. 29:31-33 and Lev. 8:31.

---

64 israelis] Israel C
66 manducare iussi] manducare a domino iussi C
66 immunda, A reads in munda
69 altare suum, corrected by A from suum altare
75 non sunt, inserted by A from margin
75 hoc tempore] tempore hoc C
et maiorem mundiciam exigit deus a populo noui
testamenti quam a populo qui erat sub priore
testamento et idcirco istis uitande sunt carnes,
quamuis illi ab eis non abstinerent. Ego uero ad
hoc dico quoniam si, ut dicitis, aliqua naturalis
immundicia est in carnibus animalium, que coinquinet
manducantem eadem et tunc erat, quia eiusdem
creacionis et condicionis erant tunc cuius sunt et
nunc.

85 Item, si licitus non est usus carnium, ostendite
nobis aliqua mandata euangelice aut apostolice
scripture, aut aliquorum orthodoxorum patrum
tradiciones in quibus generaliter preceptum sit, ut
abstineatur ab eis et credimus uobis. Dominus
saluator, quando ad predicandum discipulos suos

83 sunt, inserted by A from margin
misit, inter cetera hec dicebat eis, "In quamcumque
domum intraueritis, primum dicite, 'Pax huic domui.'
Et si ibi fuerit filius pacis, requiescit super
illam pax uestra. In eadem autem domo manete,
edentes et bibentes que apud illos sunt. Dignus est
enim operarius mercede sua." Videtis certe quod non
exclusit a cibis eorum usum carnium, ita ut diceret,
"Quod si uobis apposuerint carnes nolite
manducare." Quod utique dixisset si esum carnium
sanctitati eorum periculosum fore estimasset.

Dicite mihi, si immunda est omnis caro et
coinquinat manducantem, quomodo uerum erit quod
saluator ait, "Non quod intrat in os coinquinat
hominem, sed quod procedit de ore hoc coinquinat
hominem"? "De corde," inquit, "exeunt cogitaciones

91-96 Luke 10:5-7
103-05 Matt. 15:11
male: homicidia, adulteria, fornicaciones, furta, falsa testimonia, blasphemie. Hec sunt que coquinant hominem." Ergo, o kathari, non carnes uos coquinant si manducaueritis eas sed mendacia uestra, quibus creaturam dei bonam dicitis esse immundam. Non tamen hec dico quasi mihi sit cure, ut umquam aliquid boni manducetis, aut bibatis, qui populo dei tam peruerse doctrine mortiferum poculum ubique propinatis.

Audit (f. 21v - f. 22r) nunc et quid apostolus noster, scribens ad corinthios, dicat, "Omne," inquit, "quod in macello uenit manducate, nichil interrogantes propter conscienciam. Domini enim est terra et plenitudo eius." An nescitis quod in macello carnes uenundari solent? Si ergo omne quod
in macello uenit, id est, uenundatur, manducari licet, tunc secundum apostoli uerbum et carnes manducari possess a christianis. Quod autem adiunxit "nichil interrogantes propter 125 conscienciam," ideo dixit, quia in tempore illo etiam carnes immolate idolis uendebantur in macello et nolebat apostolus ut christiani ementes eas interrogarent utrum immolate esset idolis an non, ne forte alius christianus, adhuc infirmus in fide, 130 sciens eos scierenter manducare idolothita, putaret eos manducare ea sub ueneracione idoli cui fuissent immolata et ipse sic quoque inciperet idola uenerari.

Simile est et illud quod subiungit, "Si quis uos 135 infidelium uocat ad cenam et uultis ire omne quod

120-33 1 Cor. 8:7-13

127 ementes eas] eas ementes C
128 interrogarent utrum inserted by A from margin; A reads interrogarent ."
128 esset] fuissent C
129 forte, inserted by A from C
131 ea, inserted by A from above line
132 ipse sic quoque, corrected by A from sic quoque ipse] sic ipse quoque C
134 et, inserted by A from above line
134-35 quis uos infidelium uocat] quis uocat uos infidelium C
uobis apponitur manducate, nichil interrogante propter conscienciam. Si quis autem dixerit, 'Hoc immolacium est,' nolite manducare propter illum qui indicauit et propter conscienciam. Conscienciam autem dico non tuam sed alterius," subaudis infirmi, sicut predictum est. Si ergo carnes ille que fuerant demonibus immolate non poterant contaminare manducantem illas eum, uidelicet cui non fuisset indicatum de eis quod essent immolaticie, multominus ille que nunquam talibus sacrilegiis adhibite sunt.

Illud forte mihi obicitis quod apostolus, ad romanos scribens, dicit, "Bonum est homini non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum." Et ego idipsum concedo quidem, quoniam hoc homini bonum est. Quare bonum? Quia qui abstinet ab esu carnium

134-40 1 Cor. 10:27-29
147-48 Romans 14:21

138 immolacium, corrected from immolatum by A]
immolatitium C
144 essent, inserted by A from margin
144 immolaticie, A reads imolaticie]
146 mihi obicitis] obijcitis mihi C
147 dicit] ait C
149 quidem, inserted by A from margin
149 idipsum concedo quidem] quidem idipsum concedo C
et potu uini longius est ab eo peccato, quod contrahitur per concupiscenciam gule quam qui utitur istis. Suauia enim sunt hec ad gustandum et facile prouocant concupiscenciam gule, ut supra quam oporteat delectetur (f. 22r - f. 22v) in his qui gustat ea quod quidem peccatum est.

Item, idcirco bonum est ut per abstinentiam istorum corpus affligatur et per afflictionem corporis maior a domino merces acquiratur. Et he quidem sunt cause quibus monachi et fideles uiri penitentes ab illis se abstinent. At tamen, quamuis concedatur quoniam, sicut ait apostolus, "Bonum est homini non manducare carnem et bibere uinum," non ex hoc concedi oportebit, ut uobis uidetur, quoniam malum est comedere carnes et bibere uinum, quia

162-63 Rom. 14:21

158 affligatur] affligitur C
161 At tamen] Attamen C
163 et bibere] et non bibere C
164 concedi, inserted by A from above line
possibile est ita temperate hominem istis uti ut non peccet. Nam et salvator bibit de genimine uitis cum discipulis suis et tamen nunquam peccauit. Quod autem necessaria consecucio ista non sit,

170 bonum est homini non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum, ergo malum est homini manducare carnem et bibere uinum, in simili sermone demonstrabo. Scimus quoniam bonum est silencium et multum a spiritualibus uiris commendatur, quoniam qui silet longius est a peccato lingue quam qui loquitur. Nam "Qui non peccat in uerbo, hic perfectus est uir." Si ergo bonum est silere, malum est loqui. Nunquid hoc necessario sequitur? Nequaquam. Quoniam simul hec duo uera sunt, uidelicet bonum est silere et bonum est loqui. Itaque cum dicatur non manducare carnem

175-76 James 3:2

166 possibile, -le inserted by A from above line
167 genimine, A reads genimiue
169 aurum necessaria consecucio ista non sit] autem non necessaria sit contentio ista C
170 carnem, inserted by A from above line
173 spiritualibus] spiritualibus C
178-79 hec duo uera] haec uera C
180 Itaque cum dicatur non] Itaque non C
et non bibere uinum, cum dicatur bonum quasi cautum, non quasi uirtus, non oportet ut ob hoc dicatur malum esse comedere carnes et bibere uinum, quia in hoc continuo intelligeretur quod esset uicium et peccatum.

Verumtamen non multum est necessarium assummire nos hanc disputacionem hoc loco, quia si recte animaduertimus tenorem scripture unde sumpta sunt uerba hoc, patet quia non simpliciter dictum est, "Bonum est homini non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum." Nam cum dixisset in precedentibus, loquens de escis, "Omnia quidem munda sunt sed malum est homini qui per offendiculum manducat," protinus addidit, "Bonum est homini non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum," continuoque subiunxit, "Neque in

190-91 Rom. 14:21
192-95 Rom. 14:20-21

181 cum dicatur, inserted by A from margin
187 hoc loco, inserted by A from margin
189 uerba hoc] haec uerba C
195 continuoque] continuo que C
quo frater tuus offendit aut scandalizatur aut infirmatur." Et est sensus.

Quandoquidem (f. 22v - f. 23r) malum est homini aliquid manducare per offendiculum, ita ut alium suo cibo scandalizet, bonum est homini non manducare carnes et non bibere uinum, neque subaudis aliquid tale in quo frater tuus offendit aut scandalizatur. Est ergo generalis quedam comprehensio quorumlibet ciborum in his uerbis, ut intelligi possit et de faba et legumine idipsum. Nam si quis ista comedendo fratrem suum scandalizaret, bonum esset illi non comedere ista. Suauiores autem cibos nominatim expressit a quibus difficilius abstinetur, ut suaderet dimitti etiam concupiscibiles cibos causa fraterne caritatis. Id autem in tempore illo

195-97 Rom. 14:21

201 carnes[ carnem C
202 scandalizatur, corrected by A from scandatur
208 difficilius, A reads difficicio
necessarium estimabat suaderi quia erant quidam ita perfecte fidei, ut nullum cibum estimarent immundum, sicut et apostolus dicebat, "Omnia quidem munda sunt" et erant quidam adhuc ita infirmi in fide ut estimarent a quibusdam esse abstinendum, ueluti iudei nuper conuersi, qui abhominabantur eos qui porcinam carnem uel idolothita coram eis manducabant et ex hoc scandalizabantur. Propter huiusmodo ergo dicebat, "Si propter cibum tuum frater tuus contristatur, iam non secundum caritatem ambulas." Et de se ipso dicebat, "Quod si esca scandalizat fratrem meum, non manducabo carnem in eternum, ne fratrem meum scandalizem." Itaque si quid obiectionis in his uerbis apostoli que inducta sunt, habebatis exinanitum est.
Adhuc dicite mihi, carnes non manducatis quia ex coitu ueniunt. Et quare piscis comeditis, qui similiter ex coitu ueniunt? Nichil hic racionis habetis. Puto peccatum est coitus gresibilium et uolatilium et non natatilium et in peccatis concipitur et nascitur omne animal et ideo sine peccato non possunt manducari carnes eorum. Falsum est totum hoc, o kathari, falsum est quia nullum unquam mandatum susceperunt aut suscipere potuerunt de uitando coitu, et ideo, nichil magis racionabile est quod (f. 23r - f. 23v) dicitis, "non comedimus uaccam quia de coitu nata est," quam si diceretis, "quia cornuta est." Nam esse de coitu natam nichil magis peccatum est quam esse cornutam.

227 comeditis] manducatis C
233 totum hoc] hoc totum C
234 suscipere, -c inserted from above line
236 quod dicitis, A reads quod quod dicitis
236-37 diceretis, quia] diceretis, non comedimus uaccam, quia C
238 carnes in-? crossed through by A
Sermo VII
contra tertiam heresim de creatione carnis

Scimus autem quia princeps erroris vestri, manes, talem habebat uitandarum carnium rationem, quod dicebat omnem carmem creatam esse a diabolo et humani quoque corporis condicionem ei attribuebat; animam uero a deo creatam affirmabat et, sicut compertum habeo, uos quoque in occultis vestris eandem rationem uitandarum carnium susurratis. Sed hoc quoque mendacium mendacissimum est nisi, quod absit, menciatur scriptura ueritatis que dicit,

2-8 Scimus autem . . . susurratis: Eckbert's source is once again Augustine's De haeresibus, 46, where the phrase "evil mind", rather than "devil", is used: "Omnem carmem non Dei, sed malae mentis perhibent esse opificium, quae a contrario principio Deo coaeterna est." Augustine also describes the Manichaean rejection of meat in the same chapter: "Nec vescuntur tamen carnibus tamquam de mortuis uel occisis fugerit diuina substantia, tantumque ac tale inde remanserit quod iam dignum non sit in Electorum ventre purgari." Edited by Müller, The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, pp. 90, 96.

1 carnis] carnium C
4 carmem, inserted by A from margin
5 quoque, inserted by A from above line
7 occultis, A reads ocultis
8 sururratis] susurratis C
10 quod absit, inserted by A from margin
"Dixit quoque deus, 'Producat terra animam uiuentem in genere suo, iumenta et reptilia et bestias terre iuxta species suas et iumenta et omne reptile terre in genere suo.' Et uidit deus quod esset bonum."

Quod, si non sufficit scriptura ueteris testamenti ad conprobandum uobis quod carnem omnem fecerit deus, audite scripturam euangelicam que dicit, "In principio erat uerbum et uerbum erat apud deum et deus erat uerbum; hoc erat in principio apud deum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nichil." Si ergo omnia per uerbum dei facta sunt, ergo omnis caro per ipsum facta est.

O maniathice manes, cum insanis sequacibus tuis, ille uos adiuuet, sicut ipsum decet quam deo aduitorem in creacione rerum constituistis. Gens

23 O maniathice manes: Cf. Augustine, De haeresibus, 46: "Manichaei a quodam Persa exstiterunt qui vocabatur Manes; quamvis et ipsum, cum eius insana doctrina coepisset in Graecia praedicari, Manichaeum discipuli eius appellare maluerunt devitantes nomen insaniae." Müller, The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, p. 84.

11-14 Gen. 1:24-25
17-21 John 1:1-3

16 carnem omnem] omnem carnem C
17 scripturam, inserted by A from margin
17 euangelicam, A reads euangelaicam
21 ergo omnis] ergo et omnis C
23 maniathice, -h and -c inserted by A from above line
24 quam] quem C
maledicta, quid indiguit deus adiutorio diaboli, ut non posset perficere condicionem universitatis nisi eum diabolus adiuuisset? An nescitis quoniam tante malicie est, ut, si posset, uno momento omne quod ad laudem dei est in mundo destrueret et ad nichilum redigeret, pocius quam crearet? Taceo nunc de corporibus irrationabilium; de corpore hominis loquor, qui spiritualiter est conditus ad servendum deo uiuenti et ad resistendum per omnia diabolicum voluntati.

Certe si creasset diabolus corpus eius, nunquam tam honeste, nunquam (f. 23v - f. 24r) tam ordinate aut commode membra eius tam disposuisset, sicut sunt, quoniam si recte animaduertuntur secundum mirabilem sapienciam et benignitatem cuncta ordinata

29 posset] possit C
33 spiritaliter] specialiter C
34 deo, inserted by A from above line
34 resistendum, A reads restendum
36 diabolus corpus eius, A reads corporus] corpus eius diabolus C
37 nunquam tam ordinate, A reads nunquam quam tam ordinate] tam ordinate C
40 cuncta, A reads cunctam
sunt. Sicut omnibus patet cetera animalia sic
condita sunt, ut prono ad terram corpore et uultu
demisso incedant, solus uero homo ita dispositus est
in corpore ut incedat erectus et aptum habeat uultum
ad suspiciendos celos, ad quos et totam mentis
intensionem dirigere debet. Et nunquid putatis si
disposita fuissent membra humana secundum arbitrium
diaboli, qui interminabile odium aduersum omnes nos
gerit et cunctis bonis nostris inuidet, tales nobis
honorem pre ceteris animantibus prestitisset?
Nequaquam. Immo tales nos maluisset condidisse ut
toto corpore serperemus per terram, aut ut erectis
sursum pedibus et converso in terram capite manuum
officio, sicut fieri posset, incederemus. Quomodo
enim amet honorem et commodum humani corporis sepius

44 erectus, corrected by A from eratus] rectus C
48 omnes, inserted by A from margin
51 tales nos] nos tales C
52 aut ut erectis] aut erectis C
55 et commodum, inserted by A from margin
ostendit in illis quos deus ab illo flagellari
permittit pro aliquibus delictis, sicut et in
muliere illa quam alliguit sæchanas x et viii
annis, ita ut non posset sursum aspicere et in eo
quem frequenter in ignem et in aquam misit, ut eum
perderet et in aliis quam pluribus. Patet ergo ex
his que dicta sunt, quoniam si idcirco a carnibus
abstinetis quia nascuntur ex coitu, fatui estis. Si
uero idcirco quod opificium sint diaboli, sicut
mentitus est princeps uester manes, constat quia
insani estis cum illo. Et nunc ad alia transeamus.


56-57 quos deus ab illo flagellari permittit pro
aliquibus delictis, sicut] quos pro aliquibus
delictis, deus ab illo flagellari permittit,
sicut C
62 idcirco a carnibus] idcirco carnibus C
64 opificium, -fi inserted by A from above line
65 quia] quoniam C
Sermo VIII
contra quartam heresim de baptismo paruulorum

De baptismo paruulorum dicitis quoniam inanis est et quod neque illis prodest ad salutem, neque aliquibus qui non sunt eius discretionis, ut possint credere aut per se ipsos gratiam baptismi postulare. Confirmatis autem, ut estimo, errorem istum auctoritate euangelici sermonis, quem locutus est dominus quando ad baptizandum (f. 24r - f. 24v) misit discipulos suos, dicens, "Euntes, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit saluus erit, qui uero non crediderit condemnabitur." Hinc, nisi fallor, huiusmodi argumentacionem sumitis, ut dicatis, "Nemo credere potest, nisi discretionem habuerit boni et mali.

9-13 Matt. 28:19-20

15 habuerit] habeat C
Paruuli, autem, cum baptizantur, discretionem boni et mali non habent; ergo non credunt. Condemnatur ergo cum ante annos discretionis moriuntur." Si hoc dicitis, scire debetis quia non rectum in uerbis ueritatis intellectum habetis. Quod enim dominus ait, "Qui non crediderit condemnabitur," non ita accipiendum est quasi dictum sit de omnibus qui non credunt, sed tantum de illis qui credere possunt et nolunt. Paruulos enim qui baptizantur et necdum credere possunt inbecillitas sensus sui excusat, ut non comprehendantur in sentencia illa qua non credentes condemnantur. Sic autem pluribus in locis sancta scriptura loquitur quasi uniuersitatem quandam comprehendet, ubi tamen uniuersitas intelligenda non est sed de uniuersitate aliquid.

14-18 Mark 16:15-16
21 Mark 16:16

16 autem, inserted by A from margin
17 habent; ergo, corrected by A from habent cum baptizantur ergo
17 Condemnatur, A reads condepnantur throughout the sermon.
19 scire debetis, corrected by A from scire dicitis debetis
19 quia non, corrected by A from quia debetis? non
23 illis] his C
26-27 non credentes condemnantur] condemnantur non credentes C
excipiendum est, ut patet in priori parte eiusdem sermonis quam de euangelio induxi, ubi ait, "Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit saluus erit." Ecce, enim hic de omnibus uidetur dictum qui credunt et baptizantur quod saluandi sint, sed non est ita. Nam multi credunt et baptizantur nec tamen saluabuntur, quoniam ad tempus credunt et in tempore temptacionis a fide recedunt, uel per malam uitam fidend suam sibi inutilem reddunt. Propterea ergo, ut dixi, de uniuersitate credencium que ibi uidetur comprehensa aliquid excipiendum est, ita ut dicatur hoc dictum esse non de omnibus credentibus, sed de illis qui habent fidem que per dilectionem operatur et in ea perseverant, ita ut non refriescat caritas eorum in temptacione et non recedant corda eorum a

32-33 Mark 16:16

31 priori] priore C
32 quam] quem C
34 hic de omnibus uidetur dictum] hoc uidetur dictum de omnibus C
38 temptacionis, A reads teptacionis
38 a fide recedunt, corrected by A from recedunt a fide
39 suam sibi inutilem] suam inutilem C
42 esse, inserted by A from margin
44 refriescat] refrigescat C
Si ergo prior particula illa sermonis, que communiter dicta uidetur, stare non potest nisi aliquid (f. 24v - f. 25r) de universitate.

exciptur non debet uideri incongruum si etiam posteriorem partem eius ita exponimus, ut eam non universaliter intelligendum esse putemus. Tale est et illud quod idem salvator in euangelio de sacramento corporis et sanguinis sui pronunciat, dicens, "Qui manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, habet uitam eternam." Hoc enim uidetur dictum de omnibus qui manducant et bibunt corpus et sanguinem domini, sed non est intelligendum nisi de illis qui digne manducant et bibunt corpus et sanguinem domini. Multi enim manducant et

55-56 John 6:54

52 putemus] dicamus C
55 carnem meam] meam carnem C
55-56 Qui manducat . . . habet, corrected by A from Qui manducat manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum sanguinem meum sanguinem me in me manet habet
59 corpus et, inserted by A from above line
bibunt corpus et sanguinem domini indigne et non ex hoc habent uitam eternam, sed, ut apostolus dicit, "Iudicium sibi manducant et bibunt, non diiudicantes corpus domini."

65 Itaque, ut dixi, illa sentencia qua dictum est, "Qui non crediderit condempnabitur," non ad omnes non credentes pertinet sed ad eos qui, cum habeant possibilitatem credendi, non credunt. Excipiuntur enim paruuli qui baptizantur et necdum credere possunt. Forte adhuc uobis uidetur quia iniuriam faciamus littere euangelice que uidetur pertinere tantum ad eos qui possibilitatem habent credendi. Sed queso, respondete mihi de simili littera que in sancta scriptura inuenitur. Iacobus apostolus, in epistola canonica scribit, dicens,

63-64 1 Cor. 11:29
66 Mark 16:16

62 apostolus dicit] dicit Apostolus C
71 euangelice, -c inserted by A from above line
72 tantum, inserted by A from above line
"Qui non peccat in lingua, hic perfectus est uir."
Nunquid hoc pertinet communiter ad omnes qui non peccant in lingua? Certe si omnes qui peccatum lingue non committunt perfecte sanctitatis sunt, omnes infantes et omnes muti sancti et perfecti iudicandi sunt, quod falsum esse nulli dubium est. Itaque quod dictum est, "Qui non peccat in lingua hic perfectus est uir," ita intelligi necesse est, ut dicatur esse perfectus qui, cum possit et sciat peccare in lingua, abstinet per dei timorem ut non peccet in ea.

Tale est et illud quod apostolus ait, "Qui non laborat non manducet." Nam uniuer saliter pronuntiari uidetur de omnibus non laborantibus, (f. 25r - f. 25v) sed non est ita. Nam si de illa

76 James 3:2
82-83 James 3:2
87-88 2 Thess. 3:10

77 communiter ad omnes] ad omnes communiter C
77 pertinet communiter, corrected by A from communiter pertinet
79 sanctitatis sunt] sunt sanctitatis C
83 perfectus est uir] uir perfectus est C
87 et illud, inserted by A from margin
89 pronuntiari, inserted by A from below line
sentencia nullus qui non laborat excipiendus est, 
tunc neque pueri neque senes neque infirmi 
manducare debent, qui non laborant. Ad eos ergo 
pertinet uerbum hoc qui, cum possint laborare, non 
laborant sed ocio uacant.

Simile est et illud, "Qui uero mala egerunt in 
resurrectionem iudicii." Hoc quoque generaliter 
dici uidetur de omnibus qui mala agunt, sed 
excipiuntur ab hac sentencia qui mala agunt et 
postea penitent et in bono perseuerant. Multa in 
scripturis sanctis similiter dicta inueniuntur, sed 
non est necesse plura ad presens negocium exempla 
induci.

Et nunc, si aliam habetis defensionem erroris 
uestri, proferte eam, quoniam hoc de nunc qua locuti

96-97 John 5:29

91 qui non laborat, inserted by A from margin
93 ergo, inserted by A from above line
96 malaj male C
97 quoque, inserted by A from margin
97 generaliter, -ne inserted by A from above line
105 hoc de nunc qua] haec de qua nunc C
105 nunc, inserted by A from margin
105 locuti, -ti inserted by A from above line
sumus non proderit uobis. Popule stulte et insipiens, nunquid non cognoscitis gratie tempus? An nescitis quoniam scripture sancte uocant tempus gratie omne hoc tempus quod a christi natiuitate usque ad finem seculi decurrit? Idcirco autem tempus gratie uocatur quia in eo dilatata est misericordia dei super genus humanum et apertus est sinus dei ad suscipiendas animas hominum, magis quam in omnibus seculis que fuerunt ante christi aduentum.

At si ita est, ut predicat inpietas uestra, uidelicet quod omnes, qui ante annos discretionis moriuntur, condemnantur et nullum remedium eis constitutum est a deo, quo possint adiuuari ab ecclesia dei, ut oporteat eos ex necessitate

107 non, inserted by A from above line
112 deij domini C
118 remedium eis] eis remedium C
effluere in perdicionem eternam, durus certe et immisericors est deus magis quam fuisset in temporibus que aduentum christi precesserunt et minus curans de hominum salute. A tempore enim abrahe usque ad christum, constitutum erat a deo in populo iudaico, qui erat ex abraham, ut omnis infans masculus, die octaua a natiuitate sua, circumcideretur in carne sua ad generationem pertinente, ut sic liberaretur a peccato originali, cum quo nascitur omnis homo et pro quo damnatur omnis anima, que non fuerit aliquo remedio ab eo purgata. Quod autem pro animarum salvacione datum fuerit illud mandatum, aperte cognosci potest ex uerbis domini que ad abraham locutus est, quando ei circumcisionis (f. 25v - f. 26r) preceptum dabat,
dicens, "Infans octo dierum circumcidentur in uobis, omne masculinum in generationibus uestris, tam uernaculus quam empticius circumcidentur. Masculus cuius prepucii caro circumcisa non fuerit delebitur anima illa de populo suo." Ecce, in hac comminacione euidenter agnosci potest quod propter conservacionem animarum eorum ipsos iussit circumcidi. Et hoc animaduertite, quod non dixit expectandum esse usque dum peruenisset homo ad annos discretionis et tunc esse circumcidendum, cum se ipsum postulare posset circumcisionem, sed die octauo iussit circumcidi infantem, quia sciebat fragilitatem corporis humani et quod leui in fortunio contingere potest, ut extinguatur homo antequam ad annos maturitatis perueniat. Quod ergo,
ita festinari voluit circumcisionem, idcirco fecit
ut salue fierent anime et non inciderent in
damnacionem eternam per maculam originalis peccati,
quod a primis parentibus contraximus omnes.

155 Potuit etiam nimirum eadem circumcisione fieri
ante diem octauum si periculum mortis paruulis
imminere uidebatur, sicut et nos, pro eadem causa,
ante tempus nonnunquam paruulos baptizamus cum tamen
ab apostolicis patribus constitutum sit, ut uel in
160 pasca uel in pentecosten baptizemus. Sicut autem
paruuli masculini sexus ab originali culpa per
circumcisionem expiabantur, ita et feminini sexus
infantes per legales oblaciones ab ea purgabantur,
ut et ipsarum anime non perirent a populo suo. Ante
165 tempus autem circumcisionis ab adam usque ad

155 etiam nimirum, corrected by A from nimirum etiam
158 paruulos, inserted by A from above line
159 ab apostolicis patribus constitutum sit] sit
constitutum ab apostolicis patribus C
abraham, qui primus suscepit circumcisionis mandatum, fieri solebant oblaciones deo ab his qui dei cultum habebant, per quas deleri potuit originale peccatum atque alia peccata fragilitatis humane in electis dei, tam pusillis quam magnis, ut salute fient animae eorum, quoniam nunquam misericordia dei humanum genus omnino dereliquit. Ecce, talis erat deo de infantibus cura in prioribus seculis, ut conservarentur animae eorum a perditione.  

175 Et nunquid estimatis, inopia gens, quod deus oblivitus sit eiusdem misericordie sue in tempore isto quod gratie tempus et annus benignitatis uocatur? An putatis minus amet filios et filias christianorum quam infantes iudaeorum, quibus

172 dereliquit, A reads dereliquid  
175-76 quod deus oblivitus sit eiusdem misericordiae
179 putatis minus) putatis quoniam minus C
constituit circumcisionem, ut non perirent anime eorum a populo suo? Iussit autem cessare circumcisionem post ascensionem christi per doctrinam apostolorum, quorum unus dicebat, "Si circumcidamini christus nichil uobis prodest."

Circumcisionis autem loco esse uoluit baptismum aque, ut eo purificaretur a peccatis omnis homo, tam pusillus quam magnus, quicumque mersus fuisset in eo in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Et quidem si est ut uos dicitis, uidelicet quod tantum adultis et non etiam paruulis prosit baptismus ad salutem, non habet tantam virtutem baptismus nunc quantum habuit circumcisionio in tempore suo observata.

Super hoc ergo, mihi respondete, quando hoc

184-85 Gal. 5:2

183 circumcisionem post, corrected by A from circumcisionem christi post
186 esse, inserted by A from margin
188 mersus fuisset] fuisset mersus C
193 circumcisionio, corrected by A from baptismo
constituit dominus ut baptismus fieret in ecclesia et cessaret circumcisio, tunc uel uoluit et non potuit dare baptismo eam uirtutem quam habuerat circumcisio, uidelicet ut per ipsum conservarentur anime infantum, uel potuit hoc et noluit, uel nec uoluit hoc nec potuit. Si uoluit et non potuit, non erat tante potencie quante fuerat olim, quando constituit fieri circumcisionem et per eam animas paruulorum conservauit a dampnacione. Quomodo ergo uerum erit quod dicit scriptura, "Omnia quecumque uoluit dominus fecit in celo et in terra"? Si autem, potuit et noluit, non erat tante benignitatis quante fuerat olim, neque tam fidelis erga populum christianum ut fuerat erga populum iudaicum, in eo quod abstulit circumcisionem in qua poterant

205-06 Ps. 134:3
conservari anime infantum et nichil in loco eius fieri ordinavit per quod possent adiuvari. Si autem nec voluit nec potuit deus facere per baptismum eam misericordiam paruulis quam fecerat per circumcisionem, consequens est ut neque tam potens neque tam benignus sit in tempore hoc ut fuerat in diebus antiquis, quod quidem tam alienum est a veritate quam catharus a salute. Et si verus est sermo uester, melius certe atque felicius fuisset mundo, ut iudaica lex, que adiuvare potuit tam pusillos quam magnos, in statu suo permansisset et ut ad eam omnes gentes confluxissent, quam ut lex christiana mundum intrasset, que, sicut susurratis, prodesse non potest nisi his qui ad annos discretionis perueniunt.

206-12 Si autem . . . possent adiuuari, inserted by A from margin
211 infantum] infantum C
219 certe atque felicius, inserted by A from margin
220 ut, inserted by A from above line
223 sicut] ut C
Vix certe media pars hominum uiuendo peruenit ad dies suos in quibus scire possint quid credere debeant aut quid non. Si ergo omnes tales necesse est perire, merito debet intolerabilis esse

230 tristicia toti ecclesie pro (f. 26v - f. 27r) ea mutacione quam in ea fecit deus, in hoc quod interdixit circumcisionem et pro ea baptismum constituit et tot milia hominum in perdicionem ire permittit, quibus putatur prodesse baptismus et non eis prodest, ut docet heresy uestra. Quid ergo aliud faciet rachel, nisi ut sine intermissione ploret filios suos et non uelit consolari, quia non sunt? Quomodo ergo tempus istud recte dici potest tempus gratie et non magis tempus ire?

240 Immo o filii ire, o kathari, semen nequam filii

235-38 Jer. 31:15
239 Cf. Romans 2:5

228 omnes, inserted by A from margin
229 merito debet, corrected by A from merito intolerabilis debet
232 circumcisionem, A reads circumcionem
233 hominum] animarum C
238 istud, inserted by A from margin
scelerati, nunc est tempus gratie et non ire, nunc
tempus acceptabile, nunc dies salutis, quia sicut
predixi, dilatata est misericordia dei super hunc
mundum magis quam in prioribus seculis. Nam ante
saluatoris adventum regnuit mors et perdicio in
humano genere, et premebat ira dei totum mundum, et
paucissime anime in illo tempore salue fiebant a
morte eterna. Omnes enim gentes creatorem suum
ignorabant et idolatrie deseruiebant, preter
iudaicam gentem, in qua notus erat deus et que
legibus et obsequiis ueri deis erat mancipata. In
hoc autem tempore ostendit deus misericordiam suam
in uniuerso mundo et notus fieri uoluit in cunctis
finibus terre, et constituit baptismi gratiam non
uni genti, ut circumcisionem iudeis, sed omni generi

241-42 2 Cor. 6:2; Luke 4:19; Isa. 61:2
244-48 Nam . . . eterna: Cf. Rom. 5:14
251-55: In . . . genti: Cf. Rom. 1:8; 10:18

249 idolatrie] idololatriae C
251 erat, A reads arat
252 suam, inserted by A from above line
hominum, ita ut quicumque baptizati fuerint in nomine eius, siue iudeus, siue grecus, siue latinus, siue barbarus, pusillus aut magnus, mas aut femina, seruus siue liber, remissionem omnium peccatorum in eo consequatur tam plenarie, ut si mox post baptismum de hac uita migret, aperta sit ei ianua regni celestis. Tantam uero uirtutem salvacionis non habebat circumcisionio in ueteri testamento. Nemini quippe, pusillo uel magno quantumcumque, innocens esset aut sanctus introitus regni celestis aperiebatur per circumcisionem aut per aliquas observaciones legis antique, sed quicumque electi erant ad regnum dei in populo illo, detinebantur anime eorum in locis sibi destinatis a deo, expectantes donec per uirtutem christi patefieret

256-60 ita . . . liber: Cf. Gal. 3:28; 1 Cor. 12:13

256 baptizati fuerint] baptizatus fuerit C
257 eius, inserted by A from margin
258 aut femina] siue foemina C
259 per baptismum, inserted by A from margin
260 uita migret] migret uita C
263 testamento] populo C
264 pusillo uel] pusillo et C
265 esset aut sanctus] aut sanctus esset C
265 celestis] dei C
267 electi, inserted by A from margin
270 donec, -ne inserted by A from above line
eis accessus ad perfecte beatitudinis gloriam.

Propter hæc ergo, que nunc dixi, merito hoc tempus
christia-(f. 27r - f. 27v)-nitatis, tempus gratie,
et tempus acceptabile dicitur, et dies salutis dies

istis vocantur, qui magis dies perditionis dicer
possent, si ita esset sicut vos inpiae susurratis.
Non autem me illud dicere estimetis, quod omnes qui
in ecclesia, secundum quod constitutum est a domino,
baptizantur, ita remissionem peccatorum suscipiant,

ut qualitercumque postea uixerint, tamen ad regnum
dei perueniant. Sed hoc dico et fides nostra
inconcusse hoc tenet. Quicumque paruuli, siue a
bono homine, siue a malo, etiam sit hereticus in
nome patris et filii et spiritus sancti

baptizantur et morte preueniuntur antequam

---

273-74 2 Cor. 6:2; Luke 4:19; Isa. 61:2

---

274 salutis dies, dies inserted by A from above line
277 me illud] id me C
282 hoc, inserted by A from above line
283 etiam] et si C
maturescant, saluantur per baptismum et per fidem sancte trinitatis quam habet ecclesia catholica, que inuocat nomen domini pro salute eorum qui baptizantur in ea, sicut olim saluabantur per circumcisionem et per fidem patrum. Qui uero ad annos maturitatis perueniunt, si, gratie in baptismo accepe, uita eorum concors fuerit, hos et baptismus et fides catholica et operum rectitudo perducunt ad salutem. Qui uero prauis operibus uitam suam commaculant et contra mandata dei pompis diaboli deseruiunt, hii profecto gratiam spiritus sancti in baptismo acceptam in se ipsis extinguunt, et nichil his prodest baptismus ad salutem, sicut et circumcisio multis iudeorum peruerse gradientibus nichil his profuit ad salutem consequendam. Hec est

292 concors] consors C
293 rectitudo] iectitudo C
295 dei pompis, corrected by A from dei simus(?) pompis] dei pompis C
300 nichil his profuit] nihil profuit C
nostra catholica fides de his qui baptizantur que palam semper in ecclesia dei predicata est a temporibus apostolorum et sanctorum patrum, qui eis in romana ecclesia aliisque ecclesiis usque ad hec tempora nostra successerunt, et qui leguntur predicasse in manifesto et baptizasse in christo senes et iuuenes, mulieres et paruulos.

Ad illud redeo, quod dixi, saluari paruulos per baptisma et per fidem sancte trinitatis quam habet ecclesia, que inuocat nomen domini pro salute eorum qui baptizantur in ea. Hoc uobis incredibile esse dicitis quod alicui homini prodesse possit alterius fides apud deum. Et quare hoc uobis est incredibile? Si scitis euangelia, reuoluite (f. 27v - f. 28r) ea et inuenietis quoniam dominus
saluator, cum inter homines conuersaretur et
miracula diuina operaretur multis qui male habebant,
misericordiam suam exhibuit non propter ipsorum
merita, sed propter fidem aliorum qui ipsum
deprecabantur pro eis. Legimus siquidem de muliere
canananea, quod rogabat dominum pro filia sua que
male a demonio uexabatur et ipse, auditis miserandis
clamoribus matris, tandem misertus est super eam et
dixit, "O mulier, magna est fides tua, fiat tibi
sicut uis." Et sanata est filia eius ex illa hora."
Ecce in eo quod ait, "Magna est fides tua," aperte
declaravit quoniam per fidem quam in ipsum mater
habebat meruit ut sanaretur filia eius que nec
fidem nec sanam mentem habebat.

Et de centurione legimus quod pro sanitate

320-25 Matt. 15:22-28

316 consersaretur] consuersaretur C
321 canananea] Chananarea C
paralitici serui sui dominum deprecatus est. Cui, cum dixisset dominus, "Ego ueniam et curabo eum," atque ille respondisset, "Domine, non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, sed tantum dic uerbo et sanabitur puer meus," ammiratus est dominus super fide eius, dicens, "Amen dico uobis, non inueni tantam fidem in irrahel," moxque illi ait, "Vade et sicut credidisti fiat tibi. Et sanatus est puer eius ex illa hora." Nonne et in his uerbis patet quoniam fides uiri postulantis ei pro quo postulabat profuit ut sanaretur? Respondebitis forte quod his de quibus nunc dictum est, uidelicet puella obsessa et puero paralitico, fides postulancium pro eis profuit, quidem ad corporum sed non ad animarum sanitatem, et dicitis quod ad animarum salutem

330-37 Matt. 8:5-10; Luke 7:1-10
337-39 Matt. 8:13

paralitici, A reads paralici
est, corrected by A from sit
uerbo] uerbum C
irrahel] Israel C
ait] dixit C
sicut] sicuti C
eius ex illa hora] in illa hora C
puelle obsesse] puella obsessa C
corporum] corpus C
non, inserted by A from above line
animarum salutem] salutem animae C
consequendam unumquemque tantum propria fides
adiuuare possit et non fides aliorum quantumcumque
clament pro eo.

Et nunc aliud uobis exemplum adducam quod in hac
parte contra uos est. Scriptum est in euangelio
luce quia "Factum est in una dierum et iesus sedebat
docens et erant pharisei sedentes et legis doctores
qui uenerant ex omni cas-(f. 28r - f. 28v) -tello
galilee et iudee et ierusalem et uirtus erat domini
ad sanandum eos. Et ecce uiri portantes inlecto
paraliticum hominem qui erat paraliticus et
querebant eum inferre et ponere ante eum. Et non
inuenientes qua parte inferrent illum pre turba,
ascenderunt supra tectum et per tegulas summiserunt
illum cum lecto in medium ante iersum. Quorum fidem

349 uobis exemplum] exemplum uobis C
354 erat domini] domini erat C
355-56 lecto paraliticum hominem] lecto hominem C
358 inferrent, inserted by A from margin
358 illum] eum C
359 supra] super C
ut uidit dixit, 'Homo, remittuntur tibi peccata tua.'" Ecce, in eo quod dicit euangelista, "quorum fidem ut uidit" manifeste dat intelligi, quoniam fides illorum quam habebant de potencia eius bene placita erat domino et quod specialiter propter ipsam, illi data est primum quidem remissio peccatorum, que ad salutem anime illius pertinebat, et postmodum sanitas corporalis, quando eidem paralitico dicebat, "Tibi dico, surge, tolle lectum tuum et uade in domum tuam." Si enim hanc misericordiam dominus eidem paralitico fecisset ob meritum fidei ipsius et non propter illorum fidem, nequaquam dixisset euangelista "quorum fidem ut uidit," sed magis " cuius fidem ut uidit." Hec nos animaduertentes confidimus quod nostram quoque fidem

369-70 Luke 5:24; Matt. 9:6; Mark 2:11; John 5:8

362 euangelista, inserted by A from margin and corrected by A from euangelia  
364-65 bene placita] beneplacita C
respiciat dominus iesus, quando infirmum nostrum
ipsi offerimus curandum.

Portamus siquidem et nos paraliticum in lectulo
et ponimus ante iesum, quando paruulum baiulamus ad

380
baptismum, petentes ut baptizet eum et saluet.

Anima quippe racionalis adhuc originali peccato
constricta et nichil adhuc naturalium uirium
exercere ualens in corpore puerili, cui melius
comparatur quam homini per peccatum intus constricto

385
et foris per paralisin in membris dissoluto
iacentique in lectulo? Et pro illo quidem nichil
aliud postulabant amici eius, nisi ut in corpore
sanaretur ipse, uero ex gratuita bonitate prius
quod maius erat, prestitit sanando eum a peccatis in

390
anima et postmodum etiam quod petebatur, adiecit

378 lectulo] lecto C
380 baptismum] baptisma C
384 per peccatum intus] intus per peccatum C
386 iacentique] iacenti que C
386 lectulo] lecto C
389 sanando eum a peccatis in] sanando a peccatis
eum in C
corporalem ei sanitatem restituendo et approbata est
fides illorum qui hoc quod minus erat eum posse
credebant. (f. 28v - f. 29r) Est autem indubitanter
maior fide illorum fides nostra, cum qua paraliticum
nostrum domino presentamus ac magis spiritualis
peticio nostra petitione illorum. Credimus quippe
quod quemadmodum potest per baptismum purificare
animas maiorum ab omni peccato, tam actuali quam
originali, ita potest et paruulorum animas liberare
ab originali peccato sine meritis ipsorum, sicut et
sine meritis suis ille prefatus paraliticus et in
anima et in corpore sanatus est. Credimus, inquam,
hoc et fideliter postulamus quando ei paruulos
baptizandos offerimus. Ipse enim inuisibiliter
illic presens est et ipse inuisibiliter baptizat

392 illorum, inserted by A from below margin
394 fides nostra] nostra fides C
398 animas, mairoum] maiorum animas C
401 ille prefatus] Praefatus ille C
403 fideliter postulamus quando] fideliter ab
ipso postulamus, si quando C
405 illic, inserted by A from margin] illis C
405 est et] est illic et C
omnes qui cum inuocacione sancte trinitatis aquis immerguntur.

Nolite mirari super hoc quod dixi, quoniam ipse inuisibiliter baptizat eos qui baptizantur.

410 Scriptum quippe est quod iohannes baptista tale de ipso testimonium pronunciauit, dicens, "Qui misit me baptizare in aqua, ille mihi dixit, 'Super quem uideris spiritum descendentem et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat.' Et uidi et testimonium perhibui, quia hic est filius dei." Idem quoque dicebat ad turbas de christo, "Qui post me uenturus est forcior me est, cuius non sum dignus calciamenta portare. Ipse uos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igne." Ex his uerbis securi sumus ipsum dominum iesum christum esse communem baptistam omnium

411-15 John 1:33-34
416-19 Matt. 3:11; John 1:15, 27

412 baptizare in aqua, corrected by A from baptizare ignis in aqua] in aqua baptizare C
412 aqua, -a inserted by A from above line
417 calciamenta] calceamenta C
418 spiritu, -s inserted by A from above line
qui in catholica ecclesia baptizantur in nomine sancte trinitatis, ita uidelicet quod ipse inuisibiliter spiritum eorum sanctificat in spiritu sancto et ab omni peccato emundat. Inde est quod dicimus, quia siue bonus siue malus sit ille, per cuius manus uisibile corpus hominis qui baptizatur aquis uisibiliter immergitur, non ex hoc, plus uel minus, operatur uirtus baptismi remissionem peccatorum et inuisibilem sanctificacionem in anima eius qui regeneratur. Propterea paulus apostolus, scribens corinthiis, qui de baptistis suis se iactabant, redarguit eos, dicens, "Significatum est mihi ab his qui sunt cloes quoniam contemciones (f. 29r - f. 29v) inter uos sunt. Hoc autem dico quod unusquisque uestrum dicit, 'Ego quidem pauli, ego

426 manus uisibile corpus] manus corpus C
427 immergitur, -im inserted by A from above line
433 cloes] cloës C
uero cephe, ego autem apollo, ego uero christi."
Estimabat enim quisque eo se esse sanctiorem quo erat sanctior ille a quo fuerat baptizatus. Hoc uero nequaquam ita est, quoniam nichil sanctitatis ei qui baptizatur prestat ille qui uisibiliter baptizat, sed omnem spiritualem gratiam que in baptismo confertur ipse summus sacerdos dominus iesus christus prestat illic per uirtutem spiritus sancti.

Et ad illam quidem omne genus hominum qui ad ipsum converti volunt admittit quantumlibet sint honerati peccatis; solos autem paruulos, sicut uos dicitis, qui minimum peccati habent, inde repellit.

Negissima gens, cur hoc dicitis? Nonne ipse communiter omnes uocauit, cum dixit, "Uenite ad me,

440-441 1 Cor. 1:11-12

443 illic, inserted by A from margin
447 honerati, corrected by A from grauati
447 peccatis, inserted by A from margin and corrected from delictis
447-48 sicut uos dicitis] sicut dicitis C
omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego uos reficiam"? Certe cum hec dicebat, piissimus ille procurator salutis humane uidebat omnem hominem laborare sub penalitate quam induxerat mundo culpa originalis, uidebat simul quoniam preter ipsum nemo uiuebat hominum in tempore illo uel uicturus erat super terram, cuius non esset onerata anima peccatorum grauamine, ita ut nec infans unius diei express esset peccati. Quod intelligens, paulus apostolus dicebat, "Conclusit deus omnia sub peccato, ut omnium misereretur." Omnia, inquit, id est, omnis generis homines, omnis etatis homines, conclusit, id est, concludi permisit sub peccato, ut omnium misereretur tribuendo omnibus remissionem

450-52 Matt. 11:28
460-61 Rom. 11:32

451-52 ego uos reficiam] ego reficiam uos C
463 concludi] concludidi C
464 omnium] omni C
Si ergo conceditis et paruulos omnes conclusos esse sub peccato, necesse est ut concedatis etiam ad eos pertinere misericordiam dei et ipsos quoque ad latum gremium benignitatis eius cum ceteris

inuitari uocacione ipsius qua dicit, "Vénite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego uos reficiam." "Reficiam," inquit. Refectio ista, quam promisit, prestatur in hac uita spiritui nostro in eo quod per spiritum sanctum (f. 29v - f. 30r) a peccatorum grauamine exonératur atque in eo quod cua superaddita gratia adiuuat ad resistendum fomiti peccati et ad insistendum bone operacioni. Prestatur etiam post hanc uitam, quando datur ut requiescat homo a cunctis laboribus suis.

Omnem hanc refectionem promisit omnibus ad se

470-72 Matt. 11:28

470 uocacione, corrected by A from cocacione
471-72 uos reficiam] reficiam uos C
478 etiam] et C
uenientibus et qua racione putatis quod eam recuset paruulis uenientibus ad se? Putatis quod dicat dominus, "Omnes ueniant ad me, quantumlibet sint peccatores, soli paruuli, qui nondum satis habent peccati, maneant foris"? "Non ueniunt", dicitis, "sed apportantur ab aliis et idcirco non dat eis gratiam, quam aliis peccatoribus per se uenientibus promisit." Et nonne paraliticus ille, de quo supra dictum est, ab aliis apportatus est et non per se ipsum uenit, neque idcirco minus gratie ab ipso accipit? Similiter non per se ipsos ueniunt neque per se ipsos benedictionem ab iesu pecierunt paruuli illi, de quibus refert mattheus, dicens, "Tunc oblati sunt ei paruuli, ut manus eis inponeret et oraret. Discipuli autem increpabant eos. Iesus

480-81 ad se uenientibus] uenientibus ad se C
484-85 satis habent peccati, corrected by A from peccati satis habent
487-88 peccatoribus per se uenientibus promisit. Et] peccatoribus. Et C
489 est et non] est? non C
491 accipit?] accept. C
493 refert mattheus] Mattheus refert C
495 eos. Iesus, corrected by A from eos ut tacerei.(?) Iesus
uero ait eis, 'Sinite paruulos uenire ad me, talium est enim regnum celorum.' Et cum inposuisset illis manus, abiiit inde." Ecce, talis in illo tempore benignitatis erat dominus, ut rudes pueros, non per se ipsos quidem uenientes aut aliquid gratie postulare scientes, sed aliis ipsos ei offerentibus, ac pro eis postulantibus dignaretur suscipere, dignaretur et benedictam manum suam eis cum oracione inponere. Et quomodo accidit ei ut in istis temporibus non eandem habeat benignitatem erga paruulos, quos solet ei offerre sancta ecclesia, rogans ut manus eis inponat, id est, uirtutem sancti spiritus sui, per quam eis peccata remittantur et spiritualibus donis inpleantur?

Quomodo dulcem illam uocem, qua dixit, "Sinite

---

494-98 Matt. 19:13-15

499 dominus, inserted by A from above line
500 aliquid gratie] gratiae aliquid C
505 eandem, -n inserted by A from above line
506 offerre sancta ecclesia] offerre ecclesia C
507 manus] manum C
508 per, inserted by A from above line
paruulos ad me uenire, talium est enim regnum celorum," (f. 20r - f. 30v) mutuit in amaram uocem, ut dicat, "Auferte paruulos a me, talium enim non est regnum celorum"? Nam secundum tenorem discipline uuestre, hoc et, si non manifesta uoce, ipso tamen opere dicit, si omnes qui ante annos discretionis moriuntur perire permittit in originali peccato cum quo nati sunt. Scimus quidem in eo uerbo quod dixit "talium est regnum celorum," etiam conprehendi eos qui mature etatis sunt et similes sunt pueris in innocencia et simplicitate, uerumtamen hi qui in innocencia et simplicitate atque insuper etate pueri sunt et ab ecclesia domino offeruntur, ut paruuli illi quibus olim manus inposuit, non possunt iusta racione ab eadem

510-12 Matt. 19:14

511 ad me uenire] uenire ad me C
517 perire, inserted by A from margin
521 pueris in innocencia] pueris innocencia C
522 hi, inserted by A from margin
524 manus] manum C
sentencia excludi, nisi forte cum ad maturitatem peruenrent, acceptam in baptismo gratiam, per malam conversacionem ammittant. Nuncid adhuc sine intellectu estis et non percipitis ex his uerbis que dicta sunt, falsum et hereticum esse quod de baptismo paruulorum affirmatis?

Dicite mihi que uobis est causa huiusmodo sermonis, cum nec firmam racionem nec aliquod euidens testimonium ex scripturis sanctis habeatis ad confirmandum hunc errorem? Si erubescitis dicere, ego pro uobis dicam. Superbia cordis uestri et inuidia diaboli in ore uestro posuerunt uerbum hoc. Nam, ut quasi singulares pre ceteris habeamini, ac multa scire uideamini que non sunt in communi hominum cognicione, idcirco talia

530 hereticum, -h inserted by A from above line
532 huiusmodo] huiusmodi C
susurratis in auribus simplicium ac seductibilium hominum, quibus aque furtiue dulciores sunt. Idcirco dixi quod superbia cordis uestri que uane glorie mater est, hunc errorem, sicut et alios multos, seminare uos fecit.

Invidia quoque diaboli hoc uerbum uobis inspirauit. Quia enim uidit innumera milia animarum per baptismum saluari in infantilibus annis et nichil uoluntatis sue fieri in eis, quos, ita innocentes et puros ab omni ita macula, post regenerationem suam festinat deus ad (f. 30v - f. 31r) regnum suum transferre, quia, inquam, hoc uidit, inuidet innocencie eorum, inuidit quod ita festinaretur beatitudo eorum, inuidit quod etiam ex

538-42 Cf. Sermones, I, p. 5:

... munita sit ex his sermonibus prudentia uestra ad obstruendum ora loquencium iniqua et ad confirmandos uacillantes animos seductibilium homi-num, qui, dolosis sermonibus illorum decepti, ambulare eos secundum ueritatem existimant.

541 seductibilium] seductibilium C
546 quoque, inserted by A from margin
547 milia animarum, corrected by A from animarum milia
550 ita, inserted by A from margin
550 omni ita macula] omni macula C
553 inuidet] inserted by A from above line
554 inuidit, inserted by A from above line] inuidet C
555 ore huiusmodi infantum et lactencium, perfecturus
esset laudem suam propter inimicos suos apostatas
spiritus qui, per propriam maliciam, a curia eius
deciderant et inminuerant numerum laudancium eum.
Quesiuit itaque artem qua inpediret omnes infancium

560 animas, ne gratia que in baptismo tribuitur a deo,
participes fierent et inuenit sibi aptissima
instrumenta ad officium hoc, uidelicet linguas
katharorum que sunt pharetrae pessimarum sagittarum
eius, quibus sagittant in obscuro rectos corde. In

565 quibus posuit et hoc uerbum iniquum, quod dicunt
nichil prodesse paruulis ad salutem lauachrum
baptismi et debere eos reseruari usque dum
perueniant ad annos discrecionis et tunc primum eos
esse baptizandos, cum possint proprio ore fidem suam

570 profiteri. Hec ita excogitauit diabolus, quatinus

562-64 linguas . . . corde: Cf. Jer. 9:8

555 infantum] infantium C
558 deciderant] ceciderant C
559 itaque] igitur C
561 participes] perticipes C
563 pharete] pharetrae C
hunc morem induceret mundo, ut non ad baptismum afferrent homines paruulos suos sicque in partem suam attraheret omnes animas que in infantilibus annis ab hac uita migrant atque a regno dei eas elongaret. Sed gratia dei nondum ita creditum est huic uerbo ut est ita receptus sit mos iste in populo dei, adhuc offeruntur paruuli domino ad baptismum et inponit eis manum suam et recipit eos.

O kathari, o piphles, nescio quam laudem uobis rectius dicam, quam quod diffusa est diabolica malicia in labiis uestrís, proptera maledixit uos deus in eternum.


572 homines, inserted by A from above line
572 sicque] sic que C
573 infantilibus] infantibus C
575 ita creditum est, corrected by A from creditum est ita
579 piphles] Piphiles C
Sermo IX

sermo contra heresim de baptismo aquae

Non autem me latet quod de eis quoque qui in proueciori etate baptizantur non minorem heresim tenetis, (f. 31r - f. 31v) quam est ea que de baptismo paruulorum nunc pertractata est. Nam baptizandum quidem esse hominem dicitis cum ad annos discretionis peruenerit, non autem in aqua sed in igne, et nihil prodesse cuiumq baptismum aquae. Huius autem erroris defensionem sumitis ex uerbis iohannis que de domino saluatore pronunciauit dicens, "Ille uos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igne." Hinc est quod eos quos assumitis in societatem cathariae uestrae, sicut audiui de quodam qui expertus fuerat secreta uestra, tali modo rebaptizatis.

11-12 Matt. 3:11

1 sermo contra heresim de baptismo aquae] Contra Quintam Haeresim de baptismo aquae. Sermo VIII C 3 proueciori] prouectiori C 6 quidem esse, corrected by A from esse quidem 12 sancto, inserted by A from above line 14 de] a C

161
Conuenientibus uobis in unum in aliquo obscuro penetrali, primum hoc diligentissime procuratur, ne forte per aliquam fenestram aut per ostium quisque eorum qui foris suntuisu uel auditu percipiath qued intus geritur quoniam ut scriptum est, "Qui male agit, odit lucem." Locantur luminaria copiose in parietibus cunctis; statur per ordinem in circuitu cum reverentia magna quoniam sancta res agitur quan tamen magis complacat diabolo quam deo.

Statuitur in medio infelix ille qui baptizandus siue katharizandus est et assistit ei

20-21 John 3:20

16 in unum, inserted by A from margin
16 aliquo obscuro, obscuro aliquo C
17 hoc, inserted by A from above line
17 diligentissime, corrected by A from diligentissime
20 ut, inserted by A from above line
20 quoniam ut scriptum] quoniam scriptum C
21-22 copiose in parietibus cunctis, corrected by A from in parietibus cunctis copiose
22 ordinem, inserted by A from margin
22 in, inserted by A from above line
22 circuitum] circuitu C
24 complacat, -com inserted by A from above line
archicatharus, tenens in manu libellum deputatum ad hoc officium. Quem inponens uertici eius, dicit benedictiones que potius maledictiones uocande sunt, orantibus ceteris qui circumstant et faciunt filium gehenne, non regni dei, sicque perficitur ille baptismus.

Dicitur autem hic baptismus fieri in igne, propter ignem luminum que in circuitu ardent. Non sic, impii, non sic debetis sequi uerba sancti

27 libellum: the New Testament or perhaps only the gospel of John, given what is known of Catharist practice during the thirteenth century. See, e.g., the description of this baptism, or "consolamentum", among the Provençal Cathars, compiled perhaps as late as 1280, but regarded by scholars as preserving much earlier practices. See Léon Clédat, ed., Le Nouveau Testament traduit au XIIIe siècle en langue provençale, suivi d'un rituel cathare (Paris: Mm. Lumière, 1887): 470-82

29-30 benedictiones . . . orantibus ceteris: It is likely that the Cathars' baptism involved the Pater Noster, since it later become an essential requirement for the remission of sins during the "consolamentum", along with the imposition of hands. See, e.g., the Summa de Catharis of Rainerius Sacconi (1250); James Fears, ed., Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung im Hochmittelalters (Göttingen, 1968), p. 30, as quoted from Antoine Dondaine, Un traité néo-manichéen du XIIIe siècle, le 'Liber de duebus principiis'(Rome, 1939): 65-70.

28 hoc officium] officium hoc C
30 circumstant, inserted by A from margin
euangeli in quibus dicitur, "Ille uos baptizabit in spiritu et igne." Melius ipsa uerba attendite, "Baptizabit," inquit, "in igne", non iuxta ignem ut uos facitis. Auscultate ad me et docebo uos quomodo rectius eadem uerba impleatis. Loquar stultis iuxta stultitiam suam, ut non sibi uideantur sapientes. Struite ignem copiosum in medio sinagoge uesture et tollite (f. 31v - f. 32r) illum uestrum nouitium quem uultis katharizare et in medio ignis eum locate et tu, archicathare, pone super uerticem eius manum tuam, ut soles, et sic benedicite illum et tunc, si non adusseris tu ungulas tuas et ille si illesus euaserit, fatebor certe quia bene baptizatus est catharus tuus. Si uero non euadit, nonne mox ita calens ad celum uadit?

47 benedicte] benedicto C
47 adusseris] adiusseris C

36-37 Matt. 3:11
Nonne sic nuper baptizauit colonia archicatharum uestrum arnoldum et complices eius et similiter bona theodericum et socios eius et continuo, ut dicitis, auolauerunt in celum? Immo, ut uerius dicatur, descenderunt in profundum inferni ab igne temporali ad ardorem ignis aeterni. Et merito quidem. Vt enim exinanirent baptismum aque constitutum ab ipso domino salutatore,  

52-55 Eckbert refers to the burning of Arnold and his group of accused heretics in Cologne in 1163, also mentioned in Sermones, I, p. 16-17. The fullest account is in the Chronica Regia Coloniensis, MGH, SS, 18, p. 114. This is the only reference I have found to the burning of the Cathar Theodore and his followers at Bonn. From the manner in which Eckbert linked these two episodes, the burning at Bonn probably took place in 1163 as well.

54 bona] Bunna C
iustissimo dei iudicio factum est, ut sic in igne
baptizarentur, ut ab eo irreuocabiliter
deuorarentur. O stultissimi hominum, unde uobis
est ista presumptio qua erigimini aduersus omne
quod euangelicum et catholicum est? Vere,
singularis ille ferus pastum sibi gratissimum in
uobis habet qui tantam singularitatem in cunctis
partibus catholicae fidei habere queritis, ut
singularem quandam in uobis sanctitatem uenerentur
miseri illi quos seducitis.

Differo usque in alium locum exponere qualiter
intelligendum sit illud quod de salvatore nostro
dictum est quoniam "baptizabit in spiritu et igne."
De aque baptismo cui nunc contradicitis, loquor ad
uos. Dicite mihi qua audacia contradicitis ei cum

73 Matt. 3:11

63-64 uobis est ista] uobis ista C
65 et catholicum est] est et catholicum C
68 partibus catholicae fidei, corrected by A from
catholice fidei partibus
69-70 uenerentur miserì, corrected by A from
uenerentur in uobis miserì
72-73 salvatore nostro dictum[ salvatore dictum C
74 cui nunc contradicitis] cui contradicitis, nunc C
ipse dominus eum instituerit et seruandum esse
docuerit? Ipse etenim, sicut sancti quatuor
euangelistae singuli in scripturis suis (f. 32r -
f. 32v) testantur, uenit ad iordanem ubi erat

iohannes baptizans ibique ab eo baptizatus est, non
quia ipse baptismi sanctificacionem indigeret, qui
ab omni peccato erat immunis, sed ut nobis ad
abluenda peccata aquas sanctificaret et in se ipso
nobis exemplum preberet susciendi baptismum aque,
quem constituere uolebat ecclesie sue in
remissionem peccatorum. Ibi et spiritus sanctus in
specie columbe se manifestauit super eum, sicut de
ipso testimonium peribuit iohannes dicens, "Quia
uidi spiritum descendente quasi columbam de celo
et manentem super eum." Quod nostre quoque

77-86 Ipse . . . peccatorum: Matt. 3:13-15; Mark 1:9
88-90 John 1:33; Matt. 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22

88 iohannes, inserted by A from margin
89 de celo, inserted by A from margin
90 quoque, inserted by A from above line
erudicionis et consolacionis causa factum est, ut uidelicet tanto cercius credere possemus ad omnes eos peruenire gratiam spiritus sancti, qui christi baptismum suscipiunt, ut illius capitis, quod christus est, membra efficiantur.

Baptismum nostrum christi baptismum uocamus quia ipse principaliter in eo, ut supra diximus, baptizat dans remissionem peccatorum per spiritum sanctum et quia, ut dictum est, exemplo suo eum nobis initiauit et quoniam in uerbis sancte doctrine sue obseruari eum constituit, determinans in qua materia et secundum quam formam fieri deberet. In qua materia baptizandum esset determinauit quando in aqua hominem regenerari debere demonstrauit dicens, "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et

94-95 quod christus est membra, corrected by A from membra quod christus est
104 demonstrauit] monstrauit C
spiritu sancto, non potest uidere regnum dei."

Propter duas substancias que sunt in omni homine, uidelicet corpus et animam, dixit duo pertinere ad baptismum nostrum, uidelicet aquam et spiritum sanctum. Et nos indubitanter credimus ex uerbis ipsius quod ea hora qua uisible corpus nostrum lauatur in aqua uisible, tunc et inuisibilis substancia nostra, que est anima, lauatur in inuisibili lauacro, uidelicet in spiritu sancto et emundatur ab omni delicto. In quali etiam forma uerborum (f. 32v - f. 33r) baptizari nos uellet determinauit, cum dixit ad discipulos suos, "Euntes, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti." Hec ergo sunt uerba dominica, ex quibus ecclesia dei

105-06 John 3:5
117-19 Matt. 28:19
testimonium habet eius baptismi, qui peruenit usque in nos.

Habet et testimonium ab eo signo quod accidit in passione saluatoris quando ex latere eius, iam mortui, simul profluxerunt aqua et sanguis. Ita enim scribit iohannes dominice passionis testis fidelissimus de crucifixoribus eius dicens, "Venerunt ergo milites, et primi quidem fregerunt crura, et alterius qui crucifixus est cum eo. Ad iesum autem cum uenissent et ut uiderunt eum iam mortuum, non fregerunt eius crura, sed unus militum lancea latus eius aperuit et continuo exiuit sanguis et aqua." Quod si non ad magnam pertineret admiracionem, si non magne rei esset sacramentum, non ita diligenter hoc affirmasset euangelista cum

128-33 John 19:32-34

124 eius] ipsius C
125 simul, inserted by A from margin
125 aqua et sanguis] sanguis et aqua C
129 crucifixus est cum eo] cum eo crucifixus est C
130 uenissent et ut] uenissent ut C
subiunxit dicens, "Et qui uidit testimonium perhibuit et uerum est testimonium eius et scit ille quia dicit uera, ut et uos credatis."

Prudenter itaque utrumque animaduertendum est,

uidelicet et quod ante exitum mortis in cruce dominus purum sanguinem sine aqua de ulneribus suis emisit et quod post emissionem spiritus, mixtum aqua cruorem de latere suo produxit. In quibus rebus aptam et racinabilem nobis significacionem dedit,

uidelicet quod sanguine suo redimeret non solum illos qui ante mortem ipsius per multa secula gratiam redemptionis eius fideliter expectauerant et sine aqua baptismi, qui nondum fuerat constitutus, ab hac uita decesserant sed eos quoque quos per aquam baptismi uolebat regenerari et qui

136-38 John 19:35

136 subiunxit, -sub inserted by A from above line 139 utrumque] hic C 144 racinabilem] rationabilem C
usque in finem seculi mortem eius erant deuote adoraturi. Illa ergo mixtura sanguinis et aque de latere christi producta nobis erat et precium redemptionis et sacra significacio nostre regeneracionis qua per aquam et fidem dominici sanguinis. (f. 33r - f. 33v) Neque enim aqua sine fide passionis, neque fides sine aqua ad regeneracionem sufficiens est.

Dupliciter itaque illud beatum Christi latus ecclesiam dei edificauit et precium redemptionis effundendo et formam regeneracionis nobis ostendendo. Propter quod apostolus ad romanos scribens ait, "Quoniam uetus adam erat forma futuri ade," id est, christi. Nam sicut ex illius dormientis latere fabricata est eua, ita ex istius

163-64 Rom. 5:14

150-51 et qui usque] et usque C
151 deuote, inserted by A from margin
152 ergo mixtura sanguinis et aque] ergo sanguinis et aquae mixtura C
155 per aquam, A reads per per aquam
155 dominici, -ci inserted by A from above line
156 sanguinis. Neque] sanguinis renascimur. Neque C
156 aqua, inserted by A from above line
158 regeneracionem, -ne inserted by A from above line
161 nobis, inserted by A from margin
163 ait] dixit C
165 ex istius] ex latere istius C
in morte sopiti, edificata est sponsa eius ecclesia. Quod si non hac re, dic mihi, o cathare, in qua re ille antiquus adan extiterit forma futuri? Velim super hoc audire occultam sapienciam tuam. Puto quod ad solitum finem deueniet responsio tua, ut dicas, nescio. Si nescis, sede, sile, age opus consuetudinis tue, fac discurrere panuliam tuam cum trama per medium staminis et sine illos tractare de misteriis dei quibus divina ordinacio doctrinam scripturarum sanctarum commisit. Sicut predictum est, ad baptismum aque dominus iesus christus et uius et mortuos nos invitauit. Quod ergo alius baptismata requiris, o infidelis cathare? Si uno deo potes esse contentus, unum quoque tibi baptismat sufficiat, cum scriptum sit, "Unus dominus, una
fides, unum baptisma." Tale tibi baptisma
sufficiat, quale sancti apostoli administrauerunt
his qui baptizati sunt ab eis. Si ignoras qualì
baptismate baptizauerint, lege scripturam luce
185 euangeliste que intitulatur "actus apostolorum,"
cui non minus creditur quam euangelio quod scriptum
est ab eo. Lege, inquàm, in eo loco ubi de
conuersione cornelii et amicorum eius scribit hoc
modo, "Adhuc loquente petro, cecidit spiritus
190 sanctus super omnes qui audiebant uerbum. Et
obstupuerunt qui erant ex circumcisione fideles, qui
uenerant cum petro, quia et in (f. 33v - f. 34r)
nationes gratia spiritus sancti effusa est.
Audiebant enim illos loquentes linguís et
195 magnificantes deum. Tunc respondit petrus, 'Nunquid

180-81 Eph. 4:5
aquam quis prohibere potest ut non baptizentur hii
qui spiritum sanctum acceperunt, sicut et nos?" Et
iussit eos in nomine iesu christi baptizari." Audi,
insensate, quoniam princeps apostolorum non ignem
sed aquam ad baptizandum homines illos iussit
exhiberi.

Item refert eadem scriptura de philippo, qui
erat unus ex discipulis christi, quoniam cum
euangelizaret iesum eunucho candacis, regine
ethiopum, sedens cum illo in curru sicut
ordinauerat angelus domini, uenerunt ad quandam
aquam et ait eunuchus, "'Ecce aqua, quis prohibet me
baptizari?' Dixit autem philippus, 'Si credis ex
toto corde, licet.' Et respondens, dixit, 'Credo
filium dei esse iesum.' Et iussit stare currum et

189-98 Acts 10:44-48
202-06 Acts 8:26-35

195-96 Nunquid aquam quis prohibere potest ut non
baptizentur] Nunquis prohibere potest quo
minus aqua baptizentur C
200 iussit] fecit C
210 filium dei] dei filium C
descenderunt uterque in aquam philippus et eunuchus
et baptizauit eum. Cum autem ascendissent de aqua,
spiritus domini rapuit philippum et amplius non
uidit eum eunuchus." De hoc quoque quid tibi
uidetur? "Puto et philippus errauit, quando in aqua
hominem baptizauit." Certe si tuam sapientiam
habuisset cum ab eo petebat eunuchus, ut in aqua
baptizaret, respondisse debuerat ei, "Non non,
immo, differendum est nobis usque dum ad diuersorium
ueniamus et introibimus in obscuram cameram;
accendemus luminaria multa et ibi te baptizabo in
medio ignis." O fili erroris, utinam non peius
errares quam philippus. Vtinam non te peior angelus
duceret quam erat ille angelus qui philippum ad hoc
opus direxit. Quid ergo est, inquis, quod iohannes

---

207-14 Acts 8:36-39

212 ascendissent, A reads descendissent
215 et, inserted by A from above line
216-17 sapienciam habuisset] habuisset sapientiam C
217-18 aqua baptizaret] aqua eum baptizaret C
221 luminaria] C reads lnminaria
223 te, inserted by A from above line]
225 est, inquis] inquis, est C
baptista dicebat, "Baptizandos nos esse in spiritu et igne"? Ego de hoc in sequenti capitulo (f. 34r - f. 34v) loqui dispono, ita ut tibi sit in scandalum et appareat magis esse contra te quam pro te.

Qualitercumque autem hoc intelligendum sit, certum et manifestum est ex his que nunc dicta sunt quoniam unum et unicum baptismum constitutum est a deo ad emundacionem et sanctificacionem totius ecclesie, uidelicet baptisma aque cum invocacione sancte trinitatis, quod breui sermone comprehendit apostolus ubi ad ephesios scribens ait, "Viri, diligite uxores uestras, sicut et deus dilexit ecclesiam et tradidit semetipsum pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret, mundans eam lauacro aque in uerbo

226-27 Matt. 3:11

227 ignem"?] ignem. C
227 sequenti, A reads presenti] sequenti C
227 capitulo, -it inserted by A from above line
228 tibi sit] sit tibi C
231 autem, inserted by A from margin
232 certum et manifestum est ex] certum et manifestum ex C
232 nunc] iam C
233 baptismum] baptisma C
236-37 comprehendit apostolus] Apostolus comprehendit C
240 mundans eam lauacro] mandas lauacro C
240 aque, inserted by A from margin
uite." Da gloriam deo tandem, o kathare, et hac in quoque parte uictum te esse confitere. Et nunc transeamus hinc ad aliud certamen.

237-41 Eph. 5:25-26

241 hc, inserted by A from margin
242 quoque, inserted by A from above line
Sermo X

Contra sextam heresim de animabus mortuorum

De cura que pro mortuis agitur in ecclesia dicitis quoniam una est et superflua, asserentes quod anime defunctorum singule in ipsa hora emigracionis sue de hac uita, pro meritis suis uel in eterna beatitudine collocentur, uel eternis suppliciis tradantur, atque hac racione probatis nec malis prodesse nec bonis necessarium esse, ut pro eis oraciones fiant aut missae celebrentur aut elemosine dentur. Non enim in fide uestra hoc admittere uultis quod preter illum eternum ignem, qui paratus est diabolo et angelis eius, his qui cum ipso in perpetuum dampnandi sunt aliquae purgatorie pene sint in quibus anime fidelium que in hac uita a peccatis suis per condignam satisfactionem ad plenum

11-12 paratus . . . eius: Matt. 25:41

3 una est et superflua] una et superflua est C
11 qui paratus] que preparatus C
12 et anglis eius, his] et his C
13 perpetuum, -pe inserted by A from above line
15 satisfactionem, inserted by A from below line
purgate non sunt, ad tempus examinantur atque ex
eisdem per illa remedia que nunc descripsimus
liberentur et ad requiem transferantur.

Et nunc de his quoque disseramus secundum

20 scripturas ueritatis quia magnam earum noticiam uos
habere gloriamini. Primum autem (f. 34v - f. 35r)
dicite mihi an creditis quia dominus iesus
christus, in passione crucis, emisit spiritum et
secundum corpus quidem sepultus est, secundum animam

25 uero descendit ad inferna et spoliauit principes
tenebrarum ab animabus electorum, qui, uel ante
legem uel sub lege moysi que saluare neminem
poterat, ab hac uita migrauerant et promissam
prioribus seculis redempcionis sue graciam que per

30 christum facta est fideliter exspectauerant? Si

25-26 Eph. 4:9-10

19 nunc de his quoque] nunc quoque C
23 crucis, inserted by A from above line
28 promissam] promissum C
30 exspectauerant] expectauerant C
uere hoc credendum est quod anime ille a penis illis in quibus detente erant per christum liberate sunt, certum est quoniam mendacii predicatores estis, qui dicitis nullas esse penas animarum preter eterna supplicia damnandorum et neminem posse liberari a penis qui non statim post mortem fuerit in eterna beatitudine assumptus. At si non creditis christum ad inferos descendisse post passionem suam neque illud athanasii simbolum recipitis in quo hoc continetur pariterque illud catholicum simbolum quod publice in servicio dei decantaur recitis in quo similiter hoc confitetur ecclesia scripturarum super hoc testmonia uobis inducenda sunt tam de ueteri quam de novo testamento. Dauit propheta in psalmo depromit uocem
angelorum preeuncium ad tanta inferos christum et
inperancium principibus tartari hoc modo, "Attollite
portas, principes, uestras et eleuamini porte
eternales et introibit rex glorie." Et rursum idem
david, uictorie christi congratulans que ereptas ab
inferno animas secum cauxit ad celos, alibi dicit ad
eum, "Ascendisti in altum cepisti captiuitatem."
Item per osse prophetam ipsa filii dei persona ait,
"O mors, ero mors tua, morsus tuus ero inferne." (f.
34v - f. 35r) Morsus iste inferni tunc inpletus est
quando salvator, ad inferos descendens, electos suos
sua inuincibili potestate et iusticia inde abcidit;
reprobos autem ibi reliquit, sicut qui rem aliquam
mordet partem eius in ore comprehendit, partem foris
relinquit. Et apostolus paulus scribens ad

47-49 Ps. 24:7
52 Ps. 68:19
54 Hosea 13:14

51 animas secum] secum animas C
58 ibi] illic C

Ad eam nisi fallor responsionem nunc confugietis ut dicatis, "Concedimus quidem quod ante redemptoris audentum anime ad uitam preordinate in locis penalibus auenturis gaudiis differebantur, sed postquam per christum uitae patefactus est aditus hoc communiter omnibus saluandis collatum est, ut peracto cursu uitae huius nullatenus ab introitu regni differentur post mortem, sicut manifestum est ex eo quod latroni in cruce penitenti a salvatore olim dictum est, 'Amen, dico tibi, hodie mecum eris in paradiso.'" Hoc

61-63 Col. 2:15
74-75 Luke 23:43

61 Exspolians, inquit, principatus] Expolians principatus C
63 nunc, inserted by A from margin
65 nisi] hi C
71 cursu uite huius] uitae huius cursu C
72 nullatenus ab] nullatenus ultra ab C
74 salvatore, A reads salutore
enim de omni communiter peccatore senciendum esse
censetis quod si ipso uite sue termino penituerit
ex corde, quantulumlibet flagiosus per totam uitam
suam extiterit, ita perfecte ei cuncta peccata
remittantur ut continuo ab hac uita, sine omni
examinacione, transmigret ad celestia regna.

Ad confirmandum uero hunc errorem quarumdam
scripturarum testimonia inducis que adversari
nobis uidentur. Ex quibus est illud ezechelis,

"Iusticia iusti non liberabit eum, in quacumque die
peccauerit et inpietas inpii non nocebit ei,
quacumque die conversus fuerit ab inpietate sua."

Et rursum (f. 35v - f. 36r) quod sequitur ibidem
simile est huic, "Si dixerio inpio, morte morieris
et conversus egerit penitenciam a peccato suo,

85-87 Eze. 33:12

76 de omni communiter] communiter de omni C
77 si ipso] si in Christo ipso C
80 remittantur] remittuntur C
feceritque iudicium et iusticiam, pignus debitori restituerit, rapinamque reddiderit in mandatis uite ambulauerit nec fecerit quicquam iniustum uita uiiet et non morietur. Omnia peccata eius, que peccauit, non inputabuntur ei." Hic ergo captos nos reciaculis scripture iudicatis et dicitis nobis insultantes: "Ecce scripture nobiscum est que affirmat quoniam peccatori conuerso ab impietate sua non nocebit inpietas sua." Iterumque idipsum inculcat dicens, "Quoniam omnia peccata eius, que fecit, non inputabuntur ei." Falsum itaque est quod post penitenciam et contricionem cordis in qua peccatori remissa sunt peccata sua, de cetero tradatur aliquibus penis cruciandus et purgandus post mortem. Nam si hoc futurum est ei post

89-95 Eze. 33:14-15
100-01 Eze. 33:16

92 restituerit, rapinamque, inserted by A from margin
92 reddiderit, in] reddiderit, et in C
100 peccata eius que] peccata quae C
103 peccata, corrected by A from peccatori
104 tradatur aliquibus penis] aliquibus poenis tradatur C
conversionem suam, profecto nocet ei adhuc
inpietas sua et inputabuntur ei peccata. Talis est,
o piphles, aduersum nos obiectio uestra.

Audite nunc quid respondeamus ad hec antequam

de aliis obiectionibus uestris aliquid dicamus.
Verba sancte scripture cum magna discrecione
animaduertenda sunt, alioqui in multis locis
perturbare nimium possunt lectorem, suntque ei uasa
mortis quoniam sepe in uno eodemque dicto diverse
significaciones intelligi possunt, quarum una
pertineat ad ueritatem, altera ad falsitatem.
Itaque et illa uerba prophete de quibus nunc
tractamus, ne in nos mittant quemadmodum et uos cum
tali determinacione accipimus, ut dicamus, quoniam

inpio, quacumque die conversus fuerit, de cetero

106 ei adhuc] adhuc ei C
107 peccata. Talis] peccata sua. Talis C
108 aduersum nos obiectio uestra] obiectio uestra contra nos C
109 quid] quod C
109 hec] hoc C
110 aliquid] aliquod C
112 alioqui] alioqui C
113 nimium, inserted by A from margin
116 pertineat ad ueritatem altera] ad ueritatem alia pertineat C
117 de quibus, inserted by A from margin
120 die, inserted by A from above line
non nocet inpietas sua tali, uidelicet nocuento
ut pro ea eterniter condempnetur neque
inputabuntur peccata ad perdicionem ipsius. (f. 36r
- f. 36v) Quamuis et enim peccator post
125 conuersionem suam aliquid paciatur molestie in
anima a purgatorioigne pro peccatis suis de quibus
non sufficienter correctionem in hac uita sustinuit,
illa tamen molestia, quia temporalis est et
transitoria, quasi nullum nocumentum reputanda est
130 comperacione illius eterniter pene quam in inferno pati
debuisset, si conuersus ab inpietate sua ante mortem
non fuisset. Ostendam autem uobis similem
scripturam que simili indiget determinacione.
Beatus petrus in epistola sua quibusdam nouiter ad
135 fidem christi conuersis dicebat, "Et quis est qui

120-21 Eze. 33:12

122 ea] eo C
124 et enim, inserted by A from above line] enim C
125 aliquid patiatur molestie] aliquid molestiae
patiatur C
128-29 est et transitoria] et transitoria est C
130 comperacione] comparatione C
uobis noceat, si boni emulatores fueritis?" Hec autem interrogatio idem significabat acsi ita affirmando dixisset, "Nemo est qui uobis nocere possit, si boni, id est, bonitatis, emulatores fueritis." Dominus autem iesus christus in euangelio discipulis suis simulque ceteris boni emulatibus hec annunciat dicens, "Tradent uos in tribulacione et occident uos et eritis odio omnibus propter nomen meum." Item, "In mundo pressuram habebitis, in me autem pacem."

Ecce, similiter hic ut supra potestis raciocinari aduersum nos ita ut dicatis, "Si boni emulatores traduntur in tribulacione, occiduntur, odio habentur ab omnibus et multa huiusmodi propter iusticiam paciuntur, certum est multos illis nocere

135-36 1 Pet. 3:13
142-44 Matt. 24:9
144-45 John 16:33

137-38 si ita affirmando] si affirmando C
147 aduersum] aduersus C
pro eo quod boni emulatores sunt." Non ergo uerum dicit petrus, qui nullum eis nociturum esse promisit si boni emulatores existant. Puto autem quod non tam insani capitis sitis ut in manifesto dicere audeatis aut petrum aut christum fuisse mentitos aut contraria sibi inuicem eos dixisse. Scitote autem quoniam uerba petri que induximus ita intelligimus ut non (f. 36v - f. 37r) promiserit seruis dei qui bona emulantur quoniam nichil omnino molestie pati deberent in uia iusticie. Nam et ipse petrus continuo post uerba illa subiecit, "Sed et si quid patimini propter iusticiam beati." Hoc autem in uerbis illis significare uoluit quoniam nemo eis ita nociturus esset ut ab eterna beatitudine eos abstrahere posset. "Certus quippe

162 1 Pet. 3:14

152 eis] illis C
156 mentitos] mentitum C
156 eos, inserted by A from above line
157 Scitote autem, quoniam] Scitote quoniam C
161 ipse petrus continuo] ipse continuo C
161 continuo, corrected by A from continio
161 uerba illa] illa uerba
163 Hoc] Hic C
erat quoniam neque mors neque uita neque gladius neque fames neque ulla aduersitas, nulla denique creatura ueros emulatores boni separare posset a caritate christi." Neque enim temporales incommoditates nocumentum esse sed pocius iuuamentum ad adipiscendam beatitudinem electis dei esse arbitratus est. Sicut enim auro non nocetis qui illud in igne examinat, sed pocius iuuat ut magis resplendeat, ita fidelium persecutores, dum eos tribulant, non eis nocent ut putant, sed pocius eis cooperantur ut in beatitudine eterna resplendeant. Iuxta hoc ergo que nunc dicta sunt, considerate et illud, quoniam inpio ab inpietate sua conuerso non nocebit inpietas sua et non faciet uos deuiare sermo ille a uia ueritatis.

165-69 Rom. 8:39
172-74 Sicut . . . resplendeat: Cf. 1 Pet. 1:7; 1 Cor. 3:12-13;
178-79 Eze. 33:12

171 adipiscendam] adipiscendum C
172 esse, inserted by A from above line
172 enim, inserted by A from margin
177 hoc] haec C
177 nunc dicta sunt, corrected by A from dicta sunt nunc C
178-79 inpietate sua conuerso] inpietate conuerso C
Aliud quoque ex ecclesiaste contra nos inducitis, quod tale est, "Si ceciderit lignum ad austrum, aut ad aquilonem, in quocumque loco ceciderit ibi erit." Quod similiter in partem erroris uestri inclinatis, dicentes ita intelligi debere. Anima de corpore migrans, si declinauerit ad quietem, ibi erit perpetuo, si ad penam, ibi quoque perpetuo erit. Dico autem quia si nichil aliud quam hoc quod dicitis significare uoluit ecclesiastes in uerbis illis, superflue interpositum est "in quocumque loco ceciderit." Nam ad significandum sententiam uestram suffecisset ei dixisse, "Si ceciderit lignum ad austrum siue ad aquilonem, ibi erit."

Nunc autem, attendite sermonem meum et

---

182-84 Eccl. 11:3
193-94 Eccl. 11:3

181 quoque, inserted by A from margin
187 erit perpetuo) perpetuo erit C
193 ceciderit, corrected by A from cecederit C
apparebit quam uim habeat quod additum est, "in quocumque loco ceciderit." (f. 37r - f. 37v)
Considerate precedentem litteram et inuenietis quod ad dandam elemosinam hortatur auditorem suum
dicens, "Mitte panem tuum super transeuntes aquas, quia post multa tempora inuenies eum," et iterum, "Da partes septem nec non et octo, quia ignoras quid mali futurum sit super terram." Et in sequentibus ad perseveranciam boni operis hortatur dicens,
"Mane semina semen tuum et uespere non cesset manus tua." Quibus congrue illud interponit dicens, "Si ceciderit lignum ad austrum siue ad aquilonem, in quocumque loco ceciderit, ibi erit." Acsi dicat, "Diligenter insiste dum uuiis augere merita tua elemosinis et bonis operibus, quia post mortem,

200-03 Eccl. 11:1-2
205-06 Eccl. 11:6
206-08 Eccl. 11:3

191-97 Nam ad ... loco ceciderit, inserted by a from margin
201 eum] illum C
203 mali futurum sit] futurum sit mali C
207-08 in quocumque loco ceciderit, inserted by A from margin
209 dum uuiis, inserted by A from margin
siue deuenerit homo in eum statum qui pertinet ad
eos qui saluandi sunt, quod est cadere ad austrum,
siue deuenerit ad eum statum qui pertinet ad
dampnandos, quod est cadere ad aquilonem, in
215 quocumque loco ceciderit, id est, in quocumque gradu
meritorum tunc fuerit quando cadet, siue sint bona
siue mala, ibi erit, id est, inde non ascendet
promerendo meliora neque descendet promerendo
peiora." Ex tunc enim neque bono neque reprobo
220 locus dabitur promerendi bona uel mala sed de
cetero erit tempus suscipiendi retribuciones bonas
vel malas.

Dupliciter autem cadit lignum ad austrum, siue
quando statim post mortem uir iustus in beatitudine
225 collocatur, quod tantum est perfectissimorum qui cum

216 meritorum, inserted by A from margin
216 sint, inserted by A from above line
217 non] neque C
217 ascendet, corrected by A from ascendent
217 ascendet, -as inserted by A from above line
221 erit tempus] tempus erit C
223 dupliciter, A reads dupliciciter
deo mundum iudicabunt, siue quando in eam uiam incidit per quam transire habent quidam saluandorum quibus per purgatorias penas eundum est ad refrigerium, uidelicet hii qui iudicandi erunt ad uitam. Similiter ad aquilonem dupliciter cadunt mali cum (f. 37v - f. 38r) uel statim post mortem ad summa supplicia rapiuntur, ut hii de qualibus dicitur quod iam iudicati sunt, uidelicet infideles et summe mali, uel illis penis traduntur in quibus usque ad nouissimum iudicium reseruandi sunt, ut illi reprobi qui iudicandi sunt ad mortem. Est autem frequens hic modus loquendi in scriptura sacra, ut auster uocetur celestis beatitudo propter divinam claritatem que in ipsa est; aquilo autem mansio reproborum tenebrosa et operta mortis

226 quando, inserted by A from margin
227 transire] transere C
231 uel, inserted by A from margin
238 celestis, inserted by A from margin
239 in ipsa est] est in ipsa C
caligine.

Aliud quoque capitulum simile ei quod nunc tractatum est, quasi ex persona domini dictum nobis, obicitis quod huiusmodi est, "Ubi te inuenero, ibi te iudicabo." Quod et ita dictum arbitramini ac si diceret, "In fine tuo, cum a te repetam animam tuam, in qualis uita te inuenero, in tali statim te iudicabo, uel ad perpetuam requiem uel ad eternam dampnacionem." Nos uero aliter uerba ista discernimus. Breuiter comprehensum est in his uerbis quod diffusius per ezechielem loquitur dicens, "Cum auerterit se iustus a iusticia sua et fecerit iniquitatem, in iniusticia sua quam operatus est morietur. Et cum auerterit se impius ab impietate sua quam operatus est et fecerit iudicium

244-45 Eze. 21:30

247 statim te] te statim C
249 aliter uerba ista] aliter ista C
et iusticiam, ipse animam suam uiuificabit, uita uiuet et non morietur," subauditur, morte eterna. Tocius huius capituli breuis sentencia est illud, "Ubi te inuenero, ibi te iudicabo, siue qualem te inuenero quod idem est, talem te iudicabo." Hoc est dicere, "Si inuenero te auersum ab iniusticia et conuersum ad iusticiam, non est desperandum tibi propter retroacta mala quia ibi, id est, in eo statu conuersionis tue te iudicabo, id est, discernam ab his qui dampnandi sunt. Si uero inuenero te auersum a iusticia, non est confidendum tibi in retroacta iusticia, quia ibi, id est, in eo statu te iudicabo, id est, discernam ab his qui saluandi sunt." Discernit autem deus bonos a malis cum uel statim post mortem ad beatitudinem eos inducit, uel in ea
purgacione eos locat, in qua ad futuram gloriam (f. 38r - f. 38v) eos aptificat.

Est tamen ex habundanti quod uobis respondemus ad ea testimonia que ex ueteri scriptura inducitis ad confirmandum errorem uestrum quam de animabus mortuorum habetis. Nam si fatemini quod necessario fateri debetis, uidelicet quod anime antiquorum qui ante tempus gratie extiterunt usque ad tempus redempcionis ab introitu regni celestis dilate sunt, contrarii estis uobismetipsis, qui antiquorum patrum scripta hoc attestari estimatis quod quelibet anima, cum a corpore migrat, statim ad eternam beatitudinem transeat uel ad eternam damnacionem. Nam ea testimonia que ab illis assumitis non solum pertinent ad homines temporum istorum sed ad

\[\text{273 tamen]} autem C \\
\text{275 quam]} quem C \\
\text{280 estis uobismetipsis, corrected by A from uobismetipsis estis} \\
\text{282 statim ad]} statim uel ad C \\
\text{285 pertinent, inserted by A from margin}\]
homines antique legis sub qua adhuc clausus erat introitus regni celorum.

Non autem me latet quod ex nouo quoque testamento errorem uestrum confirmatis, obicientes nobis euangelicum illum sermonem quam locutus est saluator dicens, "Amen, dico uobis, quia qui uerbum meum audit et credit ei qui misit me, habet uitam eternam et in iudicium non uenit sed transit a morte in uitam." In his uerbis dicitis promittere saluatorem omni credenti in deum quod mox post mortem corporis transibit quisque ad uitam eternam, ita ut non ad aliud iudicium ueniat post mortem quam quod in ipsa morte experitur atque indubitanter hoc dominum significasse uultis hoc sermone quod nulle sint pene in quibus anime fidelium post mortem

290 illum, inserted by A from above line
290 quam] quem C
293 transit] transibit C
iudicium dei sustineant. Animalibus immundis quae
non ruminant quidem et unguam non findunt comparari
uire debetis, qui in ore quidem uersatis doctrinam
dei et nullam recte intelligencie in ea discretionem
habetis ideoque uerba uite non sunt uobis ad uitam,
se ad mortem. (f. 38v - f. 39r) Ceci fuerunt
doctores uestri et cecorum duceti sunt et in
foueam mendacii et perdicionis secum cadere uos
fecerunt.

Audite ergo, rebelles et increduli, quomodo
rectius animaduertere possitis uerba domini quae
peruertere nitimini, quia nisi aliter exponantur
quam uos ea intelligatis, contraria sunt aliis sacre
scripture uerbis que in suo loco inducemus, "Amen,
dico uobis," inquit, "quia qui uerbum meum audit et
credit ei qui misit me," uidelicet deo patri, si quidem audire uerbum dei et non credere inutile est; hic, inquam, habet uitam eternam. Habent sancti qui cum deo regnant uitam eternam ita quod iam eius beatitudine perfruuntur. Habent et fideles in hoc mundo positi uitam eternam, non ut rem qua iam secundum desiderium suum perfruantur, sed ut rem que illis certissime preparata et conservata est a deo, danda in tempore suo.

"Et in iudicium non ueniet, sed transiet a morte in uitam." Nomen iudicii tres significationes in scriptura sancta habere dinoscitetur. Significat enim flagellationem qua homines corripiuntur a domino, significat ultimam discriminationem bonorum et malorum que fiet in
nouissimo die, significat etiam dampnationem que
specialiter ad reprobos pertinet. Quod autem
afflictionem significet ex eo intelligi potest quod
apostolus ait, "Dum iudicamur autem a domino
corripimur," id est, dum flagellantur a domino
corripimur ut non cum hoc mundo dampnemur. Que
sint autem ista flagella determinat ubi ait, "Ideo
inter uos multi infirmi et imbecilles et dormiunt
multi." (f. 39r - f. 39v) Quod si secundum hanc
significationem dicitis accipiendum iudicii nomen
cum dicitur quod "qui credit non ueniet in
iudicium", non potest stare sermo, quia et credentes
flagellantur sepe a domino sicut non credentes,
"Flagellat enim deus omnem filium quem recipit." At
si dicitis ita debere accipi quod credentes non

334-35 1 Cor. 11:32
337-39 1 Cor. 11:30
344 Heb. 12:6

337 sint autem] autem sint C
sint uenturi post mortem ad aliam castigationem
preter eam quam in ista uita paciuntur, iniuriam
facitis littere que hoc non dicit sed simpliciter
dicit quod "qui credit in iudicium non ueniet."

350 Ultimam uero discriminationem bonorum et malorum
significat nomen iudicii, ubi salvator de se ipso
ait, "Et potestatem dedit ei iudicium facere, quia
filius hominis est." Secundum hanc quoque
significationem non potest accipi hoc loco quia
tam boni quam mali ad iudicium uenient secundum
illud, "Omnes nos oportet manifestari ante tribunal
dei, ut referat unusquisque propria corporis prout
gessit in corpore, siue bonum siue malum."
Significat autem damnationem iudicii nomen ut
statim in sequentibus cum dicitur, "Qui uero mala

352-53 John 5:27
356-58 2 Cor. 5:10

348 littere, A reads litter
352 ait] dicit C
egerunt in resurrectionem iudicii," et in apostolo
ubi ait, "Qui manducat corpus domini indigne,
iudicum sibi manducat et bibit non diiudicans
corpus domini." Hoc autem modo indubitanter accipi
debet iudicium in presenti sermone ubi a domino
dicitur, "Qui audit uerbum meum et credit ei qui
misit me habet uitam eternam et in iudicium non
ueniet," id est, in damnationem. Seguitur "sed
transiet a morte in uitam," ab ea uidelicet morte que ei damnationis causa (f. 39v - f. 40r)
exitet et per quam ad perditionem transisset, si
in ipsa permansisset. Que nam fuit mors illa? Sine
dubio mors anime quam in ea effecerat infidelitas,
in quali morte exiterant illi, de quibus petrus in
epistola ait, "Propter quod mortuis euangelizatum

360-61 John 5:29
362-64 1 Cor. 11:29
366-69 John 5:24

364 corpus, inserted by A from margin
371 transisset] transiisset C
373 effecerat, -ef inserted by A from above line
est." Similiter et illi quibus paulus scripsit
dicens, "Consepulti estis cum christo in baptismo,
in quo resurrexistis per fidem operationis dei, qui
suscitaut illum a mortuis. Et uos cum essetis
mortui in delictis, conuiuificauit cum illo, donans
uobis omnia delicta."

Palam ergo est quoniam per fidem transitur ad
uitam ut non ad iudicium, id est, dampnationem
ueniatur. Id autem duobus modis sit; uno enim modo
quisque ad uitam anime per fidem a morte transit
quando qui infidelis fuerat per fidem iustificatur
in anima. Ad hunc enim pertinet sermo quo dicitur,
"Justus autem ex fide uiuit." Hanc uero uitam in
tempore huius mortalitatis electi dei adipiscuntur.

Alio autem modo per fidem ad uitam electis

375-76 1 Pet. 4:6
377-81 Col. 2:12-13
388 Hab. 2:4; Gal. 3:11; Rom. 1:17

389 tempore, A reads tempor
transeundum est quando propter meritum fidei et earum uirtutum, que ex fide originem habent, uita eterna eis pariter in corpore et in anima tribuenda est, quod erit in die nouissime resurrectionis cum ab omni potestate mortis liberabuntur et ad beatam immortalitatem transferentur.

Hos autem duos modos transeundi a morte ad uitam in electis suis futuros dominus demonstrauit continuo (f. 40r - f. 40v) post uerba de quibus nunc tractatum est. Primum enim modum transeundi ad uitam pronunciauit cum dixit, "Amen, dico uobis, quia uenit hora et nunc est quando mortui audient uocem filii dei et qui audierint uiuent." Secundum uero modum transeundi ad uitam pronunciauit cum postea subdidit dicens, "Nolite mirari hoc, quia

401-03 John 5:25

402 uenit] ueniet C
omnes qui in monumentis sunt audient uocem eius et procedent qui bona fecerunt in resurrectionem uite, qui uero mala egerunt in resurrectionem iudicii."

Iam si quid incorrupte intelligentie est uobis, satis directe me ad ueritatem uos duxisse percipitis. Quod si sine intellectu estis, frustra a sinis canit lira.


405-08 John 5:28-29
415-16 1 Cor. 3:8
416-17 Gal. 6:5
417-18 Eze. 33:20; 7:27; 7:3, 8

414 obuiare, A reads ouiare] obuiare C
fieri quod per bona opera uiuorum adiuuentur anime
defunctorum, ut a penis suis liberentur et ad
requiem transfe\textsuperscript{r}xantur.

Dicitis enim quod si deus illis miseretur

propter bona opera que alii pro illis fecerunt, tunc
eis non retribuitur secundum opera sua sed secundum
opera aliorum et non ipsi onus suum portant, id
est, penam quam ipsi meruerunt peccatis suis, si pro
laboribus aliorum ab oneribus suis liberantur. Ad
hec ita respon-(f. 40v - f. 41r)-demus. Si fideles
pro defunctis suis orant, ieiunant, elemosinas
lar\textsuperscript{q}iuntur, missas celebrant aut celebrari faciunt,
bona opera operantur et ipsimet in tempore suo
mercedem pro istis recipient secundum suum laborem;
illi uero pro quibus ista faciunt si in crimina\textsuperscript{lib}ibus

425 illis} aliis C
peccatis in uita sua fuerunt et deipsis nec
penituerunt nec confessionem facere curauerunt,
nichil illis bona opera hec prodesse poterunt ad
salutem. Si uero in peccata aliqua lapsi fuerunt
in uita sua et de his ante finem penituerunt et in
fide catholica de hoc seculo migauerunt et morte
preuenti non poterunt omnem satisfactionem implere,
quam pro peccatis suis deebant, dicimus quia onus
suum portabunt, id est, penam pro peccatis suis
sustinebunt, quamdiu permiserit deus. Pro
penitentia autem sua quam in fine habuerunt et pro
fide catholica in qua usque ad mortem permanserunt,
ac pro ceteris bonis que in hac uita fecerunt hanc
mercedem recipient, ut eis detur uita eterna in
nouissimo die et in anima et in corpore.

437 confessionem facere] confessionem sua facere C
438 hec] hic C
441 catholica, corrected by A from chatholica
Plurimi uero istorum etiam hoc in mercede recipient ut ante nouissimum diem liberentur a penis suis per bona opera uiuentium fidelium quae supra memorata sunt; alii quidem cicius, alii autem tardius, secundum quod merita eorum maiora uel minora fuerunt in hoc mundo. De his itaque uere dicere possumus utrumque et quod onus suum portabunt quia sustinent penam pro peccatis suis secundum tempus quod constituit illis deus et quod ipsis retribuitur secundum bona opera ipsorum quibus meruerunt, ut posset eis subueniri ab ecclesia dei. Possibile quidem esset deo sine alicuius interuentu (f. 41r – f. 41v) quorumlibet hominum animas liberare a penis suis. Uult autem hoc ordine eas liberari ut a uiuis ei seruiatur

457 possumus, A reads posumus
461 posset] possit C
pro eis, quatinus in hoc ipso magis commoneantur
uiui deum reuereri et offensam eius cauere
pariterque augeantur et merita eorum per opera
pietatis que faciunt pro dilectione proximorum.

470 In nullo ergo contrarie nobis sunt scripture
que supra memorate sunt sed potius nobiscum sunt.
Si uerba divina uobis, o insulsi sapientes, cum
diligenti consideratione decoxissent, hi qui ea tam
cruda in ore uestro posuerunt, magis salubriter uos
pauissent et non tanta uentositate superbie corda
uestra inaniter distendissent. Et quidem
obiectionibus uestrins quibus maxime fidebatis satis,
ut estimo, responsum est et complose sunt, quasi
uesice turgentes et nichil inuentum est ueritatis in
480 eis.

466 quatinus] quatenus C
470 contrarie nobis] nobis contrariae C
473 qui] qua C
Nunc autem inquiramus scripturas que nobiscum sunt pro parte ueritatis ad cuius defensionem accincti sumus. Et ut a paulo incipiamus, intueamur primum uerba que ad chorinthios scrisit dicens, "Si quis autem edificat super fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides preciosos, ligna, fenum, stipulam, uniuscuiusque opus manifestum erit. Dies enim domini declarabit et uniuscuiusque opus, quale sit, ignis probabit. Si cuius opus manserit quod superedificauit, mercedem accipiet. Si cuius opus arserit, detrimentum pacietur; ipse autem saluus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem."

Non propter nostros quidem quibus sanctorum patrum nota sunt scripta (f. 41v - f. 42r) sed uestri erroris occasione, necesse est nunc me

485-92 1 Cor. 3:12-15

485-86 fundamentum aurum] fundamentum hoc aurum C
486 ligna] lignum C
494 patrum nota sunt scripta] nota sunt scripta patrum C
sermonis huius sensum aperire. Fundamentum spiritualis edificii quod intus in anima construimus fides christi est. Quam qui uere habet christum in mente gerit, qui est et initium consummatio omnis boni in electis suis ideoque et ipse fundamentum uocatur. Fundamentum nostrum dicitur fides quia a fide bonam uitam inchoamus. Nam si non sit in nobis recta fides, nichil in nobis potest deo placitum esse quicquid faciamus, siue bonum siue malum. Ex quo autem in nobis esse ceperit fides, placere incipimus deo iamque secure possimus operari bona opera quia de cetero mercedem suam accipient.

Lapides preciosos super fundamentum edificamus quando hoc recte fidei adicimus, ut bonis moribus
simus ornati, uidelicet humilitate, pacientia, temperantia, iusticia, misericordia, et ceteris huiusmodi moribus quos uirtutes animi uocamus. Quocienscumque etiam opera facimus que ex huiusmodi uirtutibus procedunt, lapides preciosos fundamento superedificamus. Lapidibus autem preciosis talia digne comparantur quia, sicut lapides preciosi aurum et alias res que in seipsis pulchre sunt ornare solent, ita uirtutes et opera bona decorem magnum prestant anime rationali que secundum deum formata est et est preciosior omni auro. Decor autem iste non potest in anima dissolui, etiam si in ignem purgatorium pro aliquibus leuioribus culpis fuerit missa, sicut et lapides preciosi liquefieri non possunt si in ignem mittantur.

518 se ipsis pulchre] se pulchrae C
519 opera bona] bona opera C
522 si, inserted by A from margin
Argentum quoque fundamento (f. 42r - f. 42v)
superedificant quibus hoc studium est ut divinas
scripturas intelligant et sermonibus sapientie
alios instruant. Argento autem quod habet dulcem
et acutam sonoritatem comparari solet scriptura
sacra ut ibi, "Eloquia domini, eloquia casta,
argentum igne examinatum." Quid enim dulcius sonat
quam sacra scriptura in qua uite etene gaudia
promittuntur? Quid accucius diuino sermone qui est
penetrabior omni gladio ancipiti et pertingens usque
ad divisionem animæ et spiritus?

Item et aurum in edificio suo collocat qui tam
perfecte contemplationi cor suum tradit ut possit
iugiter meditari de deo et trahere de occultis
sapientiam eius qua gustatur suauitas eius

531–32 Ps. 12:7
534–36 Quid . . . spiritus?: Cf. Heb. 4:12

530 acutam, corrected by A from accutam
534 promittuntur?] promittuntur. C
535 penetrabior] penetrabilior C
535 pertingens] pertingente C
539 meditari de deo] de deo meditari C
540 eius, qua gustatur eius suauitas] qua gustatur suauitas eius C
540 suauitas, A reads suauaitas] suauitas C
ipsumque sine intermissione orare, ipsum incessabili
caritatis ardore circuire. Talis contemplatio recte
auro comparatur quia cunctis uirtutibus
excellentior est sicut ceteris metallis preciosius

est aurum estque effectrix operum summe
perfectionis que et ipsa, quasi aurum, sunt in
edificio anime comparata ceteris operibus bonis.

Facit enim abstinere propter deum etiam ab his
quorum usus licitus est. Facit contemptnere mundum

et omnem gloriam eius, castitatem immaculatam
custodire, animam pro deo et fratribus ponere ac
cetera huiusmodi. Ligna uero, fenun, et stipulam
super fundamentum suum coaceruant, qui cum rectam
fidem habeant nimis occupant corda sua curis et
cogitationibus que pertinent in hunc mundum, (f. 42v

538-41 ut possit . . . orare: Cf. 1 Tim. 4:15;
1 Thess. 5:17
552-55 1 Cor. 3:12-13

545 estque] est que C
551 pro, inserted by A from above line
- f. 43r) quique maiorem quam oportet amorem habent
ad ea que prohibita ipsis non sunt, uelut uxorres,
filios et filias, seculares amicos, domos et
possessiones, et dignitates et huiusmodi. Hi,

inquam, in anima sua edificare dicuntur super
fundamentum ligna, fenum, stipulam, quia talibus
rebus mentem occupant que cremabiles sunt, sicut
ligna, fenum, et stipula. Nam hec que dicta sunt
obscuram et grauem faciunt animam, ne possit libere
cogitare ea que dei sunt ipsumque amare sicut
oportet sed omnis ista obscuritas et grauitas in
purgatorio igne exurenda est ita ut ipsum
fundamentum nichil destructionis paciatur, si tamen
inter hec omnia pre cunctis rebus habeatur deus ita
ut, si necesse sit, potius ista relinquuntur quam

561 fenum, stipulam] fenum et stipulam C
563 hec que dicta] haec dicta C
deus abnegetur.

Coacruant etiam in anima sua res cremabiles qui se non custodiunt a leuioribus culpis uelut est ociosus sermo, risus et ioci, ira, uana leticia, excessus in cibo et potu, qui non est frequens nimis et huiusmodi cottidiana peccata que capitalia non dicuntur. Hi, inquam, lignum, fenum, stipulam aggregant super fundamentum suum et hec quoque excoquenda sunt per ignem. De leuioribus dixi peccatis, nam criminalia peccata si admissa fuerint, non potest dici quod super fundamentum aliquomodo collocentur, quia ipsa destruunt fundamentum, id est, fidem, quia enecant eam et pro his dicitur mortua fides. At si pro his penituerit homo et satisfecerit deo pro ipsis in hac uita,

576-79 1 Cor. 3:12-13

577 lignum] ligna C
581 aliquomodo] aliquo modo C
582 quia] Si quidem C
582-83 id est] et C
584-85 et satisfecerit] et non satisfecerit C
585 ipsis] his C
reputabuntur quasi illa que comparata sunt ligno, feno, et stipule, et adnichilabuntur per ignem in die domini sicut et leuiora que predicta sunt.

Dies hominis dicitur (f. 43r - f. 43v) tempus

590 istud in quo unicuique homini permittit deus facere secundum arbitrium suum quod uult et quo potest homo promereri bona siue mala secundum opera sua. Dies autem domini tempus illud quod instat unicuique quando separatur a corpore anima eius et de cetero non potest incedere secundum arbitrium suum, sed secundum iudicium dei, ducitur uel ad requiem uel ad penam, ad accipiandam mercedem quam promeruit fiuntque manifesta que prius erant in eo occulta, siue bona siue mala. Unde et dicitur, "Uniuscuiusque opus manifestum erit, dies enim

586 quasi illa, corrected by A from illa quasi C
586 comparata, A reads corporata
592 potest homo pormereri] potest promereri C
594 unicuique quando, corrected by A from quando unicuique
594 separatur, A reads saparatur
598 erant in eo] in eo erant C
domini declarabit et uniuscuiusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit." Ignis autem dicitur penalitas illa quam ad hoc deus ordinavit, ut in ea affligantur et purgentur electorum anime a maculis quas in hac uita contraxerunt que nullum quidem detrimentum inferre poterit edificationi eorum qui fundamento superedificauerunt aurum et argentum et lapides preciosos, etiam si per medium illius eis transire contingat. Propter hos ergo ait, "Si cuius opus manserit quod superedificauit, mercedem accipiet eam," uidelicet quam sua superedificatione promeruit. Propter eos autem qui superedificauerunt ligna, fenum, stipulam, dicit, "Si cuius opus arserit, detrimentum pacietur," ita uidelicet, quod nullum pro sua edificatione habebit
premium, immo amaram afflictionem; "ipse autem saluus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem," id est, non aliter nisi per examinationem ignis.

Diuersis autem nominibus ligni et feni et stipule designauit ea que in quolibet exurenda sunt propter diuersitatem ipsorum secundum quam quedam diutiis (f. 43v - f. 44r) aliis ignem sustinebunt, uelut lignum diutius feno ardet, fenum diutius stipula. Est autem ignis iste idem quod psalmista ignem appellat cum dicit, "Domine, ne in furore tuo arguas me, neque in ira tua corripias me uel emendes me," ut habet alia translatio. In furore arguentur et non emendabuntur quibus dicetur, "Ite maledicti in ignem eternum." In ira autem corripientur et emendabuntur qui per ignem salui erunt. Utrumque

615-16 1 Cor. 3:15
616-17 1 Cor. 3:15
625-27 Ps. 6:2
628-29 Matt. 25:41

615-16 habebit premium] praeium habebit C
625 ignem] iram C
autem formidans deprecatur dicens, "Domine, ne in furore tuo arguas me," ac si diceret, "Non sum inter eos quibus dicturus eris, 'Ite maledicti in ignem eternum.' Neque in ira tua emendes me sed in hac uita me ure et seca et talem me redde cui emendatorius ignis necessarius non sit." Iste est ignis, o katari, quem baptista iohannes significauit quando de domino salvatore predicabat dicens, "Ille uos baptizabit in spiritu sancto et igne." Nam in hac uita baptizat in spiritu sancto quando in baptismo foris quidem per uisibles ministros baptizat nos in aqua; intus autem animas nostras propria operatione baptizat in spiritu sancto donans nobis remissionem omnium peccatorum. In igne autem nos baptizat quando post hanc uitam

631-32 Ps. 6:2
639-40 Matt. 3:11

633 eris] es C
636-37 est ignis] ignis est C
637 baptista iohannes] Iohannes Baptista C
641 uisibles] inuisibles C
in purgatoriis penis animas nostras purificat a
maculis peccatorum quas in habitaculo corruptibilis
corporis contraxerunt quia nichil in illa sua
purissima ciuitate recipere uult quod non sit ab
omni sorde defecatum.

Possumus et ex uerbis domini testimonium sumere
ad confirmationem sententie de qua nunc nobis sermo
est. Legimus in euangelio quoniam ad phariseos,
blasphemantes opera eius (f. 44r - f. 44v) inter

cetera, dicebat sic, "Qui dixerit uerbum contra
spiritum sanctum non remittetur ei, neque in hoc
seculo neque in futuro." Quale sit illud peccatum
quo dicitur peccare quis in spiritum sanctum, non me
hoc loco determinare necesse est, quia ad presens
negotium non pertinet hoc. Id uero presentis

655-57 Matt. 12:32
negocii est, ut consideremus hoc quod aliquod peccatum esse insinuatus quod non remittetur neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro.

Si uerus est sermo uester, nulli aliquod peccatum in futuro seculo contingit remitti. Nam sicut dicitis, quelibet anima mox cum de presenti seculo migrauerit, aut in eterna beatitudine constituitur quo nemo cum peccati macula accedet et ubi nemo peccati maculam contrahit, aut eternis penis deputatur ubi nulla remissio, nulla misericordie exhibitio est. Ergo superflue a saluatore talis distinctio facta est, ut diceret peccatum illud quod est in spiritum sanctum non remitti neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro. Nam sinullum in futuro seculo peccatum remitteretur,
non tam specialiter de illo peccato dixisset quod neque in hoc seculo neque in futuro remittetur sed suffecisset simpliciter dixisse quoniam non remittetur ei. Sicut autem nefas est dicere aliquam falsitatem in uerbis saluatoris inueniri, ita proculdubio nefas est dicere aliquam in eis esse superfluitatem aut inutilitatem. Scriptum quippe est de eo in psalmo, "Et folium eius non defluet et omnia quecumque faciet prosperabuntur."

Deflueret autem folium eius, si in uerbis eius aliquid superflueret et non prosperarentur quecumque fecit, si aliquid sine utilitate dixisset. Ergo necessario concedendum est quoniam in futuro seculo aliqua peccatorum remissio sit. Quam, quia non possimus dicere exhiberi eis

683-84 Ps. 1:3

686 aliquid] aliquod C
qui eternaliter damnnati sunt neque eis qui saluati sunt, necesse est ut dicamus aliquibus remitti peccata in alio seculo qui neque sint in eterna damnnatione neque in eterna beatitudine collocati.

Nulli autem medii sunt inter eternam beatitudinem et inter eternam damnnationem nisi illi de quibus dicimus quod in purgatoriis penis sint.

Videte nunc quali modo eis peccata remitti dicamus. Remittit autem deus peccatorum homin

peccata duobus modis in hac uita, uidelicet duriciam cordis eius per interiorem gratiam ad conversionem emolliendo et conversum ad se a debito gehennalis pene que ei pro peccatis debetur absolutum faciendo. Quibus autem in hac uita his modis peccata remittit, si ita transeant ab hac uita, quod

699 Remittit autem deus] Remittit deus C
705 transeant ab] transeunt de C
de peccatis suis non ad plenum satisfaciunt deo, permittit eos ad tempus puniri in quibusdam penis quas constituit ad hoc, ut electi sui in eis purificantur. Quando autem eis illas penas remittit et eos ad refrigerium educit, tunc eis peccata remittere dicitur quia et pene peccatorum peccata uocantur secundum illud apostoli, "Christus peccata nostra pertulit in corpore suo super lignum." Non autem aliter peccata nostra ipse portauit, nisi quod penas que nobis deebantur pro reatibus nostris ipse sustinuit.

Vnum adhuc satis euidens testimonium ad confirmatio-(f. 45r - f. 45v)-nem partis nostre indu cere possumus ex historia machabeorum, cuius est talis auctoritas in ecclesia ut publice in divino

712-13 1 Pet. 2:24

708 eis] his C
719-20 est talis] talis est C
servicio lectitetur. Scriptum est in libro secundo eiusdem hystorie quod iuda machabeo dimicante aduersus gorgiam prepositum idumee, contigit paucos iudeorum ruere. Fugato autem gorgia per domini auxilium, iudas collecto exercitu uenit in ciuitatem odollam. Et cum septima dies superveniret, secundum consuetudinem in eodem loco, sabbatum egerunt et sequenti die uenit iudas cum suis ut corpora prostratorum tolleret ac sepeliret. Inuenerunt autem sub tunicis interfectorum de donariis idolorum que apud iamniam fuerunt a quibus lex prohibit iudeos. Omnibus ergo manifestum factum est, ob hanc causam eos corruiisse atque ita ad preces conuersi rogauerunt deum, ut id delictum obliuione traderetur. Post hec prosequitur

721-24 2 Macc. 12:32-34
724-35 2 Macc. 12:38-42

724 domini] dei C
726 odollam] Odolla C
726 septima] septimus C
732 prohibit] prohibebat C
735 obliuione] obliuioni C
scriptura ita dicens, "Et facta collatione, iudas duodecim milia dragmas argenti misit iherosolimam, offerri ea ibi pro peccatis mortuorum, iuste et religiose de resurrectione cogitans" et cetera. Et ad ultimum ita concludit dicens, "Sancta ergo et salubris est cogitatio pro defunctis exorare, ut a peccatis solvantur."

Quid nunc ad hec dicitis, o piphles? Evangelica scriptura, ut audistis, pro nobis est et quis contra nos? Apostolica scriptura in defensione nostre partis est et quis est qui condemnnet nos? Exemplum machabei dominici bellatoris in acie nostra est (f. 45v - f. 46r) et quis dimicabit aduersus nos? Adhuc paucia de presenti negotio habeo conferre uobiscum. Si preoccupatus fuerit homo

735-39 2 Macc. 12:43
740-42 2 Macc. 12:46
gravioribus peccatis et conuersus fuerit ab
iniquitate sua et penituerit ex corde de perpetratis
malis, nunquid indiget, ut preter illam interiorem
penitentiam cordis, aliquam exteriorem

755 satisfactionem de peccatis suis deo exhibeat,
uidelicet elemosinas dando, ieiunando, et aliis
modis, corpus suum propter deum affligendo? Si
ita est ut per quosdam comperi quibus noti erant
sermones uestri, dicitis quia postquam ex corde
penituerit homo de peccatis suis et cessauerit
ab iniquitate, non opus est ei illa exteriori
satisfactione de qua dixi eo quod iam omne pecca-
tum ei sit remissum in penitentia cordis. Sed
hoc non ita esse evidentius scripture sancte

760 testimoniiis declaratur, dicit enim dominus per

755 deo, inserted by A from above line
764 evidentius] evidentibus C
prophetam iohel, "Conuertimini ad me in toto corde uestro, in ieiunio, et fletu, et planctu, et scindite corda uestro et non uestimenta uestro."

Ecce euidenter preter interiorem conversionem cordis, exteriorem quoque satisfactionem exposcit. Iohannes quoque baptista, ut in euangelio legimus, ad utrumque hortatus est dicens, "Penitentiam agite," et post pauca subiungit, "Facite ergo fructus dignos penitentie." Fructus autem penitentie sunt bona opera quibus deus placatur pro peccatis et uarie castigationes carnis.

Que qualem effectum habeant ad placandum deum patet ex historia que narrat penitentiam ninuiitarum et ex scriptu-(f. 46r - f. 46v)-ra que dicit quomodo achab, rex israel, cum argueretur per heliam de

766-68 Joel 2:12
772-73 Matt. 3:2
773-74 Matt. 3:8
778 Jon. 3:1-10

775 bona opera] opera bona C
777 effectum] affectum C
occisione naboth, scidit uuestem suam et operuit
cilicio carnem suam ieiunuitque et dormiuit in
sacco et ambulauit demisso capite. Factusque est
ermo domini ad heliam dicens, "Nonne uidisti

785 humiliatum achab coram me? Quia igitur humiliatus
est mei causa, non inducam malum in diebus eius sed
in diebus filii eius inferam malum domui eius." Ex
his ergo palam est deum non solum internam cordis
compunctionem sed etiam exteriem satisfactionem

790 peccatis congruentem exigere eaque exhibita placari,
neglecta autem ad uindictam commoueri.

    Si ergo conceditis hoc ita esse, quid dicetis
de illo, qui in omni genere criminum consenuit et
primum in ipso articulo mortis compungitur, et

795 convetitur ad iusticiam? Nunquid debitor alicuius

780-81 1 Kings 21:17-26
781-83 1 Kings 21:27
784-87 1 Kings 21:29

781 naboth, A reads naboht
satisfactionis est deo pro peccatis suis? "Vt puto
debitor quidem est sed quia propter breuitatem
temporis non potest eam implere, dimittitur ei
satisfactio simul cum peccatis et statim post
mortem rapitur ad eternam beatitudinem." Dicitis
ita? Bona est sententia ista et ad multorum
proficit correctionem. Qualem correctionem? Quod,
si hoc uerbum publice coram uanis et prauis
hominibus predicetur, differet unusquisque
conuersionem suam quanto diuitius poterit, dicens
apud se, "Faciam omnem uoluntatem cordis mei et in
fine uite mee conuertar et penitebo et statim, sine
omni labore, ad regnum celorum transibo." Videtis
ne quomodo sententia uestra, si credita et recepta
fuerit, (f. 46v - f. 47r) occasio erit omnis

796 puto] pote C
810 occasio, A reads occasio
uanitatis et omnis praeitatis? Stultissimi hominum, que ratio aut que utilitas est in hoc sermone quem dicitis? Omnino nulla nisi ut singulariter uideri possitis sapientes pre aliis hominibus, si aliquid singulare dicatis quod non sit in opinione ceterorum.

In nostro autem sermone quem de animabus mortuorum dicimus, indubitanter fructus multus est quoniam multa opera misericordie cottidie fiunt in pauperes que nullatenus fient, si non hoc crederent homines ut per talia possent adiuuare animas carorum suorum. Manifestum est itaque per omnia necessarium esse purgatorium illum ignem, de quo diximus, in quo anime eorum qui in hac uita non plenariam satisfactionem deo pro peccatis suis

811 hominum, -h and -i inserted by A from above line
818 dicimus] diximus C
exhibuerunt, tam diu examinentur donec idonee fiant
intromitti ad illam supernam ciuitatem dei que
nichil recipit quod perfectum et plene examinatum
non sit. Quid enim absurdius quam, ut credatur,

830 animam a sentina turpitudinum recentem extractam et
earum memoria adhuc quodammodo fetentem, in illud
tam limpidissimum lumen tam repente irrumpere et
purissimorum spirituum cetibus admisceri, ita ut sit
uno eodemque die mane quidem in peccatorum
turpissimo ceno et uespere in angelorum purissimo
celo? Nonne debuerat uel septem dierum rubore
suffundi pro multis criminosis excessibus cum pro
solo uerbo iurgii, maria, soror moysi, lepra pessima
correpta sit a domino ac septem diebus sequestrata a

840 castris (f. 47r - f. 47v) filiorum israel? Ex auro

836-40 Num. 12:9-15
purissimo omnia uasa sanctuarii quibus administrandum erat corruptibile sacrificium in deserto fieri iussa sunt, quanto magis uasa quibus incorruptibilis gloria purissime diuinitatis se ipsam dignabitur infundere, omni moda examinatione antequam ad sancta sanctorum inferantur, probata esse conuenit?

De latrone mihi forsitan obicitis quod eadem die qua confessus est in paradiso fuerit cum domino iesu. Ad quod ita respondemus quia hoc ei specialiter concessum est pre aliis penitentibus propter admirabilem fidei eius virtutem qua hominem quem uidit non habentem speciem neque decorem et, quasi nouissimum virorum ignominiose morti traditum, credere potuit deum esse dicens, "Domine, memento

840-43 Ex auro . . . sunt: Exo. 25, 28:6-43

843 sunt] est C
848 mihi forsitan, corrected by A from forsitan mihi
mei dum ueneris in regnum tuum." Que fides, ut arbitrator, coram diuino examine maioris meriti habita est quam multorum annorum grauis penitentia. Date iam gloriam deo et accedite ad ueritatem qua expugnati estis, aut, si non acceditis, fugite partes aduerse cum ductore uestro qui ab initicio mendax est et mendacii pater.

855-56 Luke 23:42
860-61 John 8:44

860 expugnati, A reads expugati] expugnati C
861 aduerse] adueriae C
861 ductore] doctore C
861 initicio] initio C
Sermo XI

Sermo contra septimam heresim de sacerdotio

Accedamus nunc et ad illud discuciendum quod dicitis ordinem sacerdocii defecisse apud nos et nusquam inueniri ueros sacerdotes nisi inter uos. Loquar nunc pro nobis qui in his que ad christianam religionem pertincent ad romanam ecclesiam respectum habemus. Sacerdotalem ordinem nos accepsimus a romana ecclesia, romana (f. 47v - f. 48r) autem ecclesia ab apostolo petro, petrus a christo, christus a deo patre, qui unxit eum oleo leticie, hoc est, spiritu sancto, pre participibus suis et iurauit dicens ad eum, "Tu es sacerdos in eternum secundum ordinem melchisedec." Verus sacerdos erat dominus iesus christus qui

11-12 Ps. 45:7
13-14 Ps. 110:4

1 Sermo contra septimem heresim de sacerdotio]
2 Contra septimem heresim de sacerdotio. Sermo X. C]
3 Sermo domini Hekkeberti de Saterdotio D
4 Accedamus nunc et] Accedamus et C
5 sacerdotes nisi inter] sacerdotes inter D
6 loquar] loquor C
7 11 a deo patre] a patre D
sacrosanctum corpus et sanguinem suum palam obtulit
deo patri super aram crucis, ut statueret pacem et
reconciliationem inter ipsum et genus humanum quod
perditum fuerit. Si a donatione sacre rei sacerdos

dicitur nulli unquam melius competebat hoc nomen
quam ei qui sacrum sacratissimum, hoc est, se ipsum
dedit ut saluaremur per ipsum.

Ipse etiam inuisibiliter dedit corpus et
sanguinem suum quando coram discipulis panem et
uinum in cena benedixit benedictione celesti et
fecit sua ammirabili potestate, ut sub specie
eiudem panis et uini sumerent de manibus ipsius
corpus et sanguinem eius. Ipse quoque, sicut
pollicitus est, cum ecclesia sua est usque ad

consummationem seculi et cottidie inuisibiliter

19 fuerit] fuerat C, D
20 unquam melius] melius unquam D
21 sacrum sacratissimum] sacro sanctissimum D
21 hoc est] hoc corpus? est D
23 inuisibiliter dedit] dedit inuisibiliter D
25 in cena benedixit] benedixit in cena D
28 et sanguinem] ut? sanguinem D
26 sub, inserted by A from above line
erunt." Dedit eis potestatem conficiendi corpus et sanguinem suum sub specie panis et uini quando dixit ad eos, "Hoc est corpus meum quod pro uobis tradetur, hoc facite in meam commemorationem." Omne denique potestatem que ad sacerdocii officium et ad episcopalem dignitatem spectat ab ipso acceperunt. Eandem autem potestatem singuli suis successoribus reliquerunt in illis terris et in illis ecclesiis quas eis dominus conuertendas et gubernandas delegavit.

Et ut nunc de aliis taceam, beatus petrus, princeps apostolorum, in romana urbe presbiteros et episcopos ordinavit et omnem potestatem que ad officia eorum pertinebat eis dedit, sicut ipse a domino iesu christo acceperat et puto non potestis


43-46 John 20:22-23

53 singuli suis successoribus] singuli successoribus C, D
53 singuli, inserted by A from margin
54 et in illis] et illis D
56 ut nunc] nunc ut D
59 eis dedit] dedit eis D
contradicere quin hoc facere posset. Beatum uero clementem discipulum suum, cum sciret sibi imminere terminum uite sue, in loco suo ecclesia preesse constituit et eam potestatem quam ipse habuit in principatu apostolatus ei contradidit. Ipsa autem consecratione qua per beatum petrum clemens ordinatus est in presbiterum et episcopum, ordinati sunt et a clemente alii episcopi et presbiteri rome et ipsa ordinatus est successor clementis ea et ille alios ordinavit episcopos et presbiteros et ita a successoribus ad successores per ordinem descendit sacerdotale officium et episcopalis

62 clementem: Pope Clement I, ca. 90-99 A.D.
62 clementem: Pope Clement I, ca. 90-99 A.D.
Eckbert writes of Clement as the successor of Peter as bishop of Rome, while most early sources list him as the fourth bishop of Rome, after Linus and Cletus.

65 ei] eis C
65 contradidit] tradidit C, D
67 est in presbiterum et episcopum] in presbyterum et episcopum est D
69 clementis es et] clementis et D
70 alios ordinavit] ordinavit alios D
dignitas usque ad eum qui hodierna die summus pontifex ecclesie est.

75 Si nunc dicitis quod sacerdotalis ordo defecerit in romana ecclesia, oportet ut hoc nobis demonstretis sub quo papa acciderit iste defectus et ob quam causam acciderit. Quod si dicere nescitis, (f. 48v - f. 49r) magne stulticie et temeritatis argui potestis pro eo quod rem tam magnum diffamare ausi estis quam non ueraciter comperistis sed tantum in opinione habetis. Dicitis forte, "Nescimus sub quo papa acciderit iste defectus sed hoc scimus quod ex multis temporibus, omnes qui dicebantur romani pontifices et cardinales semper auari fuerunt et superbi et multis ex causis indigni sacerdotio christi et ex hoc certi sumus quoniam uerum sacerdotium apud ipsos non est." Esto indigni sint. Nunquid impossibile est ut aliquis sit

73-74 Pope Alexander III, 1159-1181, or Victor IV, (1159-1164) the anti-pope whom Frederick Barbarossa supported. While Eckbert deplores the schism in his writings, he does not clearly state his support for either claimant.

76 hoc] sic D
76 hoc nobis] nobis hoc C
78 ob quam] quam ob C, D
78 si dicere nescitis] si nescitis D
80 quod, inserted by A from margin
80 magnum diffamare] magnam rem diffamare D; rem, inserted by D from margin
indignus sacerdotio et tamen uere sacerdocii ordinem habeat? Nequaquam hoc impossible est. Scimus quippe quoniam sacerdotium quod erat in ueteri lege institutum erat a deo et quoniam aaron et eleazarus et phineas, primi sacerdotes dei, uiri sancti, multos habuerunt successores in sacerdotio qui non erant bene placiti deo et indigni sacerdotali dignitate et tamen deus eos tolleruit in officiis suis et ratam esse permisit benedictionem sacerdotalem in eis.

Sacerdotes iudeorum in aduentu salvatoris hipocrite erant et auari ac superbi et uenditores et emptores spiritualium rerum, sicut ex uerbis domini apparat quibus eos sepe reprehendebat et tamen ipse de eis dicebat ad plebem, "Super cathedram moysi sederunt scribe et pharisei; que dicunt facite, que

91-99 Num. 25:6-14, 3:32; Ex. 28:1

94 phineas, A reads finees
96 bene placiti] beneplaciti C
97 deus eos] eos deus C
98 esse permisit] permisit esse C, D
101 et uenditores] ac uenditores D
103 eos sepe] saepe eos C
103 eos sepe reprehendebat] sepe reprehendebat eos D
autem faciunt, nolite facere." Ecce cum ipse
nosset uicia eorum ab intrinsecus, non tamen
abducebat populum ab eis sed honorem debitum
sacerdotibus (f. 49r – f. 49v) et spiritualibus
magistris uoluit illis exhiberi. Item cum
uenissent ad eum decem leprosi, uolentes mundari ab
eo, dicebat eis, "Ite, ostendite uos sacerdotibus."
Et uni cum esset mundatus per eum a lepra ait,
"Vade, ostende te sacerdoti et offer munus quod
preceptum moyses in testimonium illis." Ecce
quomodo honorabat eos quos sciebat esse iniquos.
Quid quesu honorabat in eis? Non personas ipsorum
sed officium eorum quod sanctum erat et institutum

104-06 Matt. 23:2-3
112 Luke 17:12
113-15 Matt. 8:4

105-06 dicunt facite, que autem faciunt, nolite
facere] dicerint vobis, facite opera aut
ipsorum nolite facere D
107 eorum ab intrinsecus] eorum intrinsecus D;
eorum inserted by D from margin
110 uoluit illis] uoluit ab illis C
111 uoluit illis exhiberi] uoluit exhiberi D
112 eis] illis D
113 mandatus per eum a] mandatus a C
114 Vade, ostende] Vade, et ostende D
115 in testimonium illis, corrected by A from illis
in testimonia
117 eis?] eis. D
117 ipsorum] eorum C
117-18 Non personas ipsorum sed officium] Non
personas sed officia D
118 quod sanctum erat et institutum] qua sancta
erant et instituta D
a deo. Quod certe si defecisset in eis propter a

120 quia eo erant indigni, non eos sacerdotes
appellasset neque precepisset eis offerri munus
quod sacerdotibus dei erat diuino iure offerendum.
Scriptum est de caipha summo pontifice iudeorum,
qui erat unus ex precipuis crucifixoribus christi,
quod cum collegissent pontifices et pharisei
concilium aduersus iesum, quomodo eum perderent,
dicebat, "Expedit uobis ut unus moriatur pro populo
et non tota gens pereat." Quibus uerbis euangelista
ita subiungens ait, "Hoc autem non a semetipso
dicebat sed cum esset pontifex anni illius,
prophetabat quod iesus moriturus esset pro gente et
non pro gente tantum sed ut filios dei, qui erant
dispersi, congregaret in unum." Ex quo sermone
euangeliste percipitur quod caiphas licet sanctus
non esset propter sanctitatem, tamen pontificalis

120 eo, inserted by A from above line
120 erant indigni] indigni erant D
121 precepisset, -i inserted by A from above line
121 eis offerri] offerri ei D
122 dei erat, corrected by A from erat dei
122 erat diuino iure] diuino iure erat D
123 caipha, -i inserted by A from above line
127 moriatur pro] moriatur homo pro D
128 et non] ne C
129 non a semetipso] a semetipso non D
131 prophetabat] prophetauit D
officii sui aliquam singularem gratiam habebat a
deo per quam prophetabat redemptionem que per
christum erat futura. Erat tamen indignus
dignitate officii illius non solum ob illam
140 nequitiam qua saluatori resistebat sed (f. 49v - f.
50r) propter auaritiam et superbiam ac cetera uitia
quibus irretiti erant cuncti sacerdotes temporis
illius, sicut ex uerbis saluatoris et ex uerbis
iohannis baptiste manifestum est qui
145 frequenter eos arguebant.

Ita enim erant auari et cupidi honoris, sicut
in historiis legitur, ut singulis annis mutarent
summos pontifices et festinaret unusquisque ante
alium ingredi ad dignatatem pontificatus per
150 pecunias quas dabant gentilibus qui eis prepositi

135-36 pontificalis officii sui] officii sui pontificalis D
138 erat futura] futura erat D
138 Erat, -t inserted by A from above line
138 indignus] indignus C
140 saluatori, -u inserted by A from above line
143-44 et ex uerbis] et uerbis D
145 arguebant] arguebat C
146 erant auari et cupidi honoris] auari et cupidi
honoris erant D
149 alium, corrected by A from alios
erant illis temporibus cum secundum legem
unusquisque pontifex usque ad finem uite sue stare
debuisset in officio suo. Que mutatio pontificum
intelligi potest etiam ex eo quod euangelista dicit

de caipha quod esset pontifex anni illius. Erat
autem pontifex anni prioris annas, socer illius,
sicut ex historiis habetur. Hec idcirco dicta sint
quia dicitis non posse esse sacerdotale officium
ratum apud illos qui sacerdotio indigni sunt.

Quis sceleratior, quis indignior fuit
dispensazione misteriorum dei quam iudas scariothis,
qui et fur erat dominice gaze et mortem domini
saluatoris diu in mente gerebat et voluntate eum
occidebat? Dominus tamen eum sicut et ceteros

146-53 Ita . . . suo: Cf. Josephus, Jewish
Antiquities, XX.1, T.E. Page, et. al, ed.,
Louis Feldman, trans., The Loeb Classical
Library (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University

155-57 Erat . . . habetur: v. Josephus, Jewish
Antiquities, XVIII.2.1; Page, p.

155 John 18:13

151 erant illis] erant in illis D
155 illius] eius C
155-56 Erat autem pontifex anni prioris annas, socer
illius, inserted by D from margin
157 sunt] sunt C
160 quis] quid C
161-62 scariothis, qui] iscariotis? Qui D
162 mortem domini saluatoris] mortem saluatoris C, D
165 dispensandum] dispensandam C
165 apostolos mittebat ad dispensandum gratiam suam spiritalem, predicando et baptizando et exsequendo cuncta que ad apostolatum pertinebant et rata esse permisit ea que ab illo gerebantur, sicut et ea que ceteri apostoli faciebant in ministeriis suis.

170 Legimus de pluribus qui baptizati sunt a iohanne baptista, uiro sancto et perfecto, quod rebaptizati sunt per apostolos, eorum uero (f. 50r - f. 50v) qui baptizati sunt a iuda nullum legimus fuisse rebaptizatam. Fuisset autem necessarium eos rebaptizari si uim suam non potuisset habere sacramentum illud sub manibus eius ob eam causam quia ipse fuisset indignus administratione baptismi. Ad nostram eruditionem hoc fieri permisit deus, ut ille qui indignus erat computari inter ministros dei gratiam suam h.minibus sicut et ceteri apostoli

170-72 Acts 19:1-7

166 predicando et baptizando] praedicando baptizando C
166 exsequendo] exequendo C
171 perfecte] perfecto C, D
173 legimus fuisse] fuisse legimus D
178 deus] dominus C
dispensaret, ut cum uidemus indignos sacerdotes spiritualia tractare et distribuere non propter eorum maliciam diffideremus gratie dei neque estimaremus quod nullam uirtutem haberent res

185 spirituales que ad salutem ecclesie dei constitute sunt pro eo quod mali sint qui officium habent super ea. Nolite itaque temere hoc affirmare quod in romana ecclesia defecerit ordo sacerdotalis pro eo quod qui regnant in ea indigni sunt eo. Certe

190 hoc quod dicitis uerum esse fateremur si deficisse in ea fidem catholicam probare possetis. Nam si exinanita esset fides, inania proculdubio essent et fidei sacramenta. Quod si inania essent sacramenta, inane et nullius utilitatis esset

195 officium sacerdotum dispensatium ea.

181 uidemus] uidemus C
182 non] ne C
185 ecclesie] gratiae C
186 mali, corrected by A from male
186 sint] sunt C
187 ea] eas D
189-90 Certe hoc] Certe si hoc D
190 fateremur] fatemur D
190 deficisse] defecisse C, D
194 utilitatis esset] esset utilitatis D
De aliis quidem uiciis pro quibus romanam ecclesiam culpatis, non eam fortassis sufficienter possumus excusare sed quod adhuc defecerit fides catholica nulla certe potestis ratione probare.

Nam eadem fides que ab initio per beatum petrum in ea planta est et que predicata est a successoribus eius, qui pro catholice fidei confessione martyrium pertulerunt, ut (f. 50v - f. 51r) clemens, ut sixtus, ut marcellus, et multi alii quos longum esset enumerare et qui sanctitate conversationis et celestibus doctrinis ecclesiam uehementer illustrauerunt, ut silvester, ut gregorius, ut leo, et quam plures alii; eadem, inguam, fides usque in hodiernum diem in ea predicatur et tenetur adiuuante apud patrem :illa domini nostri iesu
Christi interpellatione de qua ipse dixit ad petrum, "Ego rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua." Quod utique non dicebat specialiter pro illa fide que in mente petri erat sed de fide ecclesie quam uoluit gubernari a petro.

Vnde et si quando contigit aliquem apostolicorum patrum a fide catholica errare, non diu eum stare permissit dominus ne forte per ipsum ecclesia corrumperetur. Nam in tempore arriane heresis quidam papa dictus leo, sicut legitur in uita beati hilarii, arrianis consensit in heresi et subitanea morte a deo percussus est. Sed et de alio quodam legitur quod a uera fide exorbitauerit et ob hanc causam depositus sit.

219-22 Nam . . . est: v. Epistola Leontii Arelatensis episcopi ad Hilarium papam, PL 58, col. 22D: "Quod Leonem sanctissimum praedecessorem tuum mors abstulerit contra haereses invigilantem . . . heu!"


213 specialiter] spiritualiter C
222 morte a deo percussus] morte percussus
224 sit] sint D
Quod si adhuc in eo uerbo heresis ut dicatis romanam ecclesiam ita corruptam esse in fide, ut nunc aliud credat et doceat esse credendum quam quod credidit et in ea docuit beatus petrus et illi eius successores, de quibus dubium non est quin sancti sint, ostendere nobis debetis rationabili sermone quod sit illud in quo discordet ab illorum fide et predicatiorne et quid sit illud quod illi crediderunt et quod nunc in fide non recipiatur a successoribus illorum. Certi autem sumus quoniam ad hoc demonstrandum et ratio uobis de-(f. 51r - f. 51v)-est et sermo. Sicut dixi, dominus noster iesus ob dilectionem principis apostolorum inter multas procellas persecutionum et oblationes hereticorum incorruptam adhuc conservauit fidelem catholicam in sede illa apostolica simulque
sacerdotalis ordinis in ea conservauit sanctitatem, magis propter fidei stabilitatem quam propter merita sacerdotum regentium eam. Propter fidei dico stabilitatem quia indubitanter ipsa in negligentiam et defectum iam deuenisset, si evacuatum esset officium predicandi, baptizandi, confirmandi, ligandi ac soluendi, offerendi sacrificium salutare, et orationem faciendi pro populo dei, ecclesias quoque consecrandi et ordines faciendi ac cetera huiusmodi exequendi que ad episcopos et sacerdotes pertinent.

A romanis autem patribus, sicut noticia sacre fidei, ita et ordo sacerdotii ad nos usque peruenit per sanctos uiros qui inde ad has occidentales partes christianae religionis causa missi sunt. Nam

241 ordinis in ea conservauit sanctitatem] ordinis dignitatem D
241 sanctitatem] dignitatem C, D
244 negligentiam: A reads negligentiam] negligentia C] negligentiam D
245 deuenisset] deuisset D
247 ac] atque C
248-49 ecclesias quoque] ecclesiasque D
250 et] ac C
253 ad nos usque] usque ad nos D
255 christiane] christianae D
apostolus petrus quando tres discipulos suos, 
eucharium, et valerium, et maternum, ad predicandum 
in gallia, germania, uerbum dei transmisit primum 
guidem illorum, uidelicet beatum eucharium, in 

presbyterum ordinavit et ad episcopalem eum 
dignitatem sublimauit, ualerium autem ad gradum 
diaconatus promouit, maternum subdiaconum 
consecravuit. Beatus autem eucharius cum esset 
episcopus in treuerensi urbe, sanctum ualerium ad 
sacerdocii gradum promouit eique cum esset

254-57 eucharium: Eucharius, d. 4th cen. A.D., third 
among the 72 disciples of Christ and first 
bishop of Trier according to legend.
257 valerium: Valerius, d. 4th cen. A.D., regarded 
as successor to Eucharius as bishop of Trier.
257 maternum: Maternus, d. ca. 325 A.D., regarded as 
first bishop of Cologne, third bishop of Trier 
and bishop of Tongres.
256-63 v. Goldscherus, Vita Eucharii, Valeri, 
Palmé, 1863): 918; v. also Gesta Treverorum, 
15, Georg Waitz, ed., MGH, SS, 8, p. 147, 
and Herigeri et Anselmi gesta episcopali, 
moriturus ecclesiam uice sua (f. 51v - f. 52r)
gubernandam commisit. Similiter et ille cum esset
ab hac uita migraturus, beatum maternum in
sacerdotem ordinavit et episcopalem ei
administrationem commisit. Ab his ergo tribus
pontificibus primum sacri ordines simul cum fide
catholica plantati et radicati sunt in treuerensi
provincia et in coloniensi provincia quas utrasque
rexisse dinoctitur sanctus maternus simulque
tungrensem cum adhuc in ea esset episcopalis sedes.
Qua enim potestate et qua gratia dei ipsi
ordinauerunt episcopos et presbyteros aliosque
ordines dederunt eadem potestate, eadem gratia et
cuncti qui eorum successores fuerunt in episcopali
dignitate et in eadem fide extiterunt quam illi

263-70: Beatus . . . commisit: v. Goldscherus, *Vita*,
p. 921; *Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta*, 11-12,
col. 1016-18.
147.
272-73 treuerensi: Trier
274 coloniensii: Cologne
275 tungrensem: Tongres
285 mogunciensi: Mainz

271 primum] patrum C
271 ordines simul cum] ordines cum D
273 provincia et in coloniensii] et Colonii C
273 provincia] provincii C
275 in ea esset episcopalis sedes] episcopalis
esset sedes in ea C, D
278 eadem gratia et] et eadem gratia D
281 apostolice, corrected by D from apostolica
283 altaris dei] dei altaris C
docuerant et obedientes fuerunt apostolice sedis magisterio, ipsi quoque ordinauerunt episcopos et presbyteros aliosque altaris dei ministros usque in hodiernum diem.

285 De moguncinensi provincia similia dico. Qua potestate ordinatus fuit in presbyterum et episcopum sanctus bonefacius qui, cum esset romane ecclesie cardinalis, missus est a zacharia summo pontifice mogunciam et primus in ea archiepiscopus factus est qua, inquam, potestate ipse consecratus fuit ea et ipse episcopos et presbyteros aliosque ministros dei ordinavit easdem et successores eius eorumque suffraganei usque in presens tempus, singuli in suis ciuitatibus ordinationes fecerunt ministrorum dei.

290 Ex his ergo que nunc dicta sunt, scitote quoniam in his tribus archiepiscopatibus qui principales sunt

---


287 bonefacius: Boniface, ca. 675-754 A.D., archbishop of Mainz and considered apostle to Germany; contrary to Eckbert's statement, Boniface was not a cardinal.

288 zacharia: Pope Zacharius, 741-752 A.D.
apud teutonicam gentem et in episcopatibus qui eis subditi sunt, (f. 52r - f. 52v) officium sacerdotale radicem et firmamentum habet a capite sancte catholice ecclesie, id est, a sede beati petri apostoli que in urbe romana est. Sed et cuncte metropolitane ciuitates romani imperii in eo quod pallia pontificalia a romanis patribus requirunt eisque obediunt et decreta romanorum pontificum recipient et observant et secundum instituta illorum diuinum servicium agunt, plane demonstrant officium episcopale ac sacerdotale ceterosque ordines diini ministerii a romana ecclesia se habere.

Idem et de ciuitatibus ceterorum occidentalium regnorum dicere possumus. Regno francorum beatus dionisius ariopagita, a sancto clemente, successore petri apostoli, in episcopum ordinatus, sacerdotale officium intulit, qui primus gentem gallorum in

312 dionisius ariopagita: Dionysius, or Dénis, bishop of Paris, martyred ca. 258 A.D. during persecutions of Decius. Eckbert reflects the confusion of St. Dénis with Dionysius the Areopagite, common by the ninth century.
312 clemente: Pope Clement I, ca. 90-99 A.D.

299 capite] capiti D
301 urbe romana] Romana urbe C, D
303 requirunt, corrected by D from requirrunt
305 et] set D
311 dicere] dare D
parisiensi urbe et in finibus eius predicatione uerbi dei ad fidem convertit, ecclesias construxit et consecravit presbyteros atque alios altaris dei ministros ex probatis personis, sicut legitur, ordinavit atque ad eadem facienda tres illustres uiros a se ad hispaniam et ad aquitaniam et ad beluacensem regionem transmisit, uidelicet sanctum marcellum, saturninum, et lucianum, quos ei sanctus clemens papa socios itineris dederat. Sic et in

315-16 predicatione uerbi, corrected by D from praedicationae dei uerbi
317 alios altaris dei] alios dei D
319 atque ad eadem] atque eadem C
320 facienda, inserted by A from margin
320 hispaniam et ad aquitaniam] Hispaniam ad Aquitaniam C
regno anglorum beatus augustinus episcopus, a

325 uenerabili papa sancto gregorio missus, sicut
christiane religionis cultum ita et sacerdotale
officium dilatauit. Sicut ergo eadem fides que a
romana sede per sanctos uiros qui inde missi sunt
diseminata est, adhuc hodie permanet in cunctis

330 ciui-(f. 52v - f. 53r)-tatibus occidentalium
regnorum que predicta sunt ita et officum
sacerdotale quod per illos plantatum est ibidem
permanet usque in diem hanc.

Forte ad hoc respondetis, "Fatemur quidem quod

335 illi primi predicatores fidei christianae de quibus
dictum est uere sacerdotes dei fuerunt et alios ad
sacerdotium ordinare potuerunt sed multos
successores in episcopalibus cathedris habuerunt,
quorum uita tam praua et tam abhominabilis extitit,

340 ut nec ipsi possent sacerdotale officium habere nec
alios ad hoc possent ordinare ac per eos
sacerdotium omnino interiit.

Pro quibus respondeo id ipsum quod supra de

323-25 v. Bede, Historia ecclesiae Angelorum, I.23,
Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, ed.,
Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English
68.

334 hoc] haec C
343 id ipsum] idipsum C, D
romanis pontificibus dictum est non esse hoc impossibile ut magistri ecclesiarum habeant aliqua dona spiritualia pertinentia ad utilitatem eorum quos regere habent, qui tamen ipsi eisdem donis coram deo indigenti sint et non ipsismet proficiant ad salutem, sicut propheticus spiritus balaam et caiphe de quo et supra locuti sumus et apostolica potestas iude non ipsi provenit ad utilitatem sed aliis. Qua propter non ex hoc quod dicitis, pontifices successores sanctorum uirorum de quibus supra dictum est male et irrationabiliter uixisse, non, inquam, ex hoc necessari probare potestis quod ipsi habere non potuerunt potestatem exequendi officium sacerdotum et ordinandi sacerdotes, que potestas sine dubio sancta est et spirituale donum dei est. Multi in primitiua ecclesia hoc donum spiritus sancti habebant, ut loquerentur linguis

345 balaam: v. Num. 22-24
uaris quas nunquam ab aliquo didicerant et tamen caritatem dei (f. 53r - f. 53v) non habebant quia non ad meritum sed ad honorem dei dabatur hoc donum, multi hoc donum spiritus sancti habebant ut in nomine christi prophetarent et demonia ex obsessis corporibus eicerent et signa alia facerent et tamen non uere christum sequabantur, sicut perpenditur ex uerbis ipsius saluatoris que dicebat, "Amen, dico uobis, multi uenient in die illo dicentes, 'Domine, nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus et demonia eieicimus et uirtutes multas fecimus,' et tunc confitebor illis, 'Discedite a me, operarii iniquitatis, quia nunquam noui uos.'" Si talia discrete animaduertere scireis profecto, non


tam temere iudicaretis officium sacerdotis aut episcopi, non posse apud illos esse quorum uita coram deo laudabilis non est.

Iterum forte ad talem obiectionem confugietis ut dicatis, "Si non per malam conversationem episcoporum, tamen per infidelitatem ipsorum accidere potuit ut sacerdotalis dignitas euacuaretur. Fuerunt enim quedam tempora in quibus hereses ita in ecclesia multiplicate sunt et excreuerunt, ut etiam episcopi multarum ciuitatum in errorem ducerentur, maxime in diebus arriane perfidie cui multi episcoporum consensisse leguntur. In illis ergo temporibus per herethicos episcopos multi ad ordinem sacerdotii, multi etiam ad episcopalem dignitatem ordinati sunt.

Hereticorum autem ordinationes nullam uim habere

375 iudicaretis] indicaretis C] iudicaritis D
380 ipsorum] eorum D
382 tempora in quibus] tempora quibus D
potuerunt, ita ut aliquis ab eis ordinatus uere officium episcopi aut prebyteri exequi posset aut ad hoc alium promouere. (f. 53v - f. 54r) Hi autem qui ab hereticis ordinati sunt, putantes se esse episcopos cum non essent, alios ordinauerunt episcopos et presbyteros et nec illi ab eis ordinati uere officium quod se putabant suscepisse habuerunt et illi quoque alios ordinauerunt et ita usque ad hec tempora deuoluti sunt ordines ecclesiastici qui ab illis hereticis episcopis primum corrupti sunt et ita adnichilati sunt, ut ubi esse putantur ibi uere non sint."

Si talem obiectionem concinnatis aduersum nos, scitote quoniam absque responsione non sumus. Ita quidem sepe accidisse legimus ut etiam episcopi
diuersarum ciuitatum in errorem ducerentur et consentirent hereticis qui fidem catholicam subuertere conati sunt. Et quidem si ita aliqui heresibus consenserunt, ut tamen ipsi non manifesta contradictione ecclesiam impugnarent neque per excommunicationem ortodoxorum patrum ab ecclesia preciderentur et ita adhuc specie tenus intra ecclesiam manserunt, de talibus non negamus quin et habuerint uere sacros ordines etsi non ad suam utilitatem, etsi potuerint uere eos aliis dare quia non impossibile est ut ecclesie sacramenta aliquando etiam per herethicos dispensentur, sicut testantur et uerba augustini qui ait, "Non ideo non sunt sacramenta christi et ecclesie, quia eis ilicite utantur, non modo herethici sed et omnes

408-09 quidem si ita aliqui heresibus] si quidem ita haeresibus aliqui D
410-11 neque per excommunicationem] neque ex communicatione C] neque excommunicatione D
412 ita adhuc specie] ita specie D
413-14 quin et habuerint] quin habuerint C, D
414 ad suam] suam ad D
415 etsi potuerint] et potuerint C, D
417 etiam] et D
418 testantur et uerba] testantur uerba C] et testantur uerba D
impii, illi corrigendi sunt et puniendi, illa uero agnoscenda et ueneranda."

At si qui ita heresibus corrupti sunt ut manifeste eas auderent defendere et (f. 54r - f. 54v) impugnare catholicam fidem, hos romani magistratus et ortodoxi patres qui sub illis fidem catholicam tuebantur ubique ab episcopalibus sedibus eicere et ab ecclesia dei precidere per excommunicationem studuerunt. Si quos autem ordinines facere presumperunt interim dum ab ecclesia erant precisi, illi ordinines simul cum heresibus sub excommunicatione fuerunt, ita ut nullam salutarem uim haberent quamdiu hereses permanserunt in illis qui ordinatoribus suis in heresi consenserunt. Vnde dicit ciprianus martyr in

418-22 Augustine of Hippo, De baptismo contra Donatistas, III.x.13, Petschenig, ed., CSEL, 51, p. ?.

425 catholicam fidem] fidem catholicam D
426 patres, -r inserted by A from above line
427 tuebantur ubique ab] tuebantur ab C, D
428 sedibus eicere] sedibus quantum fieri potuit eicere C] sedibus quantum potuit fieri D
430 interim dum ab] interim ab D
431 ecclesia erant] ecclesia dei erant C, D
431 simul] simulque D
epistola sua quod "Omnia quecumque faciunt herethici carnalia et inania et sacrilega sunt et eorum altaria falsa et illicita sacerdotia et sacrificia sacrilega, qui more simiarum que cum homines non sint formam imitantur humanam uultum ecclesie catholice et auctoritatem sibi uendicant cum ipsi ecclesie non sint."

Postquam uero cum dei auxilio hereses deficere ceperunt, ita ut hi qui excommunicati fuerunt propter eas uel morerentur uel paulatim redirent ad catholicam ecclesiam eique reconciliarentur, tunc si qui ab herethicis episcopis extra ecclesiam ordinati fuerant recipiebantur quidem in communioem ecclesie sed non omnes uno eodemque modo. Quidam enim sic recepti sunt ut per manus imposicionem


443-49 Source?

436-41 humanam uultum ecclesie catholice et auctoritatem humanam et uultum et ecclesie catholice auctoritatem D
443 uero cum dei] uero dei D
446 ecclesiam] fidem D
447 extra] contra D
tantum laicam haberent communionem et omnino sine clericatus ordine in ecclesia essent, sicut intelligimus ex uerbis Innocentii pape. Legitur enim quod dicit, "Arrianorum clericos non suscipiendos (f. 54v - f. 55r) cum sacerdocii uel alicuius ministerii dignitate, quibus solum baptismum ratum esse permittit, quod in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti percipitur." Tradit etiam laicam tantum communionem talibus esse tribuendam per manus imposicionem nec ex his aliquem in clericatus honorem uel exiguum subrogandum.

Et hoc quidem primum generaliter de hereticis fuerat constitutum sed postea uariis occasionibus interuenientibus temperatus est iste rigor consilio orthodoxorum patrum quibus decernentibus nonnulli

449-53 Source?
454-58 Pope Innocent I (401?–417) Epistola Innocenciae ad episcopos Macedoniae, PL 130, col. 718B.

451 tantum laicam haberent communionem] communionem laicam haberent D
460 imposicionem, A reads imposionem
462-63 generaliter de hereticis fuerat constitutum] de hereticis fuerat constitutum generaliter D
465 orthodoxorum, A reads ortodoxorum
ordinatorum ab hereticis ita recepti sunt
dispensationis causa, ut remanerent in ordinibus
suis quos ab hereticis susceperant extra ecclesiam.
Hoc ex decreto innocencii patet in quo ista dicit,
470 "Summa sacerdotii deliberatio hec fuit, ut quos
bonosus ordinauerat ne cum eodem remanerent et
fieret non mediocre scandalum ordinati
recipentur, sed necessitas", inquit, "temporis id
fieri magnopere postulabat." Talibus ergo si quid
475 gratie spiritualis defuit quod in sua ordinatione
recipere debuerunt, hoc eis collatum esse constat
in eo quod a catholicis patribus licenciam
ministrandi in ecclesia acceperunt. Item
ordinatorum ab hereticis quidam ita recepti sunt,
480 ut accipientes manus impositionem ordinarentur et
sic manerent in clero forsitan quia non secundum
formam ecclesie fuerant ordinati quod de nouatianis

462-68 Source?
470-73 Epistola Innocenciae ad episcopos Macedoniae,
FL 130, col. 718B.

466 hereticis] heretice D
470 sacerdotii] sacerdotum C
471 remanerent, -ne inserted by A from above line
472 scandalum ordinati] scandalum si ordinati D
474 Talibus ergo si] Talibus si D
tantum fuisse statutum legitur in canonibus niceni concilii. (f. 55r - f. 55v)

Quidam arbitrati sunt omnes qui ab hereticis extra ecclesiam fuissent ordinati secundo ordinandos esse cum ad catholicam ecclesiam redissent sed hoc non faciendum esse, gregorius papa demonstrat in epistola in qua iohanni rauennati episcopo ita scripsit dicens, "Quod dicitis ut qui ordinati sunt iterum ordinentur ualde ridiculosum est. Vt enim baptizatus semel, iterum baptizari non debet, ita qui consecratus est semel in eodem ordine non ualet iterum consecrari."

482-84 Canon VIII, Council of Nicaea (325); v. J. Alberigo, et. al, ed., Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta (Fribourg: Herder, 1962): 8-9; Eckbert's source may have been Rufinus; v. Historia Ecclesiastica, I.6; PL 21, col. 474.


481 manerent] remanerent C
483 tantum fuisse statutum] tantum statutum C] nouatianis tantum fuisse statutum] nouatianis statutum D
483 canonibus niceni concilii] Niceno concilio D
488 faciendum esse] esse faciendum C, D
490 scripsit] scribit C, D
492 ridiculosum] periculosum[?] D
492-93 semel iterum baptizari] semel rebaptizari D
494 non ualet iterum] iterum non ualet D
Item et quidam uenientes ab hereticis ita recepti sunt mixto rigore quodam cum misericordia, ut quoscumque ordines tunc haberent in illis ministrarent et nunquam ad aliquos alios promouerentur. De qua re urbanus papa legitur mandasse gebehardo constanciensu episcopo sic, "Vt ab communicatis quondam tamen catholicis episcopis ordinatos, si eorum religiosior uita et doctrine prerogatiua uisa fuerit promereri penitentia indicteda quam congruam duxeris in ipsis quos acceperunt ordinibus permanere permittas. Ad superiores uero ascendere non concedimus, nisi necessitas et utilitas maxima flagitauerit et ipsorum sancta conuersatio promeruerit, hoc tamen ipsum rarius et cum cautela precipua est concedendum." Idem et alii quidam mandasse leguntur

500-10 Pope Urban II (1088-1099), written in April 1089; see Epistolae et Privilegia, PL 151, col. 298A.

498 aliquos alios, corrected by A from alios aliquos] alios aliquos C
498 ad aliquos alios] in alios D
500 sic, Vt] sic, dicens, Vt D
501 communicatis] excommunicatis C, D
501 tamen] tantum D
508 ipsorum] eorum D
508 sancta conuersatio] sancta conuersatio C, D
absque omni exceptione.

Hec me ita commemorasse sciatis quatinus ex his perpendatis quali diligentia patrum qui ecclesie dei gubernaculum (f. 55v - f. 56r) possederunt,

515 prouisum et cautum est, ne hoc quod dicitis eueniret, uidelicet ut per herethicos ecclesiastici ordines euacuarentur. Nam per eos qui ad communionem ecclesie recepti sunt non perierunt sed nec per eos qui extra communionem permanserunt euacuati sunt, quia ex quo eis catholica ecclesia preualuit non manifeste in ecclesia ministrauerunt neque ordines palam fecerunt et si in occulto eos fecerunt et aliquis catholicorum, sciens eos herethicos esse, ordinationem ab eis accepit, non 520 est receptus in ecclesia. Sic namque legitur in

511 absque] sine D
512 commemorasse] commemorare[?] D
514 gubernaculum] gubernaculum C, D
519 permanserunt] manserunt D
522 et si] sed si D
522 occulto, A reads oculto
524 accepit] recepit D
525 namque] nanque C, D
actione septime sinodi que apud niceam celebrata est, "Si quis sponte ad hereticum uadit et accipit, ordinationem non recipiatur."

Et de hereticis quid amplius dicam? Scimus certe quoniam dominus saluator cum de edificatione sancte ecclesie ad principem apostolorum loqueretur, ita inter cetera aiebat, "Et porte inferi non preualebunt aduersus eam." Portas autem inferi dicebat herethicos qui ingressum inferni patefaciunt his qui secuntur eos; hi, autem, secundum promissionem domini nondum ita preualuerunt ecclesie quam principi apostolorum commisit, ut fidem catholicam unquam in ea destruere possent. Quod si ita preualuissent aduersus eam ut omnes ordines ecclesiastici in ea per ipsos iam

526-27 Source? Does Eckbert refer to the Second Council of Nicaea?

532-33 Matt. 16:18

526 septime] septima D
531 sancte ecclesie] ecclesiae sanctae C
534 inferni] inferi C
537 quam] quoniam C
538 unquam] nunquam C
exinaniti essent atque ita infirmata essent cuncta sacramenta ecclesie, nimis certe preualuisserant aduersus eam et non bene impleta esset promissio saluatoris que euacuari non potest.

545 De symoniacis episcopis forsitan eandem obiectionem nobis facitis que supra de herethicis (f. 56r - f. 56v) inducta est. Nos uero de eis ita respondemus. Quamdiu non ita manifesta est symonia alicuius episcopi ut pro ea coram magistratibus suis accusatetur, conuincatur et canonica sententia feriatur, tamdiu officium eius uim suam credimus habere in ecclesiasticis sacramentis que ab ipso administrantur, sicut ex uerbis beati gregorii colligimus que de sacramento dominici corporis loquens ait, "Et quid melius corpore et sanguine:

540-41 iam exinaniti] exinaniti iam C, D
541 infirmata essent] infirmata iam essent C
541-42 cuncta sacramenta, corrected by A from sacramenta cuncta
548 non ita] ita non C
christi? Siue ergo per bonos siue per malos ministros intra ecclesiam dispensetur sacram, tamen est et spiritus sanctus uiuificat. Nec bonorum dispensatorum meritis ampliatur, nec malorum attenuatur."

Sunt autem adhuc intra ecclesiam simoniaci qui nondum ab ea sunt dampnati. Cum ergo utrumque ad officium eorum pertineat et corpus domini consecrare et ministros dei ordinare, si in maiori sacramento irritum non est officium eorum propter peccata eorum, probabile est quod etiam in minori irritum non sit. Nam licet reproba sit uita eorum et orationes eorum deo sint ingratie, credimus tamen quod per merita et orationes ecclesie cui adhuc utcumque adherent adiuuantur, ut rata sint officia

555-60 Eckbert's source is unknown to me.

557 intra] in D
557-58 sacram, tamen est] sacramentum est D
562 ab ea sunt] sunt ab ea C
566 quod etiam in] quod in D
569 quod per merita] quod merita D
570 adiuuantur] adiuuer D
eorum in sacramentis que ad usum ecclesie pertinent. Nemo enim in consecratione eucharistie dicit "offero" sed "offerimus" quod quidem pro tota ecclesia dicitur. Nemo etiam episcoporum in officio suo explendo dicit "oro" ut hoc uel hoc fiat sed "oremus" unusquisque dicit in quo se toti ecclesia connumerat cuius meritis et precibus (f. 56v - f. 57r) adiuuatur ad impetrandum ea de quibus postulat a deo que forte per se indignus esset impetrare.

Fortasse iterum obicitis mihi dicentes, "Et quid est quod dominus sacerdotibus siue episcopis sibi displicentibus comminatur dicens, 'Maledicam benedictionibus uestris.'" Hoc ita intelligite ac si diceret, "Benedictiones uestras faciam

---

583-84 Mal. 2:2

582-83 episcopis sibi displicentibus] episcopis displicentibus D
584 intelligite] intelligitur D
uobismetipsis prouenire in maledictionem." Potest enim esse quod benedictio alicuius ei qui benedicitur in bonum cedat, ipsi uero qui benedicit eadem benedictio in malum proueniat, quemadmodum illis qui, cum non sequerentur christum in nomine, tamen eius benedicebant obsessos a demonibus et illi quidem liberabantur, illi uero qui benedictionibus suis aliquos liberabant et ex hoc gloriam et lucrum apud homines querebant reprobati sunt a deo, sicut patet ex euangelicis uerbis que superius inducta sunt.

Ad hoc quod de symoniacis ordinatoribus iam supra dixi ut estimo dicitis, "Quomodo possunt dare spiritum sanctum qui non habent spiritum sanctum?"

Videte quid dicatis et quid interrogetis. Dico

587 ei, inserted by D from margin
591 eius] ipsius C
591 tamen eius] eius tamen D
591 obsessos a demonibus] obsessos demonibus D
592 qui benedictionibus] qui pro benedictionibus D
uobis quod propter christum qui et uerus homo et
uerus deus est non potest ullus hominum dare alii
spiritum sanctum, sicut et testatur beatus
augustinus ita de christo loquens, "Acceptit
spiritum sanctum ut homo et effudit ut deus. Nos
autem accipere quidem hoc donum possumus pro modulo
nostro, effundere uero super alios non utique
possimus sed ut hoc fiat, deum super eos a quo id
efficitur inuocamus." Item dicit, (f. 57r - f. 57v)

"Non aliquis discipulorum christi dedit spiritum
sanctum, orabant quippe ut ueniret in eos quibus
manus inponebant, non ipsi eum dabant quem morem in
suis prepositis etiam nunc seruat ecclesia.
Denique et symon magus, offerens apostolis pecuniam,
non ait, 'Date et mihi hanc potestatem ut dem

604-09 De Trinitate, XV.26.46, W.J. Mountain, ed.,
Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina

601-02 et uerus deus est] est et uerus deus C
602 hominum] homo D (check D)
602-03 alii spiritum sanctum] spiritum sanctum alii
   C
605 spiritum sanctum ut] spiritum ut D
606 accipere quidem hoc] accipere hoc D
607 non utique] utique non D
611 quippe] autem D
612 manus] manum C
612 eum] eam D
615 Date et mihi] Date mihi D
spiritum sanctum, sed 'Cuicumque,' inquit, 'imposuero manus accipiat spiritum sanctum,' quia nec scriptura superius dixerat, 'Videns autem simon quia apostoli darent spiritum sanctum,' sed dixerat, 'Videns autem simon quia per imposicionem manus apostolorum daretur spiritus sanctus.'" Si quis uero catholicorum patrum hoc in scripto posuisse inueniatur, uidelicet apostolos dedisse spiritum sanctum siue eos qui ordinant ministros dei spiritum sanctum dare, sciendum est non alium eos sensum in tali dicto habuisse quam qui in uerbis augestini que nunc inducta sunt expressus est.

Frustra ergo interrogatis quomodo possint dare spiritum sanctum qui eum non habent. Quod ergo possibile est faciunt, tam mali quam boni episcopi


616-17 Acts 8:19
620-21 Acts 8:20

616-17 Cuicumque, inquit, imposuero] Cuicumque imposuero D
619-20 quia apostoli darent spiritum sanctum sed dixerat, 'Videns autem simon quia per] quia per D
623 apostolos, corrected by D from apostolas
625 sciendum est non] sciendum non D
629-30 ergo possibile] ergo eis possibile C, D
orant, uidelicet et secundum officium suum
benedictiones statutas dicunt super eos quos
ordinant et deus, non pro ipsorum meritis sed pro
dilectione ecclesie sue cuius adhuc qualiacumque
membra sunt, prestat hoc donum spiritus sancti
unicuique eorum qui ordinantur, ut habeat eam
gratiam que pertinet ad ordinem suum qua tamen
gratia potest unusquisque uti, siue in bonum siue in
malum. Et non mirum si ad inuocationem dei quam
facit malus aliquam spiritus sancti gratiam prestat
ei qui ordinatur, cum ad inuocationem sancte
trinitatis quam interdum facit quilibet flagiosus
christianus siue etiam infidelis super eum qui
baptizatur in nomine patris et filii et
spiritus sancti, detur baptizato ea gratia spiritus

631 orant uidelicet] uidelicet orant D
636 unicuique eorum qui ordinantur] unicuique qui
ordinatur D
sancti per quam omnia peccata remittuntur et per quam christi membrum efficitur.

Ille quoque nunc mihi obiicite (f. 57v - f. 58r) quod petrus apostolus ad simonem magum, cum offerret ei pecuniam pro ea potestate ut cuicumque imponeret manus, acciperet spiritum sanctum dicebat, "Pecunia tua tecum sit in perdicione, quia existimasti donum dei pecunia possidere." Ex his ergo inducere aduersum me hunc sermonem et dicite, "Quia existimauit obtinere donum dei per pecuniam, maledictus est et repulsus ab eo et non est illud consecutus. Ita ergo et immitatores eius simoniae, qui pro officio episcopali quod est spirituale donum dei offerunt et dant pecuniam, maledicuntur a deo et non consequuntur quod querunt.

652-53 Acts 8:20

646 quam omnia] quem omnia C
647 christi membrum] membrum christi D
654 hunc sermonem] sermonem hunc D
656 et non, et inserted by D from above line
657 Ita ergo et] Ita et D
657-58 immitatores eius simoniae] imitatores Simoniae C
Et si non consecuntur non uere episcopi sunt et non possunt implere quod ad officium episcopale pertinet."

Est ne talis obiectio uestra? Non me adhuc sine responsione inuenietis. Vere quidem simon repulsus est ab illo spirituali dono pro quo male negociatus est nec consecutus est illud et hoc erat iudicium irascentis dei. Isti uero consecuntur donum spirituale pro quo et ipsi male negociantur, uidelicit officium episcopale et est hoc beneficium ex parte irascentis dei et ex parte miserentis dei. Beneficium irascentis dei est quia hoc illis prestat iratus, ut tanto damnabiliores fiant quia male pro eo negociati sunt, ac si dicat uerbis saulis qui, cum daturus esset filiam suam dauid,

664 adhuc, inserted by A from margin
665 quidem] quod C
665 Vere quidem simon] Verum est quod simon D
670 est hoc] hoc est C
671 irascentis dei et] irascentis et D
671 miserentis] miserantis D
cuius mortem disponebat ait, "Dabo ei filiam meam uxorem, ut sit ei in scandalum." Beneficium irascentis dei susceperant illi de quibus apostolus ait, "Qui cum cognouissent deum non sicut deum gloricauerunt sed euaneurunt," et cetera. Et illi de quibus psalmista ait, "Verumtamen propter dolos posuisti eos, deiecisti eos dum alleuarentur." Ex parte, inquam, (f. 58r - f. 58v) est beneficium miserentis dei quia ad usum ecclesie sue eis prestat eam spiritalem gratiam qua utuntur in officiis suis, ne occasione illorum pereant sacramenta ecclesie quibus carere ipsa non potest.

Verumtamen inter peccatum istorum et peccatum simonis uidetur differentia esse. Non ille uidebat apostolos per illam potestatem quam a deo habebant

676-77 1 Sam. 18:21
679-80 Rom. 1:21
681-82 Ps. 73:18

676 ei] illi D
680 glorificauerunt sed euaneurunt, et cetera] glorificauerunt et cetera D (check D)
680 euaneurunt] euacuauerunt C
682 eos] eis C, D
682 eos deiecisti eos dum alleuarentur. Ex] eis. Ex D
685 spiritalem] spiritualem C, D
686 occasione, A reads occasione
690 apostolos, corrected by D from apostolas
et quam ipse desiderabat habere, consecutos fuisse
aliquas diuicias aut aliquod seculare dominium et
ideo non eis obtulit pecuniam, quatinus ad talia
consequenda cum adiuuarent sed principaliter ad
ipsum spirituale donum dei quod eos habere uidebat,
intendid uenire ut uidelicet cuicumque imponeret
manum recipere spiritum sanctum cum aliquo uisibili
miraculo, ita ut loqueretur uariis linguis uel
aliquid tale in eo continget in quo manifeste
notari posset spiritus sanctus et in eo affectabant
similis fieri sanctis apostolis quibus inuidebat
quod in tam excellenti dono ei preferrentur. Que
inuidentia eius significata est nimirum in eo uerbo
quod dixit petrus ad eum, "In felle amaritudinis
uideo te esse." Adipisci autem hoc uolebat non ut

704-05 Acts 8:23

695 eos] ipsos D
695 habere uidebat] uidebat habere C, D
698 ut] quod C, D
699 aliquid tale in] aliquid in D
702 in tam excellenti] tam excellenti in D
703 est nimirum in] est in D
705 Adipisci autem hoc] Adipisci hoc D
in bonum eo uteretur sed in malum, uidelicet ad gloriam sibi coram hominibus comparandam, sicut iudei christum emerunt non ut eo fruerentur in bonum sed ut suam praueam voluntatem in eo perficerent. Et cum non esset cor eius rectum cum deo, nichil de reconcilianda sibi gratia eius tractabat, quatinus adipisci donum eius posset sed quasi eo inuito hoc obtinere posse irreuerenter et manifeste sibi uenundari postulabat inpreciablem gratiam ab hominibus quam solus dare poterat deus. Talis ergo erat temeritas eius quasi si servus alicuius potentis despectus et odibilis domino suo et nullam habens curam adipisci gratiam eius ma-
(f. 58v - f. 59r)-nifeste offerat pecuniam consiliariis domini sui, quatinus faciant eum habere

709-10 uoluntatem in eo perficerent] uoluntatem perficerent D
713 posse, inserted by A from margin] posset C
720 faciant eum] eum faciant D
filiam eius ut fornicarie ea abutatur.

Nunc uero si quis ita salutis sue obliuisus efficitur ut non secundum deum honorem cathedre appetat, primum considerat diuicias et honores et huiusmodi temporalia commoda que concupiscibilia sunt adiuncta esse prelationi illi et ea principaliter concupiscit et secum de adipiscendis illis tractat. Iuxta hec autem considerat spiritualia sine quibus illa possidere non potest,

uidelicet officium sacerdotale quod exigit ut diuine contemplationi insistat orando pro aliis et meditando que dei sunt, ut sit doctus et alios doceat, ut sit castus, sobrius, et modestus et grauis in moribus et omnino irreprehensibilis et hec cogitans pertimescit et indignum se reputat
dignitate ad quam aspirat. Positus itaque inter concupiscentiam et timorem uncitur; tamen a concupiscentia incipit negociari precibus et munerebus et promissis tum per se tum per amicos, modo occulte modo manifeste, negotium tractans. Et quidem omnia facit principaliter pro secularibus que concupiscit, secundario autem pro spiritualibus, non quia amet ea aut eis dignum se esse arbitretur sed quia scit sine his secularia illa se obtinere non posse. Perficit negotium, dat quod exiguitur, suscipit de manu secularis principis quod seculare est, suscipit de manu ecclesiastici patris a quo ordinatur spiritualem potestatem pertinentem ad dignitatem ad quam ordinatur.

Hanc uero illi confert deus non quia amet eum
aut quia dignus sit ea sed, ut supra dixi, ex parte propter misericordiam suam, ut electis dei qui sunt in populo pertinente ad regnum eius non desint propter peccatum illius sacramenta ecclesiastica pertinentia ad salu-(f. 59r - f. 59v)-tem animarum eorum. Ex parte etiam in ira sua hanc illi prestat, ut tanto maiorem occasionem habeat damnandi eum in futuro si non peniteat, qui per pecuniam se ingessit ad fruendum secundum voluntatem suam eleemosinis fidelium que illi ad honorem christi et ad usus pauperum eius ecclesiis contulerunt. Ex parte etiam tales hoc modo sinit deus habere ecclesiasticas dignitates propter peccata quorumdam qui sunt in populo et non sunt digni habere bonos prelatis ut testatur scriptura que dicit, "Propter peccata

752-53 qui sunt in] qui in C
756 etiam in ira] etiam ira D
758 pecuniam] pecunia D
759 voluntatem suam eleemosinis] voluntatem eleemosynis C
760 illi] illas D
760-61 et ad usus pauperum eius ecclesiis] ad usus pauperum et eius ecclesiarum D
762 deus habere] habere deus D
764 habere bonos] bonos habere D
populi permittit deus regnare hipocritam."

Sepe autem qui sic in ecclesia negociantur quoniam in mente non habent principalem intentionem ad emenda spiritualia sed ad temporalia que magis amant et de eis totus sermo est, apud uendentes et ementes dicunt se non emere spiritualia sed temporalia sed hoc dicendo semetipsos fallunt. Hoc enim eis quasi pro emptione reputatur quod ad ea accedunt mediante pecunia quam propter concupiscentiam temporalium dant pro eis que statuta sunt ut simul cum illis spiritualibus possideatur. De huiusmodi negotiatoribus pascasius papa dicit hoc modo, "Si aliqui obiecerint se non consecrationes emere sed res ipsas que ex consecratione prouenient, penitus desipere

---

765-66 Job 34:30

768 quoniam] quia D
768-69 non habent principalem intentionem ad emenda] principalem intentionem non habent ad emendum D
769 sed ad temporalia] sed temporalia D
771 ementes dicunt] ementes et dicunt D
772-73 Hoc enim eis] Hoc eis C, D
776 possideatur] possideantur C, D
777 negotiatoribus, corrected by A from negotiatioribus
probantur. Nam quisquis horum alterum uendit sine quo alterum non habetur neutrum uendere derelinquit."

Similitudinem autem huius negocii considero in eo quod dicam. Si tutor pupilli fraudulenter uendat molentem que sit hereditas illius uiro conscio fraudis sue, iniquus est emptor sicut et uenditor. Et quamuis nullam in conventione sua fecerit mentionem de aqua aluei pertinentis ad molentem, eadem nichilominus emptione possidere illam (f. 59v - f. 60r) dicitur et tamen solus deus, utpote gubernator nature hanc amministrat molenti, tum ut satisfaciat necessitati utentium ea, tum etiam ut iniquum possessorem eius, tanto amplius culpabilem habeat quanto largius fruitur beneficiis eius ad que

778-83 Paschasius Radbertus - Source?

783 derelinquit] omittit C, D
789 aqua] aliqua parte D
790 possidere] possideri C
791 solus deus] deus solus D
accessit inique.

Dicuntur autem hi de quibus supra dictum est simoniaci quia in eo quod per pecuniam negociantur de prelationibus ecclesiasticis que simul iuncta habent spiritualia dei dona cum temporalibus bonis, imitatores sunt simonis qui estimabat donum dei pecunia possidere et ob hoc maledicionis eius participes erunt qua ille maledictus est a petro qui dicebat, "Pecunia tua tecum erit in perdicione, quia existimasti donum dei pecunia possidere."

Sicut autem ex his que dicta sunt animaduerti potest nequior et magis temeraria fuit negotiatio illius quam istorum. Nequior quia apostolis quibus parificari voluit inuidebat gratiam dei in felle amaritudinis sue, sicut et postea factis

804-05 Acts 8:20

798 simoniaci, quia in] simoniaci in D
799 simul] similiter D
799 iuncta] iunxinta[?] D
800 spiritualia dei dona] dona dei spiritualia D
801 estimabat] existimabat C, D
802 possidere] possideri C
802 maledicionis] maledictionis C
803 participes erunt] erunt participes D
804 erit] sit C, D
805 possidere] possideri C
807 potest, nequior] potest quod nequior D
809 dei in] dei et in C
demonstrabat, sed isti nullam huiusmodi paritatem
cum sanctis habere affectant neque inuident
sanctitati eorum sed potius eos uenerantur.
Temeraria magis quia inpudenter et manifeste pro

815 gratia dei pecuniam obtulit quasi esset res uenalis
ad forum. Istri uero non directe munus intendunt ad
donum spirituale sed ad commodum seculare, quamuis
tamen in hoc culpabiles sint quod sciunt ad neutrum
accedendum esse per pecuniam, ipsi uero ad utrumque

820 accedunt per eam. Quod ergo simon principaliter
existimabat possidere, isti secundario existimant in
sua negotiatione. Existimabat, inquam, id est, in
mente tractabat nam uerbum "existimationis" non hoc
loco pro incerta opini-(f. 60r - f. 60v)-one

825 accipiendum est, sicut nec in illo loco ubi
apostolus dicit, "Existimo enim quod non sint condigne passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam que reuelabitur in nobis."

De simoniacis non manifestis et non convictis

830 hec diximus ad ostendendum quod ordines ecclesiasticos possunt dare et quod rate habentur ordinationes eorum qui, et si convicti fuerint aliquando de simonia, manent tamen in ordinibus suis hi qui ab eis fuerunt ordinati antequum manifestum fieret eis illos simoniacos esse quod utique non permetteretur si nullos ordines dare potuissent. Dicit enim de talibus papa urbanus sic, "Qui ordinantur a simoniacis quos cum ordinantur nesciunt simoniacos esse, qui et tunc pro catholicis habentur eorum ordinatio misericorditer sustinetur."

837-40 Urban on simony? Source?

826-28 Rom. 8:18

831 possunt] possint C
839 simoniacos esse] esse simoniacos D
Misericorditer, inquit, quia secundum rigorem iusticie deponi possent non quia ordines non habeant sed ad maiorem confusionem eorum a quibus ordinati sunt et ad terrem aliorum qui simoniace negociari non timent. Quibus eadem misericordia annumerantur et illi qui, cum sciant ex aliquoror relatione ordinatores suos simoniacos esse, probare tamen hoc non possunt nec debent et ab ordinatione eorum subtrahere se non audent. At si qui ordinati sunt a simoniacis convictis et damnatis horum ordinationes cassate sunt, a patribus et cessare iussi sunt a ministeriis suis.

O kathari, hoc uos scire uolo quod ea que uarie dixi de his que in ecclesia gesta sunt et que a patribus statuta et dicta sunt in ea, non propter

842 possent] possunt D
842-43 non habeant, non inserted by A from above line
843 habeant] habent D
846 annumerantur] annumeratur C, D
846 illi] illis D
846 aliquoror] aliorum D
848 tamen hoc non] tamen non D
849 se non audent] se audent D
855 in] quod D
uos tantum dixi sed magis propter nostros indoctos
populos qui pariter nostros ac uestros aliquando
percipiunt sermones, ut sciant racionabiles (f. 60v
- f. 61r) nobis sermones non deesse ad reddendam
rationem de his que credimus et agimus in ecclesia
dei. De uobis autem scio quod quicquid loquamur
quantumcumque sit racionabile uos uestros garrietis
errores, sicut uulgo dicitur, "'Ouem, ouem,' clamat
lupus, quicquid dixeris ei."

857 ac] et C
857-58 aliquando percipiunt] percipiunt aliquando D
861 quicquid] quidquid D
861 loquamur] loquimur C, D
Sermo XII
Sermo contra octauam heresim de corpore et sanguine domini

Adhuc os meum patet ad uos, o antichristi, et est sermo mihi non paruus adversus incredulitatem uestram. Infamati estis et de hoc quod de corpore et sanguine domini dei nostri iesu christi, non eam fidem habeatis quam ecclesia catholica confitetur. Ipsa autem huiusmodi est. Credit et confitetur populus dei in cunctis partibus mundi ad quas dilatata est religio christiana quod dum sacerdotes ecclesie, siue bone sint conversationis siue male, ad altare dei diuinum agunt officium et super oblationem panis et uini sacra pronunciant uerba que nobis summus sacerdos, id est christus, et sancti patres nostri illic dicenda reliquerunt,
indubitantem ibi fiat mutatic talis ut sit ibi sub
specie panis et uini uera caro christi que immolata
fuit in cruce et uerus sanguis qui fluxit de
uulneribus eius et quod eandem carnem et eundem
20 sanguinem sumit ipse sacerdos et omnes qui accedunt
ad communicandum cum ipso. Nostra fides hec est
et, sicut aiunt, uos omnino renuits credere quod ab
aliquo sacerdote, siue bono siue malo, possit ulla
consecratione fieri corpus domini et quod ab aliquo
25 homine sumi possit ad communicandum.

Ego autem non diffido etiam in hoc errore uos
esse quandoquidem cunctos sacerdotes ecclesie qui
sacramenta dominica tractant in contemptu habetis
et nichil penditis omne officium eorum. Memini
30 uidisse ( f. 61r - f. 61v) me aliquando in presentia

17 immolata] inuiolata C
19-20 carnem et eundem sanguinem sumit] carnem sumit C
25 communicandum] manducandum C
29 nichil] nihili C
colonensi archiepiscopi arnoldi quendam non parui nominis uirum qui de scola katarorum reuersus fuerat ad suos, a quo dum inquiremus diligenter que essent hereses illorum, ita respondit, "Breui sermone ea de quibus interrogatis concludam. Omnia que creditis, omnia que agitis in ecclesia, illi falsa et inania iudicant." Hec ergo cum dixisset suffecit responsio archiepiscopo et nichil amplius ab illo requirendum esse iudicauit. Hinc quoque credibile est mihi et illam incredulitatem de qua dixi non deesse malicie ueste.

Siue autem quod credimus credatis siue non, ut

31 colonensiis archiepiscopi arnoldi: Arnold of Wied, archbishop of Cologne, 1151-1156.
32 scola katarorum: This "school" may refer to a Cathar center of doctrinal training, perhaps in Cologne, where the "doctores" mentioned by Eckbert may well have received their instruction in the secret teachings of the sect. Such was the view of Arno Borst, who suggested that this "scola katarorum" was one of the Cathar schools in Cologne, which even respected burghers had attended; see his Die Katharer (Stuttgart: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 12, 1953): 94. I believe this "scola" may also refer to the Bogomil churches of the Byzantine Empire, perhaps to that of Constantinople, from which the official Nicetas made trips to Lombardy and Southern France during the late 1160's or early 1170's.

33 inquiremus] inquireremus C
38 nichil] nil C
39 illo] eo C
39-40 Hinc quoque credibile] Hinc credibile C
42 ut] et C
in hac parte fidem nostram racionabile fundamentum habere cognoscatis uerba evangelice et apostolice

45 scripture que manifestum ei testimonium perhibent inducenda nobis sunt. Sancti evangeliste, ubi locuntur de cena domini quam habuit cum discipulis suis ante passionem suam, dicunt "quod uespere facto discumbebat dominus cum duodecim discipulis suis.

50 Et manducantibus illis, accepit iesus panem et benedixit ac fregit deditque discipulis suis et ait, 'Accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum quod pro uobis tradetur, hoc facite in meam commemoracionem.' Et accipiens calicem, gratias egit et dedit illis dicens, 'Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes. Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti qui pro uobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.'" Recte animaduertite omnia uerba hec, "Benedixit panem et dedit eis et dixit, 'Hoc est corpus meum.'" Et ut certius eis
et nobis fieret quod uel quale corpus illis uerbis
significaret, determinauit cum addidit dicens,
"Quod pro uobis tradetur." Similiter et de sanguine
determinauit cum dixit, "Hic est sanguis meus qui
pro uobis et pro (f. 61v - f. 62r) multis
effundetur." Ex his ergo uerbis credimus
indubitanter quod idem corpus in quo tunc presens
coram illis apparuit cum hec loqueretur et quod
postea in cruce pependit et mortem ibi sustinuit eis
dedit comedendum et eundem sanguinem qui de
uulneribus eius profluxit dedit eis bibendum.
Humano sensui impossibile quidem est ut intelligat
qualiter id fieri posset; habet tamen rectam ac
firmam rationem quare hoc indubitanter credere
debeat. Que est illa ratio qua credi debeat illud,

63 1 Cor. 11:25; Luke 22:20
64-66 Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24

62 significaret] significaretur C
65 et pro multis] et multis C
68 hec loqueretur] hic loquebatur C
73 ac] et C
quod foris uidebatur esse panis fuisse ipsum corpus
domini quod erat in cruce passurum? Hec est ratio,
uidelicet quia dominus iesus christus, filius dei,
hoc dixit, qui mentiri non potuit. Vere mentiri
non potuit quia deus fuit quia ueritas fuit, sicut
ipse de se testatus est dicens, "Ego sum uia,
ueritas, et uita." Ego indubitanter credo quod de
corpore suo potuit facere quicquid uoluit quia de
ipso scriptum est, "Omnia quecunque uoluit dominus
fecit in celo et in terra." Dominus totius nature
fuit et ideo credo quod hoc facere potuit sua
celesti benedictione, ut panis ille quem benedixit
transsiret in substantiam corporis sui et ut
inuisibili et inexcogitabili modo ueniret in os
petri et transiret in intima spiritus eius

81-82 John 14:6
84-85 Ps. 135:6

88 transsiret] transiret C
cetorumque discipulorum quibus illud porrexit quia spiritualis cibus ille erat et proprie ad animam pertinebat. Credo quod hoc potuit facere de corpore suo sicut et potuit alia multa facere de eo que uidentur impossibilia ei qui non credit et qui hoc non considerat quoniam deus erat qui in corpore illo habitabat.

Sumpsit corpus illud de uirginis utero et produxit illud in hunc mundum clauso utero matris.

Ipse corpus illud tulit super aquas maris ita ut non mergeretur ubi mergebatur petrus, sed non submergebatur quia ab ipso adiuuabatur. (f. 62r - f. 62v) Ipse celestem claritatem ostendit in corpore illo dum adhuc futurum ei erat ut pateretur et moreretur, tunc uidelicet quando se coram

---

91 cetorumque] caeterorumque C
93 quod hoc potuit] quod potuit C
96 hoc non] non hoc C
96 deus] dominus C
105 illo] suo C
discipulis suis transfiguravit in monte et quando resplenduit facies eius ut sol. Ipse corpus illud propria uirtute suscitauit a morte et clauso sepulcro eduxit illud foras et ubi erant discipuli congregati in domo clausis ianuis, cum eodem corpore introiuit et stetit in medio eorum. Ipse quoque idem corpus de terra potenter subleuauit et in summo celi super omnes choros angelorum collocavit. Hec omnia in euangeliis scripta sunt et credimus ea, quamuis incredibilia uideantur secundum communem rerum naturam et quamuis considerare et inuenire nesciamus quali modo hec fieri potuissent.

Credimus autem quod uere dominus potuit facere et fecit omnia hec, quia deus erat cui nichil impossibile est et eadem ratione credere hoc debemus

107-11 John 20:19-31
112-13 Luke 24:51

118 dominus potuit] potuit dominus C
quod et illud potuit facere de corpore suo quod supra diximus, uidelicet quod dedit illud manducandum discipulis suis quando dicebat, "Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes, hoc est corpus meum quod pro uobis tradetur." Vbi dicit evangelista quod fregit dominus panem quem discipulis porrigebat et quod dixit eis ut manducarent in illa fractione et in illa comestione, non hoc intelligendum est quod intelligitur cum dicitur de alio communi pane quod frangatur et quod manducetur. Nam in ista fractione et in ista comestione pars una panis omnino ab alia separatur, ita ut non maneat aliqua integritas in pane qui frangitur et manducatur. At postquam panem illum dominus benedixit non erat ibi uera substantia panis sed species panis et sub illa
specie uerum corpus christi et non erat illa
fractio in substantia corporis domini sed in illa
uisibili specie pa-(f. 62v - f. 63r) -nis que adhuc
immutata permanebat sicque manducabatur corpus

140 christi, ut tamen integrum permaneret et
inconsumptum.

Illa ergo manducatio qua corpus christi
manducabant non erat similis commestioni illi qua
alia communes cibos manducabant quia interioris

145 hominis cibus erat et spiritualiter eum manducabant.
Quod enim ore sumebant fide et dilectione intus in
anima manducabant et ibi uirtute illius panis
sanctificati sunt. Similitudinem quandam huius rei
attendite. Cum docet spiritualis magister in
ecclesia populum, unam dicit aliquando sententiam

143 commestioni illi qua] commestioni qua C
144-46 manducabant quia interioris hominis cibus
erat et spiritualiter eum manducabant. Quod]
manducabant. Quod C
quam suscipit unusquisque corporal! aure et transit ad corda singulorum tota et ita quodammodo diuiditur inter eos, ut tamen integra manet apud eum qui docet. Ita et discipuli domini sanctum illum cibum corporal! ore quidem suscipiebant et ita transiit totus ad singulorum corda et hoc modo diuidebatur inter eos, ut tamen integer maneret apud eum qui dabat.

Animaduertite nunc et illud quod dominus cum dedisset discipulis corpus suum ac dixisset, "Accipite, hoc est corpus meum quod pro uobis tradetur," subiunxit dicens, "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem." Si estis eruditi de scripturis sanctis, ut uobis uidetur et ut uos iactitare soletis, dicite quidnam uerbis istis dominus

161-63 1 Cor. 11:24

153 ut] et C
154 et] etiam C
154 sanctum illum cibum] sanctum cibum C
155 ore quidem] quidem ore C
155 suscipiebant, -pi inserted by A from above line
156 totus] tutus C
160 discipulis corpus] discipulis suis corpus C
164 et ut uos] et uos C
significare voluerit et quid discipulos suos
iusserit facere sui memoriam dicendo, "Hoc facite in
meam commemorationem." Negare, ut puto, non
potestis quin illud quod eis manu porrigebat et quod
formam panis habebat, significaret dicendo, "Hoc
facite." Si autem illud nichil aliud erat nisi
panis, nunquid dicitis quod iussit eos facere panem
in me-(f. 63r - f. 63v)-moriam sui? Sed hoc stultum
est dicere. Erat autem aliud quam panis quod sub
specie panis ibi erat, id est, corpus eius, sicut
patet ex eo quod dicebat, "Hoc est corpus meum", et
illud iussit eos facere in commemorationem passionis
et mortis sue. Itaque in eo quod dixit, "Hoc facite
in meam commemoracionem," dedit tam eis quam et
omnibus ad quos peruenturum erat sacerdotale

167 sui, corrected by A from in sui in suam C
169 quin] quando C
170 eis] ei C
172 iussit eos] eos iussit C
173-74 stultum est dicere] dicere stultum est C
179 quam et, et inserted by A from above line] quam C
officium ab ipsis potestatem faciendi cum oratione et benedictione corpus et sanguinem suum.

Quod dicuntur sacerdotes corpus domini facere siue conficere quod idem sonat in laico sermone, non ita intelligimus quod ipsi corpus domini quasi de nouo creent et ei essentiam dent sed eorum facere nichil aliud ibi est, nisi quod super illud visibile sacrificium quod in altari est faciunt officium suum ac dicunt orationes et benedictiones et statuta signa faciunt et tunc uirtute diuina prestatur, ut sit ibi uerum corpus domini et uerus sanguis eius ubi prius nichil aliud erat nisi panis et uinum. Illud ergo opus sacerdotum quod tunc agunt tali modo loquendi designari solet, ut ipsi dicantur facere corpus domini et est fortasse sumptus hic modus

189 ac] et C
loquendi ex eo quod dominus tunc dicebat, "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem." Aut si cui uidetur id quod dictum est, "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem" ita intelligendum ac si diceretur, "Manducate corpus meum in meam commemorationem", ut per hoc secundo repetatur quod supra dixerat "Accipite et manducate", non aduersabor, licet non ita apte conueniat hic sensus littere circumstanti ut id quod supra dictum est. Nichilominus tamen in eo ipso quod eos iussit manducare corpus suum et sanguinem bibere etiam post passionem suam in commemorationem mortis sue, potestatem eis dedit conficiendi corpus suum et san-(f. 63v - f. 64r)-sanguinem per benedictionem quam ipse eos suo exemplo docuit et qua ipsi postea usi sunt in consecratione

196-97 1 Cor. 11:24

203 circumstanti] constanti C
206 bibere etiam] bibere et etiam C
eucharistie et aliis eam reliquerunt in quos sacerdotale officium ab ipsis peruenit. Nisi enim hanc potestatem eis dedisset, unde possent habere corpus domini ad manducandum et sanguinem eius ad bibendum etiam post resurrectionem ipsius?

Dicetis forte insaniam hanc, "Potuit quidem aliquomodo fieri ut dominus ante passionem suam daret discipulis corpus suum ad manducandum et sanguinem suum ad bibendum in sui commemorationem, id est, ut postea sui memores essent, sed nullomodo fieri potuit post passionem et resurrectionem suam ut per aliquam benedictionem habere possent corpus eius ad manducandum, siue sanguinem eius ad bibendum." Ad quod primum dico quod si illam commemorationem ita exponitis non recte intelligitis.
scripturam. Quomodo enim intelligenda sit ex uerbis apostoli patet, ubi illud uerbum commemorationis chorinthiis exponens ait, "Quocienscumque enim manducabitis panem hunc et calicem bibetis, mortem domini annunciabitis donec ueniat." Ex quibus uerbis intelligitur quod manducatio illa corporis domini quod est sub specie panis et bibitio calicis, id est sanguinis domini, annuciatio, id est testificatio mortis domini, est quam in cruce sustinuit. In eo autem quod addidit, "donec ueniat", subintelligendum est dominus ad iudicium et in hoc significuit quod hec annuciatio mortis christi per communicationem corporis et sanguinis eius non deerit in ecclesia usque ad diem iudicii. Patet itaque ex uerbis apostoli quod etiam

229-31 1 Cor. 11:26

232 quod] quae C
post passionem dominicam fideles christi mandu-(f. 64r - f. 64v)-care potuerunt corpus domini et sanguinem eius bibere.

Manifestum est etiam ex uerbis pauli quod sancti apostoli et eorum sequaces benedictiones fecerunt super sacrificium domini ad implendum sermonem domini quem eis mandauerat de corpore et sanguine suo conficiendo et sumendo in memoriam eius. Dicit enim in epistola ad chorinthios sic, "Calix benedictionis cui benedicimus, nonne communicatio sanguinis christi est et panis quem frangimus nonne communicatio corporis christi est?" Id est, nonne corpus christi est cui communicamus? In eo autem quod dixit "benedicimus", non solum significauit se et alios apostolos habere potestatem

250-52 1 Cor. 10:16
faciendi benedictiones super sacrificium altaris sed et chorinthiorum presbyteros quibus scribèbat et quibus multa mandabat de sacramento corporis et sanguinis domini quomodo digne illud tractare


Fuit mihi concertatio de his rebus quadam uice in domo mea bonne cum quodam uiro qui suspectus erat nobis quod esset de secta katarorum, et contigit ut incideremus ad loquendum de sacerdotibus malis et dicebat ita de eis, "Quomodo potest fieri ut qui tam irrationabiliter uiuunt distribuant in ecclesia corpus domini?" Et dixi ei, "Nonne legimus quod pilatus, qui salutarem crucifixit et

264 in domo mea bonne: As a secular canon in Bonn, attached to the church St. Cassius, Eckbert apparently maintained a private residence within the city, as was still common for canons in the Rhineland during the twelfth century.
infidelis erat, in potestate habuit dare corpus eius cui uellet et dedit hoc ioseph, uiro iusto? In eadem pacientia dominus est etiam nunc et tolerat malos sacerdotes et sinit eos habere potestatem in ecclesia et distribuere corpus et sanguinem suam tam bonis quam malis." Et continuo ille subiecit dicens, "Post illud tempus passionis (f. 64v - f. 65r) sue ipse non uenit in manus eorum." Ex his uerbis satis intellexi incredulitatem eius quam suspicatus fueram de eo, uidelicet quod non credebat ab aliquo hominum posse tractari aut sumi in ecclesia corpus et sanguinem domini. Dixique ei cum indignatione, "O katare, nunc te manifeste conuincam" et reuolui epistolas pauli quas presentes habebam ac demonstraui ei locum illum ubi ad


281 hominum] homine C
281 tractari, corrected by A from tractare
282 ei, inserted by A from above line
285 ac] et c
chorinthios scribens dicit, "Quicumque manducauerit panem uel biberit calicem domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis domini. Probet autem se ipsum homo et sic de pane illo edat et de calice bibat. Quicumque enim manducat et bibit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit, non diiudicans corpus domini." Hec uerba cum illi exposuissem comprehendi eum sermone hoc. "Si ita est," inquam, "ut dicis, uidelicet quod ex eo tempore quo dominus transiit ex hoc mundo non uenit corpus eius in manus cuiusquam, consequens est quod ex illo tempore neque digne neque indigne potuit aliquis manducare corpus eius aut sanguinem eius potare. Et si non potest ab aliquo sumi indigne, nemo potest in eo sumere sibi iudicium. Frustra ergo sermonem illum

286-92 1 Cor. 11:27-29

292 exposuissem, corrected by A from exposuissem
295 transiit, A reads transsiit
dixit apostolus quod qui indigne sumit corpus aut sanguinem domini iudicium sibi manducat et bibit."
Hec cum dixissem obticuit et neque incredulitatem quam in eo redarguebam negauit neque ueritati qua
305 convictus erat consensit.

Et nunc de eadem scriptura alloquor et uos aduersarios meos. Si non est ita ut credimus, quod sacerdotes ecclesie consecrent corpus et sanguinem domini et si non potest fieri ut ab aliquo homine
310 sumatur, nunquid potestis dicere nobis quis sit ille panis aut calix domini in quo sibi iudicium manducat et bibit qui indigne illud manducat et bibit et ex quo multos etiam contingit corporaliter infirmari et mori dum indigne
315 communicant? Quod est illud corpus domini quod

311-15 1 Cor. 11:27-29

301 aut] et C
303 obticuit] conticuit C
311 aut, corrected by A from auc
313 etiam, inserted by A from margin
diiudicandum esse apostolus demonstrat et quid est
diiudicare corpus domini? Omnia certe hec uane et
superflue dicuntur si ipsum uerum corpus christi
communicabile hominibus non est.

320 Ego uobis sensum scripture de qua nunc nobis
sermo est explanabo, licet indignos uos esse
cognoscam sed magis hoc facio propter nostros
simplices populos. Panem et calicem apostolus
appellat corpus domini et sanguinem domini quia sub
325 specie panis et uini ista sunt in altari et quamuis
non sit ibi uera substantia panis et uini postquam
consecratio facta est, tamen est ibi sapor et color
et forma panis et uini. Et quidem si non esset in
illo sacrificio alia substantia nisi ipse panis et
330 uinum, non in illo cibo aliquis manducaret iudicium,

317-18 uane et superflue] superflue et uane C
320-21 nunc nobis sermo] nunc sermo C
321 indignos] C reads iudignos
323-24 apostolus appellat corpus domini] domini
appellat Apostolus corpus C
326 non sit ibi] ibi non sit C
id est, damnationem suam magis quam in alio aliquo
cibo neque propter illam manducationem continget
aliquos infirmari aut mori, cum non sit periculosus
cibus simplex panis et uinum. Forsitan quia est

335 panis est benedictus et uinum est benedictum, ideo
qui indigne manducat panem illum et uinum illud
bibit iudicium sibi manducat et bibit et forte
infirmatur aut moritur quia benedictionem sanctam
non bene honorauit. Si hoc dicitis, interrogo

340 quare dixit, "Reus erit corporis et sanguinis
domini, qui indigne manducat panem illum et calicem
illum bibit." Si non est ibi nisi simplex panis
benedictus et simplex uinum benedictum, rectius
dixisset reus erit benedicti panis et benedicti (f.

345 65v - f. 66r) uini indigne accepti. Sed dixit,
"Reus erit corporis et sanguinis domini,"
subintelligimus indigné accepti et quodammodo
perditi quantum in ipso est.

Animaduertite nunc et hoc quod dicit, "Eum non
diiudicare corpus domini, qui de pane illo dominico
indigne edit aut de calice bibit." Si quis praue et
sordide uiiit et sine timore peccatorum suorum
audacter accedit ad communicandum corpori et
sanguini domini quasi sit alius cibus, hic indigne
communicat et hic non diiudicat, id est, non
discernit corpus domini ab aliis cibis per timorem
et reuerentiam dei. Item et si sit homo caste et
sobrie uiiens et tamen non credat uere esse corpus
domini illud quod a sacerdotibus ecclesie in altari
consecratur per orationem et benedictionem, hic si

346 1 Cor. 11:27
349-51 1 Cor. 11:29
propter aliquam simulationem accedit ad sanctam communionem, edit indigne corpus domini et non discernit illud ab aliis cibis per fidem catholicam et manducat ac bibit sibi iudicium, id est, damnationem. Hoc tu, infelix katare, facis, qui in occulto negas uerum corpus christi esse in altari et omnia que a sacerdotibus nostris in ecclesia aguntur in textrina tua irrides et nichilominus adueniente paschali die cum populo ad ecclesiam properas, barbam reuerenter tergis et complanas et muito humilius ceteris genua tua ad altare incuruas atque hiantius bucam apperis ad accipiendam sanctam communionem, uidelicet tuam eternam damnationem, quatinus uidearis hominibus bene catholicus ac religiosus et ut hi quos per

365-68 Here, Eckbert adds the rejection of the doctrine of the Real Presence to the core of secret teachings of the Cathar "perfect" [perfecti], which were dualist in nature and concealed from most members of the sect. See Sermones, I, p. 14. The spiritual baptism of the Cathars was probably the rite which led to access to these teachings, but elsewhere Eckbert suggests that reaching this level could take several years. See Sermones, III, p. 5.

366 occulto, A reads oculto
370-71 reuerenter tergis et complanas] reuerenter complanas C
372 bucam apperis] buccam aperis C
pecuniam conducitis ad tuendum uos dicere possint in
defensione uestra. "Quid requirimus ab hominibus
istis? (f. 66r - f. 66v) Boni et iusti sunt et omnia
agunt que pertinent ad christianos. Utinam nos
simus tales."

Ab uno uiro qui de angulis uestris exierat unam
talem sapientiam uestram audiui. Corpus uestrum
domini est et corpus domini facitis quando panem
uestrum benedicitis atque ex eo corpus uestrum
reficitis. Hoc sermone dolose significatis quando
inquiritur a uobis utrum uere fidem habeatis de
corpore domini et respondetis inquirentibus bonam
uos fidem de corpore domini habere. Si ergo hec
ita se habent et si hoc est uerbum occulte
sapientie uestre, scitote quia non est hec

380 simus tales] tales simus C
385 Hoc sermone] Hunc sermonem C
388 fidem de corpore domini] de corpore domini fidem C
sapientia a domino deo sed adinuenit eam princeps
uester diabolus, ut per talem sermonem daret
infidelitati uestre aliquem colorem in quo esset
similis fidei catholice quominus abhorreret eam
populus stultus quem trahitis post uos.

Nolite, misera gens, fallere uosmetipsos
inanibus uerbis. Verum quidem esse fatemur quod
omne corpus, omnis caro, domini est cuius est terra
et plenitudo eius et iustorum hominum non solum
anime sed et corpora membra christi dicuntur, ut
apud paulum qui dicit, "An nescitis quia corpora
uestra membra christi sunt?" Nusquam tamen hic
modus loquendi in scripturis inuenitur, ut corpus
alicuius hominis quantumlibet sancti uocetur corpus
domi uel alicuius caro uocetur caro christi preter

390-91 princeps uester diabolus: Cf. John 8:44
398-99 Ps. 24:1; 1 Cor. 10:26
401-02 1 Cor. 6:15

393-94 esset similis] similis esset C
illud unicum corpus quod unitum est diuinitati in domino salutatore, hoc singulariter uocatur corpus domini et caro christi in scripturis et ubicumque loquitur scriptura aliquid huiusmodi quod corpus 410 domini manducandum sit a fidelibus, ita hoc dicit, ut non possit sermo ille intelligi de aliqua alio nisi de illo singulari corpore persone christi. Uidete quod dominus (f. 66v - f. 67r) in euangelio sic ait, "Nisi manducaueritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebatis uitam in uobis." Nunquid putatis quod hoc de aliqua filio hominis possit ueraciter intelligi preter illum unicum filium hominis, christum urginis filium? Nunquid putatis quod mactandus sit aliquis homo et 420 coquendus aut assandus et sic manducandus ut uita

414-16 John 6:54

415 habebatis] habetis C
416-17 filio hominis] hominis filio C
eterna habeatur? Non hoc certe precepit deus in lege sua qui dixit, "Non occides." Etiam si sine peccato occidi possit homo et manducari, non habet tamen tantam uim humana caro ut suo gustu possit alicui prestare uitam eternam. Ex hoc ergo scitote quod dominus singulariter de suo corpore quod diuinitati erat unitum loquebatur cum dicebat, "Nisi manducaueritis carnem filii hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis uitam in uobis."

Filium hominis se solebat appellare salvator nec usquam in euangeliiis hac appellacione significatus est alius aliquis preter ipsum. Hinc scimus quoniam et hoc loco ubi dixit de carne filii hominis se singulariter significavit.

Vt autem certius fieret de quo filio hominis

422 Ex. 20:13
427-29 John 6:54

429-30 sanguinem non habebitis uitam in uobis. Filium] sanguinem et cetera. Filium C
430 solebat appellare, corrected by A from appellat solebat
hic loqueretur et qualem uita promitteret his qui
manducarent carnem ipsius et sanguinem biberent,
postea et alio loco ait, "Qui manducat meam carnem
et bibit meum sanguinem, habet uita eternam." Uera
quidem caro est caro christi sed in multis ab omni
alia carne singularis est et tali modo manducatur
quo nullus alius cibus manducatur, sicut et supra
ostensum est. Vnita est divinitati ex ea hanc
habet uirtutem, ut qui eam digne manducat uita
evern in ea manducet quia sancti-(f. 67r - f.
67v)-ficatur per uirtutem deifici spiritus qui
carni adiunctus est. Qui vero indigne manducat
huic ipsa caro non prodest quicquam, sicut et ipse
dominus testatus est dicens, "Spiritus est qui
uiuificat, caro non prodest quicquam." Non solum

438-39 John 6:54
449-50 John 6:64

443 divinitati ex, A reads divinitatius] divinitati
et ex C
448 quicquam] aliquid C
autem non prodest caro illa indigne manducanti sed
et nocet quia iudicium sibi manducat in ea.
Disperdit enim illum deus inhabitans carnem sanctam
et ulciscitur iniuriam habitaculi sui.

Sicut autem singularis est illa caro ab omni
alia carne, ita et de ea ordinavit deus ut
singulariter manducetur et aliter quam aliquis alius
cibus. Nam sub specie panis in altari nobis uirtute
diuina presentatur et uidetur et tangitur. In

sapore panis gustatur et manducatur sicut et
sanguis dominicus in specie uini nobis presentatur
et in sapore uini gustatur et hauritur. Fractio ibi
uidetur sed ea in sacramento est tantum, id est, in
forma panis uisibili. Comminutio partium in

manducando sentitur sed item in solo sacramento

464 panis uisibili] uisibilis panis C
464 Comminutio] Communio C
est, autem ipsa substantia dominici corporis que in sacramento latet integra manet et incorrupta. Manducatur hic cibus sed non consumitur ut alius cibus. Ad animam transit, animam confortat et illuminat eamque conducit ad uitam eternam.

Singularitas ista in illa sancta carne est quam de virginis utero filius dei assumpsit sibique eam segregavit ex omni carne que sub celo est, ut hec mirabilia operetur in ipsa ad salutem electorum suorum. Proptera non uobis durum uideatur credere specialiter de hac carne dictum esse illud quod supra ex euangelio inductum est, "Nisi manducaueritis carnem filli hominis et biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis uitam in uobis." Et illud, "Caro mea uere est cibus (f. 67v - f. 68r) et

477-79 John 6:54

466 autem, inserted by A from margin
466 autem ipsa] ipsa autem C
475 Proptera] Propterea C
sanguis meus uere est potus," aliaque similia his. Quidam discipulorum christi qui talia ipsum dicentem audierant murmurabant dicentes, "'Quo modo potest hic nobis carnem suam dare ad manducandum? Durus est hic sermo, quis potest eum audire?' Et conuersi retro discesserunt ab eo et ultra non ambulauerunt cum ipso." Estimabant enim quod diceret eis se manducandum ab eis in ea specie qua apparebat inter eos, ita ut perfrusta concideretur et dentibus eorum dilaniaretur et ut sanguis eius in sanguinis specie hauriretur ab eis. Ipse uero non hunc modum manducandi eis significabat sed illum manducandi modum quo uere quidem caro christi manducatur, ita tamen ut manducanti uideatur non se manducare carnem sed panem et ut bibenti sanguinem

480-81 John 6:56

491 sanguinis specie] specie sanguinis C
493 manducandi] manducationis C
494 manducanti, corrected by A from manducandi
eius uideatur non sanguinem se potare sed unum.

Hoc uero idcirco ita fieri ordinavit deus ut tanto maius sit meritum eius qui cum tali fide utrumque sumit, ut credat potentiam dei tantam esse ut hoc facere possit et bonitatem eius tantam esse ut hoc dignetur facere pro hominis dilectione. Item et propter hoc uoluit dominus carnem suam manducari et sanguinem suum potari in alia specie quam est, ne nimium expauesceret quisquam manducare carnem illam et sanguinem illum potare si uideret utrumque in propria specie et ut tanto minorem occasionem haberent iudei siue pagani irridendi christianos ac dicendi quod manducarent dominum suum et biberent sanguinem hominis occisi. Vir quidam nostri temporis qui infamatus erat quod de cataria uestra

496 sanguinem se] se sanguinem C
497 uero] uere C
gustasset, cum interrogaretur in extremis suis an uellet dari sibi corpus domini, dixisse memoratur, "Si esset illud corpus tante quantitatis (f. 68r - f. 68v) ut est petra (mons est secus renum) erenberti iamdudum esset consumptum ex quo primum cepit manducari." Verbum irrisionis erat hoc et ex infidelitate processit in qua, ut dicunt, et uos estis absorpti. Unde et uos de eodem uerbo conuenio.

520 Nunquid creditis uerum esse quod dominus iesus

509-16 Cf. the account of Peter de Vaux de Cernay, writing of the Southern French Cathars in about 1218: "They said . . . that the body of Christ, even though it had been as great as the Alps, would have been long ago consumed and annihilated by those who had eaten of it." P. Guébin, ed., Petri Vallium Sarnaii Monachi Hystoria Albigensis, 3 vols., 1 (Paris, 1939): 7 as quoted in Edward Peters, Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980): 124.

514-15 petra . . . erenberti: The identity of this mountain of "Erenbertus", beside the Rhine, is unknown to me. The marginal comment of C suggests that it was near Coblenz (Conduentiae), near the medieval town of Hermelstein.

513 corpus tante] corpus domini tantaec C
514 mons est secus renum, inserted by A from margin] petra Erenberti C; Ea est est regione Conduentiae, hodie Hermelstein dicta added in margin by C
515-16 cepit manducari] coepit primum manducari C
518 absorpti, A reads absorpti
christus de quinque panibus saciauit quinque milia
hominum et quod saturatis superfuerunt duodecim
chophini fragmentorum? Negare hoc non potestis nisi
euangeliiis contradicere uelitis in quibus hoc
manifeste legitur. Et nunquid non creditis quin et
per eandem uirtutem qua hoc miraculum fecit
potuisset et alios plures illis quinque milibus
saciare ex eisdem panibus? Dubium non est quin
potuisset. Plus enim panis erat in duodecim
cophinis fragmentorum quae superfuerant
manducantibus quam fuisset primo in illis quinque
panibus antequam eos distribuere cepisset in
turbas. Nam forte in uno duodecim cophinorum aut
duobus potuissent fuisse contenti panes illi qui ab
uno puero illic baiulabantur. Idcirco autem plus
superesse uoluit dominus quam distributum fuisset,
ut intelligeretur nondum ita coartatam fuisse
potentiam eius quin adhuc ex eisdem panibus multo
plura milia saciasse potuisset. Id ipsum autem
miraculum quod fecit de quinque panibus poterat sine

520-29 Matt. 14:13-21; Mark 6:30-44; Luke 9:10-17;
John 6:1-13

521-22 saciauit quinque milia hominum] quinque milia
hominum satiauit C
523 non, inserted by A from above line
524-25 hoc manifeste] manifeste hoc C
530 superfuerant] superauerant C
539 Id ipsum] Idipsum C
dubio fecisse de uno et non solum de uno integro pane sed et de buccella panis hoc facere potuit. Omni dubitatione remota credere possumus quod eadem uirtute qua potuit de nichilo omnia facere posset et miracum panis ita multiplicare, ut inde saciaret infinita milia hominum. Qua ergo ratione diffidere possimus quod eadem uirtute (f. 68v - f. 69r) possit hoc miraculum facere de corpore suo, ut cotti die in sacramento manducetur a multis in ecclesia sua et tamen nunquam manducando consumatur? Certe sicut olim christus in cena sua inconsumpto et integro corpore coram discipulis suis sedebat ea hora qua manducabant corpus eius ipso dicente, "Accipite et manducate, hoc est corpus meum quod pro uobis tradetur," sic et nunc eisdem horis eisdemque

553-551 Cor. 11:24; Luke 22:19

544 omnia facere] facere omnia C
547 possit, corrected by A from posset
552 discipulis suis sedebat] discipulis sedebat C
554 manducate] C reads mandncate
555 eisdemque, -que inserted by A from above line
momentis quibus per diversos fines mundi in ecclesiis manducatur sacrum corpus eius sedet inconsumpto et integro corpore ad dexteram patris in celo. Non ex nostro humano sensu hanc fidem habemus sed ex scripturis veritatis que sunt a spiritu sancto et in quibus totius catholice fidei fundamentum uniuersa christi ecclesia habet.

Tu uero, o katare, hanc fidem in absconditis tuis irrides quasi stulticiam magnam. Infelix, quomodo tu audes stulticie deputare hoc quod facit sapientia dei? An impossible est an non christo, qui est dei uirtus et dei sapientia, de corpore suo facere quod uult? An oculus tuus neguam est quia ipse bonus est? Vere bonus est quia causa electorum suorum multa fecit et adhuc facitque ei ab

557 manducatur sacrum corpus] manducatur corpus C
558 inconsumpto et integro corpore] inconsumpto corpore C
559 ex nostro] ex hoc nostro C
565 quomodo tu audes] quomodo audes C
569-70 causa electorum suorum] electorum suorum causa C
inimicis suis, uidelicet iudeis et paganis et
similibus tui reputantur ad stulticiam et ad
infirmatem. Sed sicut dicit apostolus, "Quod
stultum est dei sapientius est hominibus et quod
infirmmum est dei fortius est hominibus."

"Non possum," inquis, "credere hoc quod dicitur
de corpore domini quia nullatenus intelligo qualiter
esse possit." Insipiens homo, nunquid putas deum
nichil fa-(f. 69r - f. 69v)-cere posse quod tu non
possis intelligere? Et quid est in omnibus que
credere nos oportet quod homo super terram uiuens
suo sensu ualeat omnino penetrare aut intelligere
quomodo sit aut quomodo fuerit? Iam tandem pone
pertinatiam inimice ueritatis et crede securus ea
que dixi, quia nichil periculi ex hac fide pacieris,

573-75 1 Cor. 1:25

577 domini] Christi C
579 facere posse] posse facere C
immo et multum fructum ex ea inuenies. Si uero non credideris in infidelitate tua eternaliter peribis. Secure dico quod nichil ex ea fide quam predico periculi pacieris quia sancti uiri, qui fuerunt ante nos quorum sanctitas predicatur et glorificatur in uniueso mundo, in hac fide saluati sunt. Sancti apostoli et apostolici patres missas celebrasse leguntur in ea fide qua crediderunt se corpus et sanguinem domini conficere et accipere et aliis dare.

Legitur quod accidit aliquando ut hec infidelitas de corpore domini qua uos irretiti estis etiam in populo romano increuisset et magnam partem ciuitatis occupasset tempore beati gregorii pape. Qui, cum oraret pro infidelitate populi et

588 quod] quia, quod C  
597 domini] Christi C  
599 tempore beati gregorii, A reads tempor] tempore Gregorii C
inter missarum sollemnia secundum consuetudinem, obtulisset super altare dei panem et unum et solitas benedictiones fecisset, hoc precibus a deo obtinuit ut appareret illic caro dominica sicuti erat et ostenderetur his qui aderant in specie carnis que prius illic fuerat in specie panis sicque liberatus est populus ab infidelitate hac.

Legimus de beato martino tuonensi episcopo, qui non minor sanctis apostolis habebatur, quod dum sacramenta corporis et sanguinis domini in ecclesia offerret, globus igneus apparuit super caput eius. Signum hoc indubitanter a deo erat et demonstrauit deus in hoc meritum sancti uiri et officii eius sanctitatem (f. 69v – f. 70r) honorauit, quod nequaquam fecisset si falsa et inanis fuisset fides.
eius cum qua astabat altari divino et qua credebat adesse in manibus suis corpus et sanguinem domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Tales itaque uiros confidenter sequi potes in ea fide qua ipsi nos precesserunt et quam a talibus scriptam habemus in libris quos reliquerunt post se. Manes tuus manet in inferno, illi uero manent in celo. Tu fuge manen et infernum, hos nobiscum sequere, ut cum eis pariter maneamus in eternum. Quod prestare dignetur Iesus Christus dominus nostrum qui cum deo patre et spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat deus per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.


Cum hac igitur oblaturus sacrificium Deo ueste procedit quo quidem die - mira dicturus sum - cum iam altarium, sicut est sollemne, benediceret, globum ignis de capite illius uidimus emicare, ita ut in sublime contendens longum admodum crinem flamma produceret . . .

616 astabat
622 ili] isti C
623 manen] Manem C
625-26 christus dominus noster qui] CHRISTUS qui C
Sermo XIII

Sermo contra nonam hereses de humanitate saluatoris

Edificium sine fundamento, ut opinor, construxi.

Nam qui bene uos noscunt saluatoris humanitatem
genare uos dicunt. Quod si ita est, uane operam
consumpsi disputans uobiscum de corpore et sanguine
domi. Non est autem incredibile mihi insani
magistri insanos esse discipulos. Nam princeps
erroris uestri, manes, saluatorem nostrum ita in
humanitate apparessse docebat ut uideretur quidem
esse homo et non esset uere homo et quod nec uere
natus fuisset de uirgine nec uere passus nec uere
mortuus nec uere a morte suscitus, sicut et duo
magi zaroe et arfaxat ante ipsum in persia docuisse

13 zaroe: Zoroaster?, b. ca. 660 B.C.
13 arfaxat: Arphaxad?, king of the Medes, overthrown
by Nebuchadnezzar, according to Judith 1;
probably an apocryphal character.

1 Sermo contra ix hereses de humanitate saluatoris]
Contra nonam haeresim de humanitate Saluatoris.
Sermo XII. C
10 esse homo] homo esse C
11-12 nec uere passus nec] neque uere passus neque C

337
leguntur. Quod si in hoc errore illum sequimini magis quam sancta euangelia de quibus uos iactatis quod uos soli ea sciatis et obseruetis, proculdubio aut ceci estis aut insani. Ceci estis si in eis humanitatem christi non intelligitis que ibi manifeste predicatur; insani autem si uere intelligitis et tamen obstinata mente euangeliiis contradicere audetis. Si essetis (f. 70r - f. 70v) iudei, forsitan longam disputationem ex lege et prophetis de hac re uobiscum aggredere; nunc autem cum uos profiteamini esse christianos et euangelia legatis et sciatis, sicut dicitis, non me sinit indignatio de hoc aduersum uos longo sermone laborare.

6-14 De haeresibus, 46; Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 94: "Christum . . . nec fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur . . ." See also Contra Faustum, XX.11; XXIX.1-4, CSEL, 25, pp. 548-51, 743-47.

14 hoc, inserted by A from margin
20 euangeliiis] Evangelistis C
23 aggredere, A reads agrederer
Legitis enim ibi manifeste quod easdem humane nature infirmitates in carne sua sustinuit quas
naturaliter pati et aliī homines solent. Esuruit et sitiuit, lassatus est ex itinere, dormiuit, fleuit, tristatus est, sicut euangeliste testantur quos ut puto non auditis dicere fuisse mentitos. Quod si uere non fuit in eo substantia carnis sed umbratilis quedam similitudo corporis humani, nullo modo ista uera esse potuerunt de eo.

Dicitis forte quod quia simuluit se esurire, sitire, et cetera omnia que diximus, ideo euangeliste ita de eo locuti sunt, ut illos gestus simulationis eius talibus exprimerent uerbis filii belial, qua uos audatis imponitis simplici agno simulationis duplicitatem ueritati que deus est falsitatem? Ipse uerum corpus et animam se habuisse testatus est et qua temeritate uos dicitis neutrum in ipso fuisset et magis in hoc credendum

29 sua, inserted by A from margin
30 naturaliter, A reads natulariter
30 Esuruit] Esuriuit C
36 esse potuerunt] potuerunt esse C
37 quia simuluit] qui assimiluit C
40 simulationis] similationis C
45 in hoc credendum] credendum in hoc C
arbitramini fallaci manicheo quam ueraci deo?

Verum corpus se habere testabatur quando ad discipulos suos dicebat, "'Uidete manus meas et pedes meos quia ego sum. Palpate et uidete quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut me habere.' Et cum hoc dixisset, ostendit eis manus et pedes."

Et post hoc cum obtulissent ei ad manducandum partem piscis assi et fauum mellis, manducauit coram illis. Animam quoque se habere ostendit in eo quod imminente sibi passione sua (f. 70v - f. 71r) dicebat, "Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem."

Similiter et in eo quod dicebat, "Potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam et iterum sumendi eam." Quid ergo dubitas, infelix katare, ueram humanitatem eum habuisse quem ex uerbis ipsius intelligere potes

56 Matt. 26:38  
57-58 John 10:18

47 se habere] habere se C  
60 habuisse] habuisset C
uerum corpus humanum et animam habuisse?

Si dubitas eum de uirginis utero corpus
assumpsisse, curre, miser, ad euangelium luce in quo
leguntur uerba angeli ad mariam loquentis hoc modo,

65
"Ecce, concipies in utero et paries filium."

"In utero," inquit, "concipies," ut intelligas de ipsa
carne uirginalis uteri et non aliunde eum carnem
assumpsisse. Item idipsum intelligere potes ex
uerbis angeli que, ut matheus scribit, ad ioseph

70
locutus est hoc modo, "Ioseph fili dauid, noli
timere accipere mariam coniugem tuam quod enim in ea
natus est de spiritu sancto est."

"In ea," inquit,
"natum est," ne putas umbratile aliquod et non
ueram carnem eum eduxisse de utero matris, uel

75
aliunde quam ab ipsa corpus assumpsisse, ut infelix

65 Luke 1:31
70-72 Matt. 1:20

73 aliquod] aliquid C
75 corpus assumpsisse] corpus eum assumpsisse C
ualentinianus dicebat, "Christum de celo corpus attulisse in uterum matris ac per eam quasi per fistulam eum transisse in hunc mundum," uel sicut apelles hereticus dicebat, "Non de celis sed ex aere eum corpus assumpssisse quod produxit de uirgine."

Item ad hoc ipsum pertinet quod apostolus dicit, "Misit deus filium suum factum ex muliere factum sub lege." "Factum," inquit, "ex muliere", ut intelligas substantiam corporis eius de substantia uirgine carnis fabricatam fuisse.

Cum uera carne natum fuisse christum ex predictis testimoniis, si quid sane mentis habes,
intelligere potes et in uera carne eum fuisse passum et mortuum ex multis scripture testimoniis
evidentissimum est et nunc unum pro multis inductum sufficiat, ex iohannis euangelio qui in fine passionis dominice ita ait, "Vnus militum lancea latus eius ape- (f. 71r - f. 71v) -ruit et continuo exiuit sanguis et aqua et qui uidit testimonium
perhibuit et uerum est testimonium eius. Et scit ille quia dicit uera ut et uos credatis. Facta sunt enim hec ut scriptura impleretur, 'Os non cominuetis ex eo.' Et iterum alia scriptura dicit, 'Uidebunt in quem transfinxerunt.'" Adtende quid ait quia exiuit sanguis et aqua et quod hoc se uidisse testatur et scire se rei ueritatem dicere diligenter affirmat, ut nullo modo dubitetur ueritatem carnee substantie in christo fuisse. Nam si fantasticum habuisset corpus, ita ut non fuisse in ipso uera
caro sed inanis et umbratilis quedam carnis

---

92-99 John 19:34-37
97-98 Ps. 34:20
98-99 Zech. 12:10

93 aperuit] perforauit C
99 transfinixerunt] transfixerunt C
99 Adtende] Attende C
103 fantasticum] phantasticum C
104 habuisset corpus] corpus habuisset C
104 ipso] eo C
similitudo, ut mentitus est uester manicheus, non
magis de corpore eius lancea confixo quam de uento
percusso potuisset profluere sanguis et aqua. Quod
uero in eadem carne in qua natus est et passus est
etiam resurrexerit ex uerbis que supra induxi patet
que post resurrectionem suam dixit, ostendens
discipulis suis manus suas et pedes et ex eis que
dixit thome dubitanti. Si sufficere possunt hec que
dixi ad comprobandum uobis ueritatem humane nature
que est in christo iesu, sufficient. Sin autem
maneat, infelix katharus, sum suo mane in mendaciis
suis et qui in sordibus est, sordescat adhuc et
pereffluat in perditionem loquentium mendatium.

107 confixo] perforato C
108 potuisset] potuissent C
109-10 passus est etiam] passus etiam C
110 resurrexerit] resurrexit C
114 comprobandum] comprobandum C
115 que est in] quae in C
Sermo XIV

Sermo contra christi heresim de humanis animabus

De heresi quam supra inter ceteras decimo loco ordinaui, nescio an sit generalis hominibus secte huius quia in plerisque rebus dissident a se ipsis, ita ut quod a quibusdam eorum asseritur ab aliis negetur. De ea heresi loquor qua dicunt nichil aliud esse animas humanas nisi illos apostatos 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 ipsorum. Hoc autem non legitur inter errores manichei sed alia non minor insania (f. 71v - f. 72r) de animabus ibi inuenitur idcirco dubium mihi est, ut dixi, utrum hii homines hunc errorem generaliter teneant an non. Quod siue ita sit siue

1 Sermo contra christi heresim de humanis animabus] Contra haeresim decimam de humanis animabus. Sermo XIII C
5 quod, inserted by A from margin
5 quibusdam, -bus inserted by A from above line
7 apostatos, -tos inserted by A from above line
7 apostatos] apostatas C
11 ipsorum] eorum C
non, quamuis ad magnam dementiam pertineat hic sermo et iuste non aliis argumentis compesci deberet nisi uirga et baculo, rationabilia tamen responsa dare nos decet etiam insanis.

20 Est autem hic error ita abhominabilis et humane rationi contrarius ut non sit mihi grandis metus de simpliciori populo quod facile in eum possit induci, propterea non multum laboris in hac parte assumere propono sed breuem contradictionem adversus insensatos adduco. Ex antiquo hoc in communi fide est et sacra scripta attestantur quod ad hoc creavit deus humanum genus, ut ex eo restauraret celestis curie numerum angelorum qui ex ea ceciderant in exordio mundi. Postquam autem per inuidiam diaboli etiam humanum genus lapsum est in peccatum et de

25-29 Gen. 1:26-27

17 non aliis] non ab aliis C
22 possit] posset C
27 celestis] coelesti C
paradiso expulsum est in primis parentibus; filius
dei in his nouissimis temporibus factus est homo ut
humanum genus a peccatis suis et a potestate diaboli
liberaret, quatinus adhuc in eo perficeret quod
proposuerat, uidelicet ut ex eo celestem curiam
restauraret et impleret numerum angelorum suorum qui
fuerat imminutus per ruinam illorum qui proiecti
fuerant de celo propter superbiam suam.

Creditis hoc uos qui ex aduerso estis? Si non
creditis, ecce, inducam uobis uerba apostoli ex
quibus intelligere potestis ita esse ut dixi. Hic
in epistola quam scripsit ad ephesios de deo patre
dicit quodam loco sic, "Gratificauit nos in dilecto
filio suo in quo habemus redemptionem per sanguinem
eius et remissionem peccatorum secundum diuicias

39 aduerso] paradiso C
40 apostoli ex] apostoli Pauli ex C
gratiae sue que superhabundauit in nobis in omni sapientia et prudentia, ut notum nobis sacramentum faceret voluntatis sue secundum bonum placitum eius quod proposuit in eo in dispensatione plenitudinis temporum (f. 72r - f. 72v) instaurare omnia in christo que in celis et que in terris sunt in ipso."

Hoc ergo animaduertite in hoc sermone quod dicit proposuisse deum patrem instaurare in christo "omnia que in celis et que in terris sunt in ipso." Omnia que in terris sunt in ipso, id est, in predestinatione et electione ipsius, id est, omnes electos homines proposuit deus instaurare in christo, id est, per christum. Item omnia que in celis sunt, id est, totum numerum angelorum qui fuerat diminutus per ruinam lapsorum spirituum

43-51 Eph. 1:6-10
54-55 omnia . . . ipso: Eph. 1:10; Col. 1:16, 20

47-48 sacramentum faceret] faceret sacramentum C
60 diminutus] imminutus C
proposuit instaurare per christum, ita ut
redimeretur humanum genus per ipsum et loco
angelorum qui ceciderant collocaretur atque ita
celestis curia ad integritatem plenitudinis sue
rediret in qua primo condita fuerat. Nam si ille
numerus ministrorum dei quam in principio ad laudem
nominis sui creavit per christum redintegratus non
fuerit, non omnia in celis per ipsum instaurantur.
Si uero per ipsum impletus fuerit ille numerus, ita
ut tot homines saluentur quot angeli ceciderunt uel
plures, sicut asserunt, quidam et si nichil aliud
sunt anime humane quam illi spiritus qui
ceciderunt, necessario concedendum est quod et omnes
angeli qui ceciderunt et omnes homines saluandi
sint.

63 qui ceciderant collocaretur atque] collocaretur
electorum hominum numerus C
63-64 ita celestis curia] coelestis curia ita C
66 quam] quem C
68 ipsum] Christum C
73 concedendum: A reads concedum?
Qui erunt ergo angeli de quibus in nouissimo dominus dicturus est et qui erunt homines quibus dicturus est, "Ite maledicti in ignem" angelorum collocaetur electorum hominum numerus atque "eternum qui paratus est diabolo et angelis eius"?

Nunquid non cognoscitis hic quoque vos esse mendaces? Intelligite nunc, insipientes, insipientiam uestram et stulti aliquando sapite et cognoscite quod non descendit filius dei de celo ut redimeret a morte eterna demones sed homines, qui non sunt demones sed quibus est colluctatio contra spiritualia nequicie in celestibus, id est, adversus malignos spiritus qui non regunt, ut dicitis, nostra corpora sed pocius destruere nos et in corpore et in anima incessabiliter student. Non

78-80 Matt. 25:41

76-77 in nouissimo dominus] dominus in nouissimo C 77 est et] est? Et C 77-78 et qui erunt homines quibus dicturus est, inserted by A from margin 80 paratus] praeparatus C 81 cognoscitis, A reads connoscitis 84 cognoscite] agnoscite C 89 nostra corpora] corpora nostra C
uenit saluare malignos spiritus sed torquere eos sicut ipsi confessi sunt quando ex obsessis hominum corporibus clamabant ad eum dicentes, "Quid nobis et tibi fili dei? Uenisti ante tempus torquere nos?"

95 Hactenus de his me disputasse sufficiat et si quid minus sufficienter dixi, ad hec addat prudens defensor ueritatis (f. 72v - f. 73r) quecumque ei competentia uidebuntur ad munimentum catholice fidei, ut arceantur a uinea domini uulpecule pessime que demoliuntur eam. Si quid etiam simpliciter et quodammodo grosse uidobor dixisse, non ex hoc me lector despiciat quia ea consideratione feci ut ubique esset sermo interpretabilis simplici populo, cuius edificationi precipue intendi ista scribendo

100 ad laudem et honorem iesu christi dei et domini nostri, cui est gloria et potestas in celo et in terra permanens in secula seculorum. Amen.

93-94 Matt. 8:29
99-100 arceantur . . . eam: Songs 2:15

95 nos?] nos: C
95 de his me] me de his C
96 ad hec addat] addat ad haec C
98 uidebuntur] uidentur C
Excerptum de Manichaeis ex Augustino

Manes, qui et Manichaeus a discipulis suis
uocatus est ut uitaretur nomen insaniae, natione


Nam que de manicheis a beato augustino con-
scripta sunt summatim et breuiter collegi ex
tribus libris eius, ex eo quin scribitur contra
manicheos et ex eo qui intitulatur de moribus
manicheorum et ex libro de haeresibus . . . ut
qui legerint possint quasi a fundamento totam
hanc heresim plenius agnoscere et intelligent
quoniam hec heresis omnium heresum sentina est.

This collection of Augustine's anti-Manichaean
writings is not found in any manuscript of the
*Sermones*, but is only known through the printed
edition of 1530. It is a compilation of passages in
narrative form taken from the following works:
*Contra epistolam Manichaei uocant fundamenti*, ed. J.
Zycha, CSEL, 25, pt. 2 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891):
193-206; *De moribus ecleesiae catholicae et de
moribus Manichaeorum*, edited in Migne, PL 32, col.
1309-78; *De haeresibus*, ed. Liguori Müller, The De
Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, vol. 90 of The
Catholic University of America Patristic Studies
(Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America
Press, 1956); also see C. Beukers, ed., CCSL, 46
Persa, ueniens in partes Graeciae, spiritum paracletum se esse affirmauit quem dominus Jesus apostolis se missurum promiserat. Hic ex discipulis suis duodecim elegit eosque apostolos nominavit ad imitationem domini Jesu. Quem numerum Manichaei adhuc hodie custodiunt. Nam ex electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros et tertium decimum principem ipsorum. Episcopos autem septuaginta duos qui ordinantur a magistris et presbyteros qui ordinantur ab episcopis; habent et diaconos suos et hi omnes electi uocantur inter eos. Caeteri uero qui nondum ad hos gradus

2-4: Manes . . . Graeciae: v. Augustine of Hippo, De haeresibus, 46, p. 84: "Manichaei a quodam Persa exstiterunt qui vocabatur Manes; quamvis et ipsum, cum eius insana doctrina coepisset in Graecia praedicari, Manichaeum discipuli eius appellare maluerunt devitantes nomen insaniae."

4-6: spiritum . . . promiserat: Ibid., p. 94: "Promissionem Domini Iesu Christi de Paraclito Spiritu Sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam."

6-15: Hic . . . eos: Ibid., p. 94:

Propter quod etiam ipse Manichaeus duodecim discipulos habuit ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichaei hodieque custodiunt. Nam ex Electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros, et tertium decimum principem ipsorum; episcopos autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos.
ascenderunt auditores tantum. Mittuntur autem ex omnibus qui uidentur idonei ad eorum errorem, uel ubi est, sustentandum et augendum, uel ubi non est, seminandum.

Est autem dogma quod a suo haeresiarcha acceperunt huiusmodi: creatorem omnium rerum deum esse negant sed duo rerum principia esse affirmant, unum bonum et alterum malum, et haec sibi coaeterna esse et contraria et bonum quidem principium esse affirmant; malum uero quendam immanem principem tenebrarum a quo omne corpus originem ducere censent. Animas autem hominum et uitalem spiritum quorumlibet animantium et uirtutem quae uiuificat arbores et herbas et semina a deo originem habere

15-16 Caeteri ... tantum: v. De moribus manichaeorum, XVIII.65, col. 1373A: "... quandoquidem auditores vestri, quorum apud vos secundus est gradus, ducere atque habere non prohibeantur uxores."

16-19 Mittuntur ... seminandum: v. De haeresibus, 46; Müller, p. 94: "Sed mittuntur etiam ipsi qui videntur idone ad hunc errorem vel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, vel ubi non est etiam seminandum."

21-22 Creatorem ... negant: v. Ibid., p. 96: "Omnem carnem non Dei, sed malae mentis perhibent esse opificium, quae a contrario principio Deo coaeterna est."

22-27 sed ... censent: Ibid., pp. 84-86: "Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque aeterna et coaeterna, hoc est semper fuisse, compositum duaque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali."
dicunt imo et partem dei unum (p. 150 - p. 151)
quodque talium esse uolunt, nam diuinam substantiam
omnibus generibus corporum admixtam esse credunt.
Hanc autem commixtionem hac ratione factam esse
asserunt; fuerunt, ut ait Manichaeus, ab exordio
duae substantiae a se diuisae; duo scilicet regna
diversa et contraria atque coaeterna, uidelicet
regnum lucis et regnum tenebrarum et regnum quidem
lucis deus pater obtinebat. Hoc quoque substantiam
bonam Manichaeus appellauit, siue naturam bonam et
incommutabilem, et omnino inuiolabilem et hoc non
aliud quam deum esse confessus est. Erat autem, ut
ait, iuxta unum latus illius illustris ac sanctae
terrae tenebrarum terra immensa magnitudine hanc-
quae substantiam malam appellauit, siue fumum malum,
siue malam naturam. Distinxit autem eam in

34-38 Fuerunt . . . obtinebat: v. Contra epistulam,
XIII, p. 209: "Haec quippe, inquit, in
exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae
et luminis quidem imperium tenebat deus pater
in sua sancta stirpe perpetuus."
41-43 Erat . . . magnitudine: v. Ibid., XV,
p. 212: "... iuxta unam uero partem ac latus
in lustris illius ac sanctae terrae erat
tenebrarum terra profunda et inmensa
magnitudine."
quince elementa, fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam,
uentum, et haec quince malas naturas appellauit.

In singulis autem monstra pestifera ac pessima nata
fuisset dicebat: in fumo bipedia, unde et ex

50 habitatoribus fumi homines originem habere dixit; in
tenebris, serpentia; in igne, quadrupedia; in aquis,
natatilia; in uento, volatilia. Vnumquodque autem
genus in suo elemento manere dixit omniaque haec
gentem tenebrarum appellauit.

55 In hac ergo terra morabatur, inquit, immanis
quidam princeps, habens circa se innumerabiles
principes eratque ipse omnium horum dux et origo.
Ponit autem sedem eius in elemento fumi. Quoniam
ergo terra ista cum suis habitatoribus ualde erat

60 pestifera ac regno dei contraria, ne forte ipsa

45-54 Distinxit . . . appellauit: v. De haeresibus,
46, pp. 86-88:

Quinque enim elementa quae geneurunt prin-
cipes proprios genti tribuunt tenebrarum,
eaque elementa his nominibus nuncupant:
fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam, ventum.
In fumo nata animalia bipedia, unde homines
ducere originem censent; in tenebris ser-
pentia, in igne quadrupedia, in aquis
natatilia, in vento volatilia.

55-58 In . . . fumi: v. Contra epistulam, XV,
p. 212: "Pari more introrsum gens
caliginis ac fumi plena, in qua morabatur
immanis princeps omnium et dux habens circa
se innumerabiles principes, quorum omnium
ipse erat mens atque origo . . ."
regno dei aliquod inferret nocumentum, placuit deo
(p. 151 - p. 152) expugnare eam eiusque malitiam
aliquo tempora mento refrenare. Misit itaque de
regno suo alia quinque elementa quae de sua ipsius
substantia fabricauerat et haec quinque illis malis
immiscuit, singula singulis, fumo aerea, tenebris
lucem, igni malo ignem bonum, aquae malae aquam
bonam, uento malo uentum bonum. Facta ergo hac
commixtione bonae naturae cum mala orta sunt ex
illis quinque generibus animantium quae supra
distincta sunt omnia haec genera animantium quae
uidemus in terris, ita ut ex singulis singula
provenirent atque ex illo tempore omnia animalia
partem bonae naturae et partem malae habere dicunt
eo quod post commixtionem boni et mali nata sunt.

63-68 Misit . . . bonum: v. De haeresibus, p. 88:

His quinque elementis malis debellandis alia quinque elementa de regno et
substantia Dei missa esse, et in illa
pugna fuisse permixta fumo aëra, tenebris
lucem, igni malo ignem bonum, aquae malae
aquam bonam, vento malo ventum bonum."
Hac ergo ratione Adam et Euam ex principibus fumi natos asserunt quorum pater nomine Sacllas, ut dicunt, omnium sociorum suorum foetus deuorauit. Et quia magna pars diuinae substantiae admixta erat foetibus illis, ideo maximam partem bonae naturae dicunt eum habuisse et exiguam malae. Qui, cum sancte uiueret propter exuberantem copiam boni, commotam tamen fuisse in eo aduersam partem mali, ut ad concubitum declinaret atque ita eum lapsum esse et peccasse sed uixisse postea sanctiorem.

76-81 Hac . . . malae: v. De haeresibus, 46, p. 94:
Adam et Evam ex parentibus principibus fumi natos, cum pater eorum nomine Saclos sociorum suorum fetus omnium devorasset, et quidquid inde commixtum divinae substantiae ceperat, cum uxore concumbens in carne prolis tamquam tenacissimo vinculo colligasset."

77 Sacllas: The male demon, also known as Ashaqloun, who concentrated the particles of light held in matter into a single creation, Adam, in order to help prevent their escaping. After the female demons had aborted their offspring, and the light contained within them, Sacllas devoured these fetuses in order to ingest as much light as possible. He then mated with his wife, the demoness Namrael, to create Adam and Eve. See Müller, pp. 169-70; Widengren, Mani and Manichaeism, p. 59; Puech, Le Manichéisme, p. 80.

81-85 Qui . . . sanctiorem: v. De moribus manichaeorum, XIX.73, col. 1376A:
Qui cum sancte uiueret propter exsuperantem copiam boni, commotam tamen in eo fuisse aduersam illam partem, ut ad concubitum declinaretur: ita eum lapsum esse atque pecasse, sed vixisse postea sanctiorem.
Dicunt autem quasdam coelestes virtutes ad hoc a deo ordinatas, ut per totum mundum euntes, bonam illam naturam paulatim purgarent a mala cui immixta est et purgatam duabus naibus imponant et ad regna sua transmitant. Naeves autem illas dicunt fabricatas esse ex pura dei substantia et hae sunt, ut dicunt, sol et luna et lunam quidem dicunt factam ex aqua bona, so-(p. 152 - p. 153)-lem uero ex igne bono. Ideoque orationes faciunt ad solem per diem quacunque circuit; ad lunam uero per noctem, si apparet; si non apparet, ad aquilonem, qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem reuertitur.

Ad imitationem itaque coelestium spirituum

86-90 Dicunt . . . transmittant: v. De haeresibus, 46, p. 88:

Esse autem in eis navibus sanctas virtutes, quae se in masculos transfigurant ut ut illiciant feminas gentis adversae, et rursus per hanc illecebran commota eorum eorum concupiscentia fugiat de illis lumen quod membris suis permixtum tenebant, et purgandum suscipiatur ab angelis lucis, purgatumque illis navibus imponatur ad regna propria reportandum.

90-94 Naeves . . . bono: Ibid.: "Naves autem illas, id est, duo caeli luminiaria, ita distinguunt ut lunam dicant factam ex bona aqua, solem vero exigne bono."

94-97 Ideoque . . . reuertitur: Ibid., p. 96: "Orationes faciunt ad solem per diem, quacquareversum circuit; ad lunam per noctem, si apparet; si autem non apparet, ad Aquiloniam partem qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem reuertitur."
etiam electi eorum dicunt se purgare bonam illam

100 natura mala dum comedunt vel bibunt. Quod enim
bonae naturae immixtum est cibis et potibus in
uentre eorum, ut aiunt, liberatur et ipsi illud cum
orationibus transmittunt ad coelestia; quod autem
malae naturae ibi est ad secessum uadit. Hoc autem

105 faciunt in omnibus frugibus et fructibus et
seminibus. Dicunt enim partem illius bonae naturae
etiam terrae admixtam esse, unde cum exhalet et
sursum ad sedes proprias redire conatur in herbas
et arbores per radices earum incurrit sicque in his
eam detineri contingit et impediri, ne ascendat.

110

98-100 Ad . . . bibunt: Ibid., p. 90:

Divinas enim virtutes quantum possunt
imitari se putant ut purgent Dei sui
partem . . . Ac per hoc sequitur eos,
ut sic eam etiam de semine humano,
quemadmodum de aliis seminibus quae in
alimentis sumunt, debeant manducando
purgare.

106-10 Dicunt . . . ascendat: v. De moribus
manicheorum, XV.36, col. 1301A:

Quoniam, inquit, membrum Dei malorum
substantiae commixtum est . . . Pars
autem ilia divina ex omni parte mundi
quotidie purgatur, et in sua regna
resumitur: sed haec per terram exhal-
lans, et ad coelum tendens, incurrirt
in stirpes, quoniam radicibus terrae
affiguntur, atque ita omnes herbas, et
arbusta omnia fecundat et vegetat.
Hinc animalia cibum capiunt, quae si
concumbunt . . . et a certo suo itinere
aversum atque impeditu, erroribus
aerumnisque implicant.
Haec ergo est causa quare agriculturam non exercent quoniam quasi homicidium reputant herbas aut arbores eradicare aut truncare sed et folia aut fructus decerpere nefas habent. His enim in esse sanitas quasdam animas, intellectum habentes, perhibent easque uehementer dolere cum ista laeduntur et expelli cum amputantur. Animas auditorum suorum in electos transire aut in arbores opinantur ideoque omnes arbores ita uenerantur ut et spinas de agris euellere non audeant. Permittunt autem auditoribus suis haec facere ut per eos uictum habere possint; foenerari uero multo licentius putant quam agros colere.

111-23: v. De haeresibus, 46, p. 92:

Herbas enim atque arbores sic putant vivere ut vitam quae illis inest et sentire credant et dolere cum laeduntur, nec aliquid inde sine cruciatu eorum quemquam posse vellere aut carpare. Propter quod agrum etiam spinis purgare nefas habent. Unde agriculturam, quae omnium artium est innocentissima, tanquam plurimum homicidiorum ream dementer accusant. Suisque Auditoribus ideo haec arbitrantur ignosci quia praebent inde alimenta Electis suis ut divina illa substantia in eorum ventre purgata impetret eis veniam quorum traditur oblatione purganda.
A deo autem, ut dictum est, diligentius uolunt
pur-gare illam bonam naturam in omnibus seminibus per
comestionem ut et sperma hu-(p. 153 - p. 154)-manum
farinae panis sui admixtum gustare non abhoreant
sed hoc uelhementer occultant; detecta est tamen haec
illorum turpitude apud Carthaginem, cogente Vrso
tribuno per du-as puellas in diuersis locis, ita ut
neutra alteram hoc prodidisse sciret. Quarum altera
nome Margareta, cum esset annorum nondum duodecim,
propter hoc quasi coeleste mysterium corruptam se
esse confess-a est; altera uero nomine Eusebia
Manichaea quasi sanctimonialis, primo negans,

124-34 A . . . est: v. De haeresibus, 46,
pp. 88-90:

Qua occasione, vel potius exsecrabilis
superstitionis quadam necessitate, co-
guntur Electi eorum velut eucharistiam
conspersam cum semine humano sumere ut
etiam inde, sicut de alius cibus quos
quos accipiunt, substantia illa divina
purgetur. Sed hoc se facere negant, et
alios nescio quos sub nomine Manichaeo-
rum facere affirmant. Detecti sunt tamen
in ecclesia, sicut scis, apud Carthaginem,
iam te ibi diacono constituto, quando in-
stante Urso tribuno, qui tunc domui regiae
praefuit, aliqui adducti sunt. Ubi puella
nomine Margarita istam nefarium turpitudi-
nem prodidit, quae cum esset annorum non-
dum duodecim, propter hoc sclestum mys-
terium se dicebat esse vitiatam. Tunc
Eusebiam quandam Manichaeam quasi sancti-
monialem, idipsum propter hoc ipsum passam
xiv compulit confiteri, cum primo illa se
asseruisset integram, atque ab obstetrice
tandem uix compulsa est idipsum de se fateri et
totum turpissimum illud scelus exponere. Non autem
omnes hoc facere dicuntur sed quidam eorum qui
dicuntur Catharistae, id est, purgatores.

140 Est enim secta illa diuisa in tres partes, in
Catharistas, et Mattharios, et eos qui specialiter
Manichaei obseruent. Carnes omnes immundas iudi-
cant nec eis uescuntur, dicunt enim quia cum
occiditum quodlibet animalis, statim pars illa diui-

145 nae substantiae, quae inerat corpori, euolat et quod
remanet totum immundum est quia ex concubitu

134-37 altera . . . exponere: v. Ibid., pp. 88-90:
Tunc Eusebiam quandam Manichaeam quasi
sanctimoniallem, idipsum propter hoc ip-
sum propter hoc ipsum passam, vix com-
pulit confiteri, cum primo illa se asserv-
uisset integram, atque ab obstetricie in-
spici postulasset. Quae inspecta et quid
esset inventa, totum illud turpissimum
scelus, ubi ad excipiendum et commiscendum
concumbentium semen farina substerni-
tur . . . similiter indicavit.

137-39 Non . . . purgatores: v. Ibid., p. 90: "Unde
etiam Catharistae appellantur, quasi purga-
tores, tanta eam purgantes diligentia ut se
nec ab hac tam horrenda cibi turpitudine
abstineant."

140-42 Est . . . obseruent: v. Ibid.: "Quorum unus
nomine Viator eos qui ista faciunt proprie
Catharistas vocari dicens, cum alias eiusdem
Manichaeae sectae partes in Mattarios et spe-
cialiter Manichaeos distribui perhiberet."
uenit et opificium est gentis tenebrarum et
coinquinat manducantem. Auditoribus suis tamen eas
comedere permittunt sed omnino prohibent ne
animalia occidant; aiunt enim quia principes gentis
tenebrarum sua singuli in terris animalia possident
de suo genere ac stirpe uenientia; qui peremptores
eorum reos tenent nec de hoc mundo exire
permittunt, quin antea poenis quibus possunt eos
atterant; nec oua saltem sumunt, quasi et ipsa cum
franguntur, expirent, sed nec alimonia lactis
utuntur quamuis de corpore uiui animalis mulgeatur.

Vinum non bibunt, dicentes fel esse principum

142-47 Carnes . . . manducantem: v. Ibid., p. 90:
"Nec vescuntur tamen carnibus tamquam de
mortuis vel occisis fugerit divina substantia, tantumque ac tale inde remanserit quod
iam digum non sit in Electorum ventre purgari." v. also De moribus manicheorum,
XV.37, col. 1301C:

Atque ita tot occasionibus divina
fugiente natura, quiddam sordissimum
remanet . . . Quocirca, cum animaetiam
carnem deseruerit, nimias sordes reliquas
fieri, et ideo eorum qui vescuntur
carnibus, animam coinquinari.

148-52 Auditoribus . . . uenientia: v. De
haeresibus, 46, p. 92: "Monent etiam
eosdem Auditores suos ut, si vescuntur
carnibus, animalia non occidant, ne offendant
principes tenebrarum in caelestibus colli-
gatos, a quibus omnem carnem dicunt originem
ducere."
tenebra-(p. 154 - p. 155) -rum; bibunt tamen
caroenum quod non est aliud nisi uinum coctum.
Vuas comedunt et mustum abominantur, dicentes
divinam substantiam fugari in attritione uuarum
quam multis modis a rebus fugere dicunt. Fugit
enim, ut aiunt, dum fruges et poma carpuntur; fugit
cum affliguntur terendo, molendo, coquendo,
manducando; fugit in omnibus motibus animalium, uel
cum gestiunt uel laborant, fugit etiam in ipsa
digestione multaque circa haec turpissime
cofingunt. Eleemosynam ex omnibus quae ipsi

---

155-63 nec . . . dicunt v. De hae.esibus, 46,
pp. 90-92:

Nec ova saltem sumunt quasi et ipsa cum
franguntur exspirent, nec oporteat ullis
mortuis corporibus vesci, et hoc solum
vivat ex carne quod farina, ne moriatur,
excipitur. Sed nec alimonia lactis utuntur,
quamvis de corpore animantis vivente
mulgeatur sive sugatur . . . Nam et vinum
non bibunt, dicentes fel esse principum
tenebrarum, cum vescantur uvis. Nec
musti aliquid, vel recentissimi, sorbent.

163-69 Fugit . . . cofingunt: v. De moribus mani-
cheorum, XV.37; col. 1361C:

Fugit enim aliquid partis illius divinae,
ut perhibetis, dum fruges et poma carpun-
tur; fugit cum affliguntur vel terendo
vel molendo vel coquendo, vel etiam mord-
dendo atque mandendo. Fugit etiam in
omnibus motibus animalium, vel cum ges-
tiunt, vel cum expercentur, vel cum labo-
rant, vel cum omnino aliquid operantur.

---

161 Vuas comedunt: read Vuas non comedunt
comedunt, dare alicui non Manichaeo mendicanti prohibent, ita ut nec aquam in summa necessitate posito uelint porrigere, ne membrum dei quod his rebus admixtum est in illum transeat eiusque peccatis sordidatum impediatur a reitu; ideo saepe coartantur ultra modum comedere et paruulos suos nimia ingluuiie interficere, ne uel aliis dentur uel apud ipsos pereant cibaria eorum quorum utrunque nefas habent.

Vxores electis suis prohibentur, auditoribus conceduntur; monentur tamen auditores

169-74 Eleemosynam . . . reitu: v. Ibid., XV.36, col. 1361B:

Hinc est quod mendicanti homini, qui manichaeus non sit, panem vel aliquid frugum, vel aquam ipsam, quae omnibus vilis est, dari prohibetis; ne membrum Dei, quod his rebus admixtum est, suis peccatis sordidatum a reitu impediat.
diligentissime ut si utuntur coniugibus, conceptum
tamen generationemque arte qua possint deuitent, ne
diuina substantia quae in eos per alimenta
ingreditur uinculis carneis ligetur in prole; per
185
escas etenim et potus parentum in omnem foetum
animam credunt descendere itaque nuptias sine dubio
condemnant quandoquidem generare prohibent propter
quod coniugia copulanda sunt.

Dominum Jesum in terras uenisse, ad animas non
190 ad corpora liberanda eumque nec de uirgine natum

179-80 Vxores . . . conceduntur: v. De moribus
manicheorum, XVIII.65, col. 1372D-73A:

Non enim concubitum, sed . . . vere nuptias prohibetis, quae talis operis una
est honesta defensio. . . non tamen nuptias prohibere; quandoquidem auditores
vestri, quorum apud vos secundus est gradus, ducere atque habere non prohi-
beantur uxores.

180-88 monentur . . . sunt: v. De haeresibus, 46,
p. 92-94:

Et si utuntur coniugibus, conceptum tamen
generationemque devitent ne divina sub-
stantia, quae in eos per alimenta ingre-
ditur, vinculis carneis ligetur in prole.
Sic quippe in omnem carnem, id est, per
escas et potus venire animas credunt.
Unde nuptias sine dubitatione condemnant
et, quantum in ipsis est, prohibent,
quando generare prohibent, propter quod
coniugia copulanda sunt.
credunt, nec fuisse in carne uera sed simulatam
speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus
praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, uerum etiam
resurrectionem mentiretur. Vnde pascha nostrum (p.
195 - p. 156) uel negligentem uel omnino non
celebrent. Celebrant autem pro eo quoddam festum
quod uocant Bema, id est, diem quo Manichaeus eorum
occisus est.

Deum qui legem dedit per Moysen et per prophetas
locutus est non uerum deum fuisse dicunt sed unum ex
principibus tenebrarum. Promissionem

189-94 Dominum . . . mentiretur: v. Ibid., p. 94:
Affirmant . . . eumque Christum novissimis temporibus venisse ad animas,
non ad corpora liberanda; nec fuisse
in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem
carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus
praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter
mentiretur . . ."

194-98 Vnde . . . est: v. Contra epistulam, VIII,
p. 202:
Hoc unde coniciam, breuiter dicam. Cum
saepe a uobis quaererem illo tempore,
quae causa esset, quod
pascha domini plerumque nulla, interdum
a paucis tepidissima celebritate frequentaretis nullis uigiliosis . . . cum
bema uestrum, id est diem, quo Mani-
chaeus occisus est . . ."

199-201 Deum . . . tenebrarum: v. De haeresibus, 46;
Müller, p. 94: "Deum qui Legem per Moysen
dedit, et in Hebrais Prophetis locutus est,
non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus
tenebrarum."
domini nostri Jesu Christi de paracleto spiritu sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam, ita uidelicet ut ipse esset spiritus paracletus; unde se in suis litteris Jesu Christi apostolum dicit.

Baptismum in aqua nemini prodesse ad salutem dicunt. Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis attribuunt sed substantiae gentis aduersae quam hominibus mixtam esse dicunt. Duas

201-06 Promissionem . . . dicit: v. Ibid.: "Promissionem Domini Iesu Christi de Paracleti Spiritu Sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam. Unde se in suis litteris Iesu Christi apostolum dicit, . . . ."

207-08 Baptismum . . . dicunt: v. Ibid.: "Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre . . . ."

208-10 Peccatorum . . . dicunt: v. Ibid., p. 96: "Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, sed substantiae tribuunt gentis adversae, quam dogmatizantes esse hominibus mixtam."
animas in uno homine esse dicunt, bonam et malam, easque inter se habere conflictum quando caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum et spiritus aduersus carnem. Asserunt etiam finito isto seculo animas quidem natura bonas sed quae non potuerunt a naturae malae contagione mundari, quasi in unum globum accessuras et cum mala natura in aeternum damnandas. Finiuntur uerba Augustini collecta de libris eius quae in principio libri huius me huic operi appositorum spopondi. FINIS.

210-18 Duas . . . damnandas: v. Ibid.: . . . easque duas animas, vel duas mentes, unam bonam, alteram malam, in uno homine inter se habere conflictum, quando caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum, et spiritus aduersus carnem . . . et finito isto saeculo post conflagrationem mundi in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere sempiterno, esse victuram. Cui globo affirmant accessurum semper et adhaesurum quasi coopertorium atque tectorium ex animabus natura quidem bonis, sed tamen quae non potuerint a naturae malae contagione mundari.
De Manichaeo ex Raphaele Volaterrano.

Manes haeresiarcha sub Aureliano principe Romam ex Perside uenit. Magistrum habuit Buddam nomine, qui et Terebinthus dicebatur, Brachman genere ac secta. Hic edoctus literas Graecas, sectam Empedoclis amauit, duo principia ponens inuicem contraria. Deinde in Persidem reuertens, dictitabat se ex uirgine natum, et in montibus educatum. Edidit libros quatuor, quorum primum inscripsit, De mysteriis; secundum, de euangeliis; tertium, de thesauris; quartum, de fumis. Cuius tandem defuncti libri ad manus mulieris, apud quam ille diuertebat, peruenere. Haec puerum septem annorum ab se emptum, cui Cubrino nomen erat, literis erudiit, haeredemque omnium fecit bonorum.

1 Raphaële Volaterrano: Raffaele de Maffei of Volterra, 1451-1522.
1 De Manicheo: Commentariorum rerum urbanorum, XVII, p. 236 (Basil: Hieronymum Frobenium, 1530). First published in 1506, the Commentariorum urbanorum, divided into 38 chapters, was an ambitious attempt to summarize many disciplines of knowledge in a comprehensive manner, characteristic of the Italian Renaissance in this period. Its topics included geography, history, mathematics, music, navigation and exploration, and zoology. v. Roberto Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity (New York: Humanities Press, 1969): 81-86.

Hunc denique Manetem ad ultimum rex Persarum uiuum cute direpta necauit, quod filium eius quem
reiectis aliis medicis curare pollicebatur, interfecerit. Ex Suida. Eusebius quoque suae historiae sic ait: "Manes haeresiarcha, genere Persa, uita et moribus barbarus, tam acer ingenio, ut ex nominis argumento, insanire uidetur."

Denique Christi se nunc (p. 157 - p. 158) formam gerere conabatur ostendere, nunc ipsum se esse paracletum dictitabat, eiusque more duodecim discipulos quos elegerat quaquauersus stultissima
dogmata nuntiatum mittebat, atque hoc pacto Persica uenena in nostro orbe propinabat. Ex hoc igitur Manichaeorum haeresis orta, in praesentem diem ex eo tempore quo Foelix urbi Romae praerat,
Diocletianusque imperabat. FINIS. Apud sanctam
Coloniam, Anno a Christi natuquitate millesimo quingente simotricesimo, nono calendas Ianuarii,
Impensis Iohannis Soteris, Cum gratia et priulegio adsexennium. Erratum, folio i facie i uersu 3 lege
mite, non mente.
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Chapter I

Eckbert of Schönau: Life and Work

During the last 40 years, scholars of medieval heresy have reconstructed the rise of Catharism in twelfth-century France and Italy with ever greater clarity, aided by the discovery of valuable primary sources and an appreciation for the links between Catharism and Bogomilism.¹ The notion that ancient

¹ Most important in this regard has been the work of Antoine Dondaine. In 1939, Dondaine published an edition of a Latin manuscript which described the radical dualism of the sect of Lombard Cathars called the "Albanenses," written by Jean de Lugio of Bergamo, Cathar bishop of Desenzano. This was the Liber de duobus principiis (Rome: Istituto Storico Dominicano, 1939). In the same volume, Dondaine published three other original sources on Catharism: Rainer Sacconi's De catharis et pauperibus lugduno, the Fragmentum ritualis, and an account of the Cathar consolamentum. In 1949, Dondaine edited an important source for the early history of Catharism in Lombardy, the De heresi catharorum, in "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie," I: "Le 'De heresi catharorum in Lombardia,'" Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 19 (1949): 280-312. Another work concerning early Catharism in Italy, written by the Dominican inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria early in the thirteenth century, was discovered in Budapest and edited by Dondaine in 1950; see "Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselm d'Alexandrie O.P.", Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 20 (1950): 234-324.

Other significant publications include two by Christine Thouzellier: Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIIIe siècle d'après le "Liber contra manichaeos" de Durand de Huesca (Louvain, Belgium: 374
Manichaeanism and twelfth-century Catharism were connected by the transmission of dualism via various heretical groups, set forth most powerfully by Steven Runciman, has been abandoned.²


Moreover, two works of Bogomil origin which influenced Catharist doctrine in Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries have been edited and translated into English: the Interrogatio Johannis (or The Secret Supper), and The Vision of Isaiah. The first is edited in E. Bozoky, Le livre secret des Cathares. Interrogatio Johannis, Apocryphe d'origine bogomile, 2 vols. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980); the second is edited in Richard Reitzenstein, Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe (Leipzig and Berlin, 1929): 297-311. See also I. Ivanov, Livres et légendes bogomiles (aux sources du catharisme), trans. of Bogomilski knigi i legendi (Sofia, 1925) by M. Ribeyrol, no. 22 of "Les Littératures populaires de toutes les nations," (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1976); and A. Vaillant, "Un apocryphe pseudo-bogomile: La Vision d'Isaie," Revue des études slaves, 42 (1963): 109-21.


Reviews of Cathar scholarship include Daniel Walther, "A Survey of Recent Research on the Abligensian Cathari," Church History, 34 (1965): 146-77 and the more extensive work by Gerald Rottenwöhrer, Der Katharismus??

² Steven Runciman, The Medieval Manichee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947). Before the appearance of Runciman's study, this thesis had been set forth by such scholars of medieval heresy as Henry Charles Lea, History of the
The growth of Catharism in twelfth-century Germany, however, has not attracted the kind of scrutiny directed toward the Languedoc and Lombardy, mainly because the sources for such a study are scarce by comparison and also because German Catharism, faced with persecution from Church and Emperor during the early thirteenth century, never achieved the permanency of the French and Italian heretics.

Most scholars of medieval heresy now agree that the first indisputable sign of Eastern dualism in the medieval West appeared in 1143 near Cologne.3


3 In reaction to the view of Dondaine that dualism was present in the West as early as the eleventh century (a view Dondaine later amended), Arno Borst placed the first appearance of Bogomilism in Western Europe at Cologne in 1143 in Die Katharer (Stuttgart: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 12, 1953): 93-94. Likewise, Raoul Manselli considered the letter by Everinus of Steinfeld (1143) the first clear evidence of the Cathars' presence in the Rhineland; see his "Amicizi Spirituali ed Azione Pastorale nella Germania del secolo XII: Ildegarde di Bingen, Elisabetta ed Ecberto di Schönau contro l'eresia catara," Studi in onore di Alberto Pincherle, in Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni, 38 (1967): 302-12. Jeffrey Russell has agreed with this view, writing that "the
Everinus of Steinfeld wrote to Bernard of Clairvaux about a group of heretics claiming distant origins in the East and professing doctrines which, I believe, identify them as Cathars, although Everinus did not call them such. From 1143 to 1163, however, these Rhineland heretics disappear from the historical sources; in 1163, a group of dissidents was condemned and burned at Cologne. Shortly thereafter, probably late that same year, Eckbert, a monk at the Benedictine monastery of Schönau, in the diocese of Trier, wrote a series of letters. These letters, together with the works of other medieval writers, provide valuable insights into the influence of Catharism in the northwest, first perceptible at Cologne at the time of Everinus of Steinfeld, had by the 1160's become fully entrenched." See his Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965): 220. R.I. Moore believed that mitigated dualism seem to appear in the West "at least as early as the 1140s"; see his "The Origins of Medieval Heresy," History, 65 (1970): 223. Malcolm Lambert also regarded Everinus' letter as the first significant evidence for Bogomilism in the medieval West; see his Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976): 60.

4 Ad S. Bernardi Epistolas, no. 432, PL 182, col. 676-80.

5 Although Eckbert mentioned this episode in the Sermones, I, pp. 15-16, the best account is in the Chronica Regia Coloniensis, MGH, SS, 18, p. 114. A slightly different account is presented in Caesarii Heisterbacensis dialogus miraculorum, 5.xix, ed. Joseph Strange, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1851), I, 298-99.

6 Schönau, founded in 1127 at Nastätten, some 20-25 miles southwest of Cologne and Bonn, was a double monastery dedicated to the martyr St.
sermons directed against them, the Sermones contra Catharos. While Eckbert had much to report about the beliefs and rites of these Cathars, his testimony has been largely dismissed by historians of medieval heresy. Scholars have praised the sermons as a forerunner of the thirteenth-century inquisitorial treatises in their organization and completeness, yet have treated their testimony with skepticism, claiming that Eckbert relied too heavily on Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings in his work.7


7 Eckbert has thus been placed in the tradition of medieval chroniclers who identified any heretics whose views in some way smacked of Manichaeism as Manichaeans, or neo-Manichaeans. Examples include the statement of Adhemar of Chabannes that "Manichaeans" were seducing people in Aquitaine in about 1022; see Jules Chavanon, ed., Chronique, III.49 in Collection de textes pour servir à l'enseignement de l'histoire, 20 (Paris, 1897): 173. In about 1043, Bishop Wazo of Liège replied to a letter from Bishop Roger of Chalons about certain heretics in the latter region, who, he declared,
I disagree with this negative view of the value of Eckbert's work; his polemic is an indispensable source for the study of Catharism's rise in medieval Europe. Part of its importance lies in the fact that Eckbert wrote his sermons in 1163, several decades before any histories of Catharism in Southern France or Italy were composed. Thus, the were following the teachings of the "Manichaeans"; see Rudolf Koepke, ed., Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta Episcoporum Leodiensium, II.62-64 in MGH, SS, 8, p. 226. In the twelfth century, this identification of contemporary heretics with Manichaeans continued; an example is the description by Guibert of Nogent of heretics near Soissons in 1114. After a description of their doctrines, Guibert noted, "Si relegas haereses ab Augustino digestas, nulli magis quam manicheorum reperies convenire." See Edmond-René Labande, ed., Guibert de Nogent. Autobiographie (Paris: Société d'édition, Les Belles Lettres, 1981): 430. Even in the thirteenth century, this belief in the revival of Manichaeism continued; an example is the Tractus de diversis materiis praedicabilis of the French inquisitor Stephan de Bourbon, written between 1249 and 1260. See the edition by Albert Lecoy de la Marche, Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues, tirées du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon, dominicain du XIIIe siècle (Paris: Libraire de la Société de l'histoire de France, 1878): 300.

For Southern France, the earliest concrete evidence of Cathar activity is the Council of Albi, held in 1165; edited in Martin Bouquet, et al., Acta concilii Lumbariensis, in Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, 14 (Paris: 1738-1904?): 431-34. Another important source for the early history of Catharism in Southern France is the account of the Council of St. Félix-de-Caraman, held between 1167 and 1174. See the edition by F. Sanjek, "Le rassemblement hérétique de Saint-Félix-de-Caraman (1167) et les églises cathares au XIIe siècle," Revue Histoire Ecclésiastique, 67 (1972): 767-99; see also R.I. Moore, "Nicétas, émissaire de Dragovitch, a-t-il traversé les Alpes?" Annales du
sermons represent the first attempt by a Western writer at a thorough description and refutation of Cathar doctrines. Moreover, Eckbert's accounts of


For Italian Catharism during the twelfth century, the two most important sources, both dating from the thirteenth century, have been edited by Antoine Dondaine: the De heresi Catharorum, written by an anonymous Catholic author, probably within the first decade of the thirteenth century; and the Tractatus de hereticis by the inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria, written about 1250 and based on inquisitorial testimony. See Dondaine, "La Hiérarchie cathare en Italie, I: Le 'De heresi catharorum in Lombardia,' " Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum, 19 (1949): 306-12; II: Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; III: Catalogue de la hiérarchie cathare d'Italie," Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum, 20 (1950): 308-10.

Also important is the account of Cathar doctrine presented to the clergy of Milan by Bonacursus, a former Cathar, sometime between 1176 and 1190, the Manifestatio haeresis catharorum quam fecit Bonacursus, edited in PL 204, col. 775-777. See the study by Ilarino da Milano, "La 'Manifestatio heresi catharorum,' " Aevum, 12 (1938): 281-333.

Although also dating from the thirteenth century (ca. 1250-1280), a description of the Cathar consolamentum in both Provençal and Latin survives, which has been recognized as preserving much older ritual traditions. For the Provençal version, see Léon Clédat, Le Nouveau Testament traduit au XIIIe siècle en langue provençale suivi d'un rituel cathare. (Paris, 1887; rep. Geneva: Slatkine, 1968). For the Latin version (written ca. 1240-1250) see the edition by Dondaine in Un Traité neo-manichéen de XIIIe siècle: Le "Liber de duobus principiis", suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare (Rome, 1939): 34-39.
Cathar teaching and organization are remarkably detailed and offer a good look at Catharism in its early stages of development in Western Europe. When compared with the much more complete sources for Italian and French Catharism in the thirteenth century, the *Sermones* indicate how certain doctrines and the scriptural exegesis on which they rested developed between the mid-twelfth and the mid-thirteenth century in the West. Eckbert also provided a detailed description of the central ritual act in Catharism, the "consolamentum", or spiritual baptism by the laying on of hands; a comparison of his account with those from the thirteenth century reveals how this rite evolved from certain basic features into a much more complicated form. However, before we can fully appreciate Eckbert's contribution to our study of Catharism, we must overcome the obstacle which has turned back a good number of highly respected scholars: his alleged reliance on Augustine of Hippo for much of his information. I will demonstrate that Eckbert's dependence on Augustine has been exaggerated, primarily due to a misunderstanding of the function of his first sermon. I will argue that while Eckbert did connect the Cathars with the Manichaeans, he did not consider them identical,
and, in fact, he constructed a relationship between the two which was, for his day, quite sophisticated. Moreover, I will emphasize the extent of Eckbert's first-hand experience with the Cathars, evident throughout the *Sermones*, and the fact that only in a few places, most notably in the first sermon, is there any evidence of a direct reliance on Augustine. Indeed, I will argue that in cases where Eckbert would have benefitted most from drawing upon Augustine, he did not.

Although our knowledge of the life and education of Eckbert of Schönaun is limited, it is clear that both prepared him to write his powerful polemic against the Cathars. He was best remembered, it seems, for two facts: first, as the brother of the celebrated mystic Elizabeth of Schönaun and as the reporter of her visions; second, as an effective force against the Cathars. Emecho, Eckbert's successor as abbot at Schönaun, stressed his familiarity with the Cathars and his successes against them. Moreover, in a list of Schönaun's abbots from its foundation in 1127 to 1655, Eckbert

9 Emecho's *vita* of Eckbert is edited by Roth, *Die Visionen*, pp. 348-53.
is described as a "hammer" against the Cathars.\textsuperscript{10}

Eckbert's date of birth is unknown; scholars have suggested 1130, and it must have been before January 9, 1132, since Eckbert's godfather, Bishop Eckbert of Münster, died on that date.\textsuperscript{11} It is most likely that Eckbert was born between 1125 and 1130, given the description of his death in 1184 as unexpected, while he was still middle-aged, "in etate satis matura".\textsuperscript{12} It is also probable that Bonn was Eckbert's birthplace, since Emecho reported that after taking priestly orders, Eckbert returned there to inform his family and arrange his business affairs.\textsuperscript{13}

It is clear also that Eckbert's family was of noble status, probably belonging to the order of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 181: "Eckbertus electus 1167, frater s. Elisabeth abbatissae Schonaugiensis, relictis ingenii monimentis celeber, Catharorum Haereticorum malleus, mortuus anno 1189." This list mistakenly gives Eckbert's year of death as 1189; he actually died in 1184; see below, p. 47, n. 95.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Roth, Die Visionen, p. 351.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 350.
\end{itemize}
"ministeriales", since several of his relatives held ecclesiastical office, and given the general truth that in Germany in the mid-twelfth century, advancement to such positions was more often a result of one's family status than one's level of education. One of Eckbert's uncles, also named Eckbert, was a teacher and dean of the cathedral chapter at Cologne before serving as bishop of Münster, where he supported the reforms of Innocent II's papacy. Moreover, Eckbert's brother Ruother was provost of the Premonstratensian canonry of Polden from 1156 to 1163, his nephew Simon served as provost of St. Gereon at Cologne, and three cousins were nuns at the convent at Andernach: Guda, Hadewiga, and Regelinda. Elizabeth of Schönau


16 Didier, "Egbert de Schoenau," p. 1472. Didier's source for this statement is unclear.

17 H.A. Erhard, Regesta historiae Westfaliae (Münster, 1951); see also P. Back mund, Monasticon Praemonstratense (Straubing, 1949), I, p. 238.

18 For Simon, see Didier, "Egbert von Schoenau," p. 1472; Eckbert wrote to this three cousins at Andernach concerning the death of his sister Elizabeth in 1164; see Roth, Die Visionen, p.
also mentioned "Dominus Helidus", her paternal great uncle, and Theodericus, her maternal uncle, in her visions, although I have discovered nothing more about them.\(^1\)\(^9\) Finally, Elizabeth's entry into Schönau (at some time before her older brother Eckbert) itself suggests her noble status.

F.W.E. Roth suggested that Eckbert was a younger son and as a result had to seek a career within the Church. He maintained that according to the custom of that period, Eckbert probably became a canon at the cathedral of Bonn at the age of fourteen.\(^2\)\(^0\) As a canon of the church of St. Cassius in Bonn, Eckbert would have served Provost Gerhard II, Count of Ahr, an important figure in the building of the cathedral church there, which was being completed during the 1150s.\(^2\)\(^1\)

\(^{263}\), according to whom one manuscript reads "Bude" instead of "Gude" (p. XXI).

\(^1\)\(^9\) Edited in Roth, Die Visionen, p. 49. Elizabeth was shown both Theodericus and Helidus in purgatory, suffering from the flames, the former because "verba indisciplinata, que habebat in consuetudine," the latter because "iocosis tamen frequenter sermonibus utebatur."


\(^2\)\(^1\) For the history of the foundation of St. Cassius and Bonn, see Josef Niessen, Geschichte Der Stadt Bonn, 1 (Bonn: Ferd. Dummlers Verlag, 1956): 62-101; and Friedrich Oediger, et. al, Das Bistum
Eckbert's education can be reconstructed to some degree based on the citations in the *Sermones* and his other works, but here, too, dates and facts are shadowy at best. It is likely that he would have been recruited to be canon at a fairly early age and educated in the cathedral school of Bonn. Moreover, advancement to senior canon was probably automatic upon his becoming an adult.22 Before receiving this promotion, however, Eckbert studied at Paris, as a schoolmate of Rainhald of Dassel, later imperial chancellor and archbishop of Cologne (1159-1167).2 Although Roth suggested that this schooling could have been at the monastic school of Hildesheim, Paris is a more likely site.23 In a letter to Rainhald of Dassel written in 1159/60, shortly after Rainhald's election as archbishop of Cologne, Eckbert recalled how the two had shared the


German cathedral canons were recruited at an early age and educated in the school of the cathedral to which they belonged. Emancipation, or promotion to the status of senior canon, followed more or less as a matter of course when one reached adulthood.

23 Roth, *Die Visionen*, pp. 197-98.
"foods of philosophical doctrine" under their illustrious master Adam, without specifying when or where this training occurred.24

The identity of this Adam is unknown, but based on what is known of Rainhald's career, we can determine that this schooling occurred some time between 1140 and 1146 at Paris.25 Thus, Adam might refer to either Adam of Balsham, one of the first medieval commentators on Aristotle, (also known as Adam Petit-Pont), or Adam of Saint Victor, the noted writer of sequences, both of whom were active in Paris during the 1140s.

The other clue to Adam's identity is a passage in the visions of Elizabeth, in which she was shown "that famous master Adam among the spirits of the blessed, full of glory and joy, whom, he

24 Ibid., pp. 311-12:

Ipsa est, que in diebus adolescentie nostre conglutinavit mentes nostras, quando in scola electissima nostri amabilis doctoris domini Ade viri eminentissimi tam vita quam scientia simul dulces capiebamus cibos philosophice doctrine, et erat nobis sicut studium unum, ita identitas voluntatum.

said, had been liberated five years after the time at which one of his students [familiaribus] was promoted to the priestly order."\(^2\)

There is no consensus on this question. If Elizabeth's statement is accurate, this teacher would have died about 1160, since Eckbert became a priest in 1155, assuming that he is the "familiaris" mentioned in the passage. Adam of St. Victor died in about 1181;\(^27\) the date of Adam of Balsham's death, however, is not so certain. 1180 has been put forward, but one scholar has suggested that Adam died as early as 1159, which would fit chronologically better with Elizabeth's testimony.\(^28\)

Roth argued on other grounds that Eckbert's teacher was Adam of Saint Victor. He believed that Eckbert stood in the tradition of the school of Adam and Richard of Saint Victor; his "mystical

\(^26\) Roth, *Die Visionen*, p. 50:

Sed et famosum illum magistrum Adam inter animas beatorum michi ostendit gloria et gaudio plenum, quem infra quinquennium fuisse liberatum asseruit dicens, 'Ab eo tempore liberatus est, quo ad ordinem sacerdotii promotus est unus ex familiaribus eius.


depth, the pure form of his mysticism, the subordinate place of morality are unique points in his writings.\textsuperscript{29} Moreover, Roth found a similarity of themes between Adam of St. Victor's sequences and Eckbert's devotional writings; he concluded that Eckbert utilized the former.\textsuperscript{30} H. Barré has also noted parallels between Eckbert's devotional writings and those of the Victorines, particularly Hugh of Saint Victor. In a study of Eckbert's role in the development of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary and of Jesus, Barré stated that Eckbert had studied at the school of the Victorines in Paris.\textsuperscript{31} Kurt Köster and J.C. Didier, however, identified Adam of Balsham as Eckbert's master.\textsuperscript{32}

Two other scholars, Raoul Manselli and Werner Grebe, have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to identify "Master Adam." Manselli ruled out both Adam of Balsham and Adam of Saint Victor on

\textsuperscript{29} Roth, \textit{Die Visionen}, p. 227.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. xxvi: "... und in den Thematas sowie den Anschauungen mit denen Ekberts übereinstimmen, so dass Eckbert dieselben benutze."


the basis of too little evidence. Grebe, whose interest in the question was motivated by his work on Rainhald of Dassel, noted similarities between Eckbert's scriptural commentary and that of Adam of Saint Victor, yet believed the dialectic of Adam of Balsham corresponded more to the interests of Rainhald. While admitting that the problem cannot be resolved, Grebe's statement that Adam of St. Victor is known to have died in 1181 seems to favor Adam of Balsham.

Based on Elizabeth's vision and a familiarity with not only the Sermones but also Eckbert's devotional tracts and hymns, I believe Adam of Balsham is the most likely choice as Eckbert's teacher in Paris. Despite Roth's position, I find no convincing evidence in Eckbert's writings that he studied with Adam of St. Victor. While Eckbert wrote eloquently in praise of Mary, Christ's humanity, and the Cross, his style is very straightforward, without the typology characteristic

33 "Ecberto di Schönau e l'eresia catara in Germani alla meta del secolo xii," Arte e storia: studi in onore di Leonello Vincenti (Turin: 1965): 314. Manselli's article is the most extensive study of Eckbert's sermons against the Cathars to date.

Moreover, Eckbert's chief concerns in the *Sermones* are theological, not practical; he attempts to defend a set of doctrines rather than explore questions of actual behavior. In contrast, the Victorine masters had "a common interest in biblical studies and in practical moral questions, which distinguishes them from those who were primarily theologians and dialecticians: Peter Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, Adam of the Petit Pont [Adam of Balsham]."36

Eckbert's strategy for refuting the Cathars in the *Sermones* indicates that he was immersed in theology and dialectic as a student at Paris, and that he probably studied with Adam of Balsham. We should also remember that at Bonn, Eckbert had experience debating with the Cathars, and in the


sermons he places this practical knowledge within a framework which clearly reveals some training in dialectic. Eckbert himself tells us that he frequently engaged them in debate, and Emecho reported that while a canon, Eckbert was befriended by some Cathars, who tried to convert him to their heresy.

Again and again, Eckbert stated the Church's position on a question, listed scriptural and patristic support, and then considered the Cathars' counter points one by one. A good example is his sermon in defense of marriage. He began by quoting and commenting on several passages which, in his view, not only condoned marriage but commended it: Matt. 19:3-8, Mark 10:9, Matt. 5:32, I Cor. 7:10-14, and I Peter 3:1-3 and 3:7. Eckbert then turned

37 *Sermones*, I, p. 4-5:

Cum essem canonicus in ecclesia bunnensi, sepe ego et unanimis meus diligenter attendi errores illorum ac defensiones, multa quoque mihi de illis per eos qui exierant de conventiculis eorum innotuerunt et resipuerant a laqueis diaboli.

38 Edited in Roth, *Die Visionen*, p. 352: "Multa etenim de secta eorum noverat, quoniam, dum adhuc Bunne maneret, quidam de hac heresi familiares se ei fecerant, egerantes in sectam suam se eum abducere posse."

39 *Sermones*, V, pp. 1-5.
to the Cathar rejection of marriage: "Perhaps you say, 'A husband and wife remaining together can still be saved, but only if they abstain from the conjugal act.'" He also cited and refuted two passages which, he says, the Cathars "might" use in their defense: I Cor. 7:1 and 7:29. Further, we frequently find expressions in Eckbert which were characteristic of the glosses which the Vulgate had accumulated by the mid-twelfth century: "as if he had said", "someone might say". With such phrases, biblical commentators created imaginary opponents, seeking, in Beryl Smalley's words, to "clarify the argument, follow the windings, and supply every missing link in the chain of thought." This is precisely Eckbert's aim in the Sermones.

Another feature which seems to place Eckbert in the school of Adam of Balsham is the fact that his exegesis was meant to elucidate the literal sense of scripture and did not delve into allegory. At several points, he seemed almost stymied because the Cathars would not believe what he regarded as the

40 Ibid., p. 69: "Dicitis forte, 'Possunt quidem aliquomodo saluari uir et mulier simul manentes, sed non aliter, nisi abstineant ab opere coniugali.'"

41 Ibid., pp. 70-71.

42 Smalley, The Study of the Bible, p. 70.
plain language of scripture. For example, in his sermon in defense of eating meat, which the Cathars rejected as unclean because it was the product of sexual intercourse, Eckbert quoted Genesis 9:1-4, and asked, "Is it not clear from these words that God made it permissible for man to eat flesh? And by what affrontery, by what audacity, do you say that it is not permissible?" It is a pity, Eckbert added, that when God told Noah this, he did not have a Cathar to whisper the truth in his ear.

Although aware of at least some of the allegorical teaching of the Cathar "perfecti", Eckbert did not argue on that level. For example, he described the secret Cathar doctrine that the forbidden tree in Genesis 2:15-16 was actually Eve, and that God thereby forbade all future sexual relations. It appears that the "perfecti" among the Cathars thus taught that the entire human race was founded in fornication and that salvation for a husband and wife could come only after their

---

43 Sermones, VI, p. 103: "Nonne ecce patet ex his verbis quod Deus fecit homini licitum comedere carnes? Et qua fronte, qua audacia, uos dicitis esse illicitum?"

44 Ibid., pp. 102-03.
separation and cleansing by the perfect. Eckbert attacked this notion by presenting a very straightforward interpretation of several texts from Genesis. One part of the argument focused on Genesis 1:28, in which God told Adam and Eve that they should multiply and fill the earth. But how, Eckbert asked, could they have done this without resorting to sexual intercourse? Why would God have laid down two such contradictory commandments? Clearly, this is not possible, and the Cathar interpretation of the injunction against eating the fruit must be wrong. Eckbert explained with an analogy which is characteristic of the "exempla" which were popular among the teachers of theology in his day: "If I altogether prohibited my farmer from planting and nevertheless told him, 'See that my field is very productive and I will produce many

45 Ibid., V, pp. 77-78:

Dicitis enim quod fructus ille, de quo precepit deus primo homini in paradiso ne gustaret ex eo, nichil aliud fuit, nisi mulier quam creauerat. De ipsa dicitis ade precepit dominus ut non commisceretur ei et commixtus est ei contra preceptum dei, quod erat gustare de uetito ligno. Ex hoc ergo probatis omne genus humanum, quod de eis propagatum est, natum esse ex fornicatione et neminem posse saluari nisi purgatus fuerit per orationes et sanctificationes eorum, qui inter uos perfecti uocantur."

46 Ibid., pp. 87-88.
fruits through you,' would I not be contradicting myself, and would I be able to be called foolish?"  

This is an example of an exegesis which, though well thought out and well organized, remains on the literal level of scriptural interpretation.

Admittedly, there is no decisive proof that Eckbert studied with Adam of Balsham rather than Adam of Saint Victor, and there is no evidence that Eckbert ever studied the Ars Disserendi (1132), the influential work on dialectic written by the former. Still, his emphasis on the literal sense of Scripture, rather than the allegorical, and the structure of his arguments, which roughly follow that of the "quaestiones" at that time, seem to place him in the school of Adam of Balsham rather than that of the Victorines.

Whatever the identity of "Master Adam", it is clear that Eckbert studied not only the Bible and the Church Fathers, but also some measure of

47 Ibid., p. 88:

Si ego agricole meo omnino interdicerem officium seminandi et tamen ei dicerem, "Uide ut bene fructificet ager meus et per te multas fruges habeam," nonne mihi ipsi contrarius essem et insipiencie argui possem?"

On the development of the "exempla" in the twelfth century, see Smalley, The Study of the Bible, pp. 245-56.
philosophy. It is probable that Eckbert was using a standard gloss on Scripture in his arguments against the Cathars, since by around the mid-twelfth century certain commentaries had gained recognition as the standard, and were simply referred to as the "gloss". Based on the work of Anselm of Laon and his pupils on Paul's epistles and the Psalms, this standardized gloss also contained the work of Anselm's brother Ralph on St. Matthew and Anselm's student Gilbert the Universal on the Pentateuch, the Greater Prophets, and Lamentations. The authors of the glosses for many other biblical books were unknown. According to Smalley, the earliest example of a "gloss on the Gloss" was a set of lectures by Peter Comester, sometime before 1168.48

It is also clear from a reading of the sermons that Eckbert was well versed in the Old and New Testaments and the Church Fathers. As we have seen, Eckbert's strategy for refuting Cathar doctrines generally follows one of two lines: often, he listed and then expounded on verses from the Old and New Testaments which he believed plainly contradict the Cathar position; at other times, he attempted to disprove a Cathar teaching as illogical by a "reductio ad absurdium" technique, often involving

rhetorical questions. For the first strategy, Eckbert relied primarily on the gospels and Paul's epistles; of the Old Testament books, he utilized Genesis and Psalms most often, while occasionally making use of major and minor prophets.

Eckbert also enlisted the aid of a wide variety of church fathers in his sermons; his conviction that the Cathars were a distant off-shoot of the Manichaeans led him to quote from part of Augustine's De haeresibus in the first sermon; moreover, he included an appendix with selections from two of Augustine's other anti-Manichaean works: the Contra epistolam quam uocant fundamenti (which Eckbert called the Contra manicheos) and the De moribus Manichaeorum. Augustine was the author quoted most often; his anti-Manichaean works lay behind several of Eckbert's mistaken assertions about the Cathars—for example, that they celebrated a commemoration of Mani's death every autumn, and

---

that in their docetism they followed Mani.\textsuperscript{50}

Eckbert buttressed his attack on Cathar doctrine with quotes from the Fathers. For example, in defense of the Catholic priesthood, he mentioned the mission of Augustine to England under Gregory the Great, taken (probably indirectly) from Bede's history of the English church.\textsuperscript{51} In the same sermon, Eckbert defended the principle of the inviolability of the sacraments regardless of the moral state of the minister; for support, he quoted Augustine's work on baptism against the Donatists; a letter of Cyprian; and a letter of Gregory the Great to John, bishop of Ravenna.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., I, p. 15. According to Eckbert, although Augustine had called this festival "bema", his "informant about them [the Cathars], who had commemorated it himself, said that it is called 'malillosa' and is celebrated in the autumn." For the Cathars' docetism, see Sermones, XIII, pp. 337-344.


Moreover, in the third and tenth sermons, Eckbert outlined the early expansion of the Church to illustrate that the Catholic faith had never been hidden, unlike that of the Cathars. Eckbert was drawing from several sources of church history, including Cassiodorus' Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita, the letters of Pope Hilarius, and Irenaeus' work on heresy. More important for Eckbert, however, were local works of church history and saints' lives. For example, in his description of the Church's development in the Rhineland, Eckbert's drew upon the lives of Saints Eucharius, Valerius, and Maternus written by Goldscherus, a monk of Trier, in the ninth century; and the Gesta Treverorum, probably compiled during the ninth century by Eberhard, a monk of Trier.

53 For Cassiodorus' work, see PL 69, col. 879-1214; for Hilary, see P. Coustant, ed., Vita Sancti Hilari, PL 9, col. 125-184; for Irenaeus' Contra Haereses, see the edition by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau, Contre les Hérésies, no. 264 of Sources Chrétiennes (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1979).

54 Goldscherus' vita is edited in Acta Sanctorum quotquot tota orbe coluntur, vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur . . . notis illustravit Joannes Bollandus, 1, January 19 (Paris: V. Palmé, 1863): 917-22. For the Gesta Treverorum, see Georg Waitz, ed., MGH, SS, 8, pp. 111-200. Eckbert may have been using a version of another work which related the stories of Saints Eucharius, Valerius, and Maternus, contained in Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta Episcopi Tungrensis, Traiecti et Leodicensis; see PL 139, col. 998-1034.
Besides his familiarity with Scripture and the Fathers, Eckbert reveals at least some education in secular literature. In the above mentioned letter to Rainhald of Dassel, Eckbert warned Rainhald about the corrupting powers of money upon someone in his position, alluding to two mythological creatures: Argus, the hundred-eyed guardian of Io, and Briareus, a beast with one-hundred arms. Since Rainhald was interested in ancient literature, Eckbert believed that an admonishment against money couched in such language would have greater effect. Moreover, Eckbert may have gained some knowledge of Hebrew: as part of his defense of marriage, utilizing Jesus' teaching on divorce in Matthew 19:3-8, Eckbert challenged the Cathars to "go to our enemies the Jews and inspect the Hebrew scripture in

55 Eckbert's warning was in vain; as spiritual and secular leaders, the record of the twelfth-century archbishops of Cologne was poor, and Rainhald's was worst. He set foot in Cologne only twice, in 1159 to collect troops and in 1165, to be installed as archbishop. See, for example, Strait, Cologne in the Twelfth Century, p. 39-40, 43: "The archbishops' policy towards the town might be better summed up as one of salutary neglect . . ." also see Oediger, Das Bistum Köln, pp. 149-56.

56 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 314: "Nam si nummosi eruperit uspiam odor marsupii, penes hominem, cui non est auditor, continuo ibi oculos Argi, ibi manus Briarei, ibi springis ungues exerceri uidemus."
which they have written the gospel of Matthew."

At some point after his schooling in Paris Eckbert became a canon of the chapter of St. Cassius in Bonn. By his own account, his life during this period was oriented toward material rather than spiritual pursuits. In 1164, he wrote to Abbot Reinhard of Reinhausen to reassure the latter that his account of Elizabeth's visions was true. In an attempt to establish his credibility as a witness, Eckbert explained that "the glory of the world smiled on me abundantly: the most excellent provider poured an abundance of temporal things into my hand, while I was still a canon in the church of Bonn." He added, however, that for the last nine years, compelled by "a love for the Lord, and by no necessity, forced by no infirmity, I have

57 Sermones, V, p. 63:

Intuemini euangelium matthei, quod per uniuersum orbem in ecclesiis legitur, et si non creditis grecis et latinis codicibus, ite ad inimicos nostros iudeos et inspicite hebraicam scripturam, in qua euangelium matthei scriptum habent, et inuenietis in eo scripturam hoc modo, "Accesserunt ad iesum pharisei, temptantes eum et dicentes, 'Si licet homini dimittere uxorem quacunque ex causa?'"

58 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 318: "Satis mihi gloria mundi arridebat, satis plena manu rerum temporalium copias supernus provisor michi fundebat, dum adhuc essem canonicus in ecclesia Bunnensi."
embraced the monastic life."\textsuperscript{59}

Further evidence as to the quality of Eckbert's life while in Bonn comes from his \textit{vita} by Emecho. Having become convinced, due in large part to his sister Elizabeth's visions and encouragement, to become a monk at Schönau, Eckbert, having returned to Bonn to arrange his affair, disclosed to his friends, whom he had always loved sincerely, his secret decision. Having learned of this and wondering and considering this sudden change of so important a man, since they knew what sort he had been in the clergy and what he could be, but ignorant and fearful of what sort he was going to be in a monastery, they began to persuade him that he should continue securely in that certain and good life which he had embarked on and which he knew and that he should not attempt an unknown way of life.\textsuperscript{60}

Eckbert also admitted that when Elizabeth first began experiencing her visions, while he was still a

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.: "... nulla necessitate, nulla coactus infirmitate, monasticam vitam ab annis novem amplexatus sum."  

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 350:  

Reversus itaque Bunnam, ut de rebus suis suis ordinaret, familiaribus suis, quos sincero semper affectu dilexerat, secretum propositi sui detexit. Quo cognito et admirantes tanti viri subitam mutationem considerantes, qualis in clero fuisset et esse posset, ignorantes uero et timentes, qualis in monastica vita futurus esset, suadere ei ceperunt, ut in via certa et bona, quam impressus fuisset et quam novisset, securus curreret et ignotum vivendi genus non attemptaret.
canon, he neglected recording them, "because of the bad opinion of slanderers which made me slow and sluggish, and because of my occupation with the chapter's business, and also the lack of parchment." He had become the editor, as it were, of his sister's visions because of the special affection with which she regarded him.

It appears, then, that Eckbert was supported by the established prebendary system, which since the ninth century, had become increasingly alienated from church control by lay powers. While it is

In his prologue to Elizabeth's visions, Eckbert stated that her first experience occurred in 1152, when she was 30 years old and had been a nun at Schönau for 10 years. Moreover, Emecho wrote that while still at the church of Bonn, with the approval of the abbot and sisters of Schönau, Eckbert began copying down and editing his sister's visions. See Roth, p. 1.

On canonical reform in twelfth-century Germany and resistance to it, I have relied heavily on Charles Dereine, Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, 12 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1960), s.v. "Chanoines," pp. 370-85. Also see
not certain whether Bonn was a center of canonical reform or a bastion of the old system, we know that in Germany as a whole reform was slow and the majority of canons remained faithful to the Carolingian tradition. Many canons refused to relinquish their prebends for a life in which goods were held in common, and those who wished to live by a more rigorous rule often left their chapter and founded new churches or established themselves in already existing ones.  

Young canons from the nobility, in particular, were reluctant to give up such pursuits as hunting and warfare, and marriage


among canons was considered a mark of the secularization of the church which the Gregorians criticized.65

Until the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, the canon's function was to "assure the service of public prayer, in common and continuously",66 as well as to build and operate hospitals, and, in the larger cities, schools. This program, based on the Carolingian Rule of Aix (816), served as the primary model for canonical life in Germany until it was challenged by the Gregorian reformers, who saw in its sanction of private property, according to Charles Dereine, "the source of all evil."67 Moreover, while the Rule bound canons to a common dormitory in principle, in practice canons often lived in their own houses, sometimes outside the chapter.68 Eckbert mentioned his own residence in Bonn, although it is unclear whether it was within the confines of the chapter or outside in the city.69

65 Ibid.
66 Ibid., p. 370.
67 Ibid., p. 376.
68 Ibid.
69 Sermones, XI, p. 14: "Fuit mihi concertatio de his rebus, quadum uice in domo mea bonne, cum quodam uiro, qui suspectus erat nobis quod esset de
From what little we know about Eckbert's life at Bonn, it is clear that at first he belonged to the majority who resisted canonical reform. His friendship with the powerful Rainhald of Dassel indicates his sympathies would not have been with those pushing for reform. Clearly, he was for a time part of the secular clergy in Germany who were criticized for neglecting spiritual duties and for paying too much attention to financial matters. As noted by Alfred Haverkamp, a good example of the religious program of reform during the period, and of the opposition which it faced, is seen in the letters exchanged between two abbesses of the period: Hildegard of Bingen and Tenxwind of Andernach. Hildegard defended the value of the prayer and liturgy which was emphasized over manual labor in Benedictine life, while Tenxwind "strongly criticized the magnificent liturgy and particularly the rigorous exclusion of non-noble women in Hildegard's convent . . ."70

Eckbert eventually became a critic of the system from which he had once profited. In 1155, he became a priest and soon afterward a monk at

secta katarorum, et contigit ut incideremus ad loquendum de sacerdotibus malis . . ."70

70 Haverkamp, Medieval Germany, p. 191. For this correspondence, see Migne, PL 197, col. 336-38.
Schönau, and Elizabeth's role in this decision was crucial. She often prayed that Eckbert would join the priesthood and urged him to do so; however, according to her, he feared he could not endure the more aseptic lifestyle this would impose upon him.71

In Elizabeth's visions, we find a description of her supplication before Mary on behalf of Eckbert.

Therefore I called upon her in the accustomed manner and especially on behalf of a certain one of my family I exorted her. He was a deacon in order and I had frequently urged him not to delay ascending to the sacred order of the priesthood. . . Therefore, in my supplication to her, when I mentioned this matter before my Lady, she replied to me with these words, 'Say to my servant, 'Do not fear, do what you will, and render an account of my service which you owed me and have not done.72

In 1155, Eckbert undertook a pilgrimage to

71 Visiones, I.59; Roth, p. 29: "Ille vero diversas causas timoris sui pretendens, tam arduam rem aggredi nondum se audere fatebatur."

72 Ibid.:

Rome where he took priestly orders from the pope. Shortly after his return, he made monastic vows and entered the double Benedictine monastery of St. Florianus at Schönau, where his sister was already being visited by heavenly trances and visions, an account of which Eckbert would later write. This change of direction was due in large part to the influence of Elizabeth, whose concern for her brother's spiritual welfare was expressed in a vision she experienced during Eckbert's pilgrimage to Rome, described by Emecho:

His sister Elizabeth struggled with a most serious infirmity one night, and saw in a vision her brother standing with a key and engaged in great battle with the Devil, who shot innumerable arrows into him with great force. However, he resisted bravely, because he could not be injured by them. Finally however, he shot sharp fiery arrows into him, one of which entered him with great force, so that it seemed to her that he was weakened and fell to his knees, but still resisting with great effort, he stood. At last it appeared to her that a venerable man came, whom she understood to be the venerable abbot, the father of our monastic order, the holy Benedict, offering to him the monastic hood and the pastoral staff, and that he said to him: "Conquer in this." And thus comforted, he overcame every attack of the evil foe.73

73 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 349:

.. predicta soror eius Elisabeth quadam nocte gravissima infirmitate laborabat, et vidit in visione eun- dem fratrem suum cum clava stantem et
After Eckbert returned from Rome, during the feast of Pentecost, Elizabeth was visited with another vision, also described by Emecho:

His sister saw in a vision a most beautiful tree, beside the greater altar of the brothers, decorated with various flowers and spread out with many fruits, at whose sight she was delighted. And when she asked the angel of the Lord, who stood before her, what the tree which she saw signified, he said to her, "This tree signifies your brother. The various flowers and ripened fruits and greenness of leaves are his various virtues and his sound doctrine, with which he will edify many. Encourage him to renounce the world, because the Lord has chosen him for his personal service for the purpose of edifying many."

---

Ibid., p. 349:

Postea in festo Pentecostes ipsa eadem soror eius vidit in visione arborem
Emecho also relates that Elizabeth was hesitant to tell Eckbert about these visions, and shortly thereafter was confronted by the Angel of the Lord, who demanded with a "stern face" to know why she had not done as he had commanded. She replied that she feared Eckbert would not be able to bear the rigor of the monastic rule, with its fasts, vigils, and abstinence. "Do not fear," the Angel responded, "because I will be his ready help in all these things."75

After much discussion with Elizabeth, Eckbert eventually succumbed to her wishes and as a monk at Schönaun became his sister's staunch defender and secretary. Elizabeth wrote down her visions in both Latin and German, and in the prologue to this work, Eckbert reported that he translated what was in

pulcherrimam secus maius altare fratrum diversis floribus ornatam et copiosis fructibus dilatamat, ad cuius aspectum valde delectabatur. Que cum angelum domini, qui ei astabat, interrogaret, quam significationem hec arbor, quam viderat, haberet, dixit ei: 'Fratrem tuum hec arbor significat. Diversi flores et maturi fructus et viriditas foliorum eius sunt diverse virtutes eius et sana doctrina, qua multos fideliter erudiet. Hortare eum, ut seculo abrenunciet, quia eum dominus in suum familiare ministerium ad multorum edificationem elegit.'

75 Ibid., p. 350: "Noli timere, quia ego in his omnibus eius ero promptus adiutor."
German into Latin, and left untouched whatever was already in Latin. As noted by Didier, Elizabeth's visions display a polished style in many places which clearly point to Eckbert's hand; he admitted that his sister was unlearned and not skilled in Latin and proclaimed that only through God's power was she able to record her visions so clearly and forcefully.

76 Visiones, I.1; Roth, Die Visionen, p. 1:
Ego autem Eckebertus . . . conscripsi omnia hec, et alia, que de revelationibus eius leguntur, ita quidem, ut ubi erant latina verba angeli immutata relinquerem, ubi vero teutonica erant, in latinum transferrem, prout expressius potui, nihil mea presumptione adiungens, nihil favoris humani, nihil terreni commodi querens, testis mihi est deus, cui nuda et aperta sunt omnia.

77 Didier, "Egbert de Schoenau," p. 1475. According to Didier, this influence is clear not only in Elizabeth's visions, but pervades all of her works, especially the Liber viarum Dei (edited in Roth, Die Visionen, pp. 88-122) and Elizabeth's letters (edited in Roth, pp. 139-53).

78 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 318-19:
Illud autem latere vos nolo, quod preter visiones celestium secretorum et allocutiones angelorum et sanctorum, quibus frequenter potitur, hanc illi gratiam prestitit deus, ut cum sit indecta et nullam dictandi ac latine loquendi pericam unquam ab homine acceperit, sepe absque omni præmeditacione subito proferat epistolas ad ecclesias sive ad personas, quas vult salutare, et de aliqua re necessaria commonere.
Thus, once part of a system which attracted reproach for its abuses, Eckbert became one of the critics himself. In a letter written to his former schoolmate Rainhald, archbishop of Cologne, in 1164, Eckbert revealed his concerns with the state of the clergy in Germany. First, he lamented the fact that there is not yet peace among the "sons of peace", although the "businessmen have peace." The Mother of God, twisting inwardly, laments the situation with groaning: "I suffer pain in my womb, there is peace without but ravage within." Everywhere, debts are collected by the clergy, who have forsaken the altar. It was originally ordained that the church's temporal needs should be met by the prince or king, so that the "milites Christi"

79 Ibid., p. 319. This letter was probably written sometime shortly before that to Abbot Reinhard of Reinhausen, which can be dated to 1164 from internal evidence. In the letter to Reinhard, Eckbert wrote that "De epistola, quam ego conscripsi domino Reinoldo Coloniensi electo, interrogavit me nuncius vester, scitote quod scripsi eam in claustro, dum torquerer gravi dolore artetice passionis." I believe the letter to Rainald referred to here was the one under discussion, and can safely be assigned a date of 1164.

80 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 319: "Pacem negociatones habent, sed nondum super filios pacis pax requievit."

81 Ibid.: "... adhuc mater passionis quasi torsiones intrinsecus sentiens in hunc modum gemebunda congemnat. Ventrem meum doleo, foris pax, intra predatio."
could attend to the preaching and reading of Scripture; however, due to the greed and neglect of the Church's ministers, worship is suspended in nearly every church, which are often left barren because clergy are attending to their own business dealings.\textsuperscript{82}

Moreover, Eckbert claimed that he attempted to understand the causes for such widespread ruin of this sort. I looked closely at the churches of clerics and I found great and innumerable abuses in them. I saw the cloisters of virgins, others of whom more correctly I should call cloisters of children, that is, the snare of Satan, and behold, a strange fire laid waste all things, the lilies of chastity were trodden under.\textsuperscript{83}

To remedy this situation, Eckbert expressed the hope that God raise up another Judas Maccabeus, to "force the sword away from our borders", but also another patriarch to "keep those things sanctified to the Lord away from foreign omens" and another Phineas,

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., pp. 319-20.

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., p. 320:

Verti me alio, et apposui cor meum, ut huius tam generalis ruine causas intelligerem. Inspecxi clericorum ecclesias, ac reperi in eis enormitates grandes et innumeratas. Vidi clastra virginum, quorum alia rectius viscarium, id est, aucipium Satane appellaverim, et ecce ignis alienus cuncta vastavit, lilia castitatis aruerant ...
to "stab with the dagger of strict justice the great distortions and cries of the Lord’s tabernacle of the Lord." Eckbert turned to Rainhald to fill these lofty ambitions; in closing, he wrote: "I hope that in you, my lord, all these things should come together, so that the true and entire peace of the church of God should be restored through you."

Criticism of the secular clergy was also voiced by Elizabeth, who, in a letter to Hildegard of Bingen, lamented that "the vineyard of the Lord does not have a husbandman, the vineyard of the Lord is perishing, the head of the Church languishes and its members are dead." Elizabeth also employed the imagery of the cistern and the cornerstone:

Because of this, the thief has come and has dug up and destroyed the foundation stone, and cast it into a cistern without

84 Ibid.: Si itaque in his diebus suscitavit nobis deus Machabeum, qui a finibus nostris gladium coerceat, utinam et patriarcham nobis suscitet, qui a sanctificatis domino alienarum avium nostrum prohibeat. Utinam et phineam nobis suscitet, qui et enormitates et conclamationes tabernaculorum domini, districtui iudicii pugione confodiat.

85 Ibid.: "Hec autem omnia in vobis, mi domine, ipso concurrere, ut vera et integra pax ecclesie dei per vos restituatur."

86 Ibid., p. 74: "Vinea domini non habet cultorem, vinea domini perit, caput ecclesie languit, et membra eius mortua sunt."
water and without irrigation. The foundation stone is the head of the Church, which was cast out, and the Church of God is dry, having no moisture, but cold to the love of God.  

Moreover, like Eckbert, Elizabeth recognized the danger that the Cathars posed to a Church in such poor condition. She wrote to Hildegard that "it once appeared to me that poisonous serpents would come into the Church of God, desiring to wound the Church of God secretly. And I understand this vision to refer to those Cathars who now secretly are deceiving the Church of God."  

Moreover, although according to Eckbert's statement, Abbot Hildelin of Schöna (1127-1167) urged him to write the sermons against the Cathars, Elizabeth must have exerted considerable influence toward this end, based on a letter she addressed to the abbots of the German church at about this time.

87 Ibid:

Propter hoc venit fur et perfodit et destruxit lapidem fundamenti, et proiectit in cisternam non habentem aquam neque irrigata est. Lapis fundamenti est caput ecclesie, quod proiectum est, et ecclesia dei arida est, non habens humorem, sed frigida est ab amore dei.

88 Ibid.: "... olim apparuit, venenosos serpentes venturos esse in ecclesiam dei, secreto ecclesiam dei lacerare cupientes. Et hoc intelligo pertinere ad kartaros istos, qui ecclesiam dei nunc occulte decipiunt."
She called on them to eradicate the "serpent" among them, referring almost certainly to the Cathars, and chastised them for their lack of action.\textsuperscript{89}

How often Eckbert encountered the Cathars after becoming a monk at Schönau is unknown. He may have taken part in the interrogation of Arnold and his followers at Cologne in 1163, although he does not say so, and is not mentioned in the account of the \textit{Chronica Regia Coloniensiis}.\textsuperscript{90} Eckbert's previous

\begin{quotation}
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., pp. 74-75.

\textsuperscript{90} The condemnation and burning of Arnold and his companions, discussed more fully in the following chapter, is mentioned by Eckbert in \textit{Sermones}, I, pp. 15-16 and IX, p. 165; the fullest account is that of the \textit{Chronica Regia Coloniensiis}, MGH, SS, 18, p. 114; the second recension is the more detailed and reads as follows:

\begin{quotation}
Hoc etiam anno quidam heretici de secta Catarorum de Flandriae partibus Coloniam venientes, ibi deprehensi sunt, et extra urbem igne concremati sunt Nonis Augusti quatuor mares et iuuencula, quae se igni invito etiam populo iniecit. Et cum hora combustionis eorum in civitate vehementissima nimis foret pluvia, ita ut clerus, qui in civitate totus remanserat, pluviam exorreret, propter fidem debilis vulgi ne una quidam gutta tam vehementis pluviae ubi combusti sunt cecidit.
\end{quotation}

Caesarius of Heisterbach, writing early in the thirteenth century, also described the episode at Cologne in his \textit{Dialogus miraculorum}. He added to the earlier Cologne account that Arnold, leader of the band, asked for bread and a bowl of water before being led to the stake, for the purpose of making a sacrilegious communion. There is also reference to what appears to be the Cathar consolamentum in this account: "And as many stood to watch and listen while they fiercely burned, Arnold, putting his hand
experience with the Cathars, however, must have proven useful at this time. While Arnold of Wied was archbishop of Cologne (1151-1156), Eckbert participated in the questioning of a Cathar who had recently returned from "one of their schools."91 Asked to divulge the doctrines he had learned, the Cathar said only that they were contrary to whatever the Catholic Church taught. According to Eckbert, Archbishop Arnold required nothing more of him, which is ambivalent, but which suggests that nothing more was required to convict him of heresy and that his condemnation and punishment could then proceed.92 The last known time Eckbert took part in the interrogation of suspected heretics was in Mainz, at some point after he had been elected abbot on the heads of his disciples who were already aflame, said 'Be firm in your faith, for today you shall be with Lawrence'--although theirs was quite unlike the faith of Lawrence." I have utilized the translation of Walter Wakefield and Austin Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969): 244, taken from the Latin text of Josephus Strange, ed., Dialogus miraculorum, V.19, vol. 1 (Cologne: J.M. Heberle, 1851; rep. Gregg Press, 1966), I, p. 298.

91 Sermones, XII, pp. 296-97.

92 Ibid.: "Hec ergo cum dixisset suffecit responsio archiepiscopo et nichil amplius ab illo requirendum esse iudicait."
of Schönau (1167).\textsuperscript{93}

According to Emecho, by 1167, Eckbert's reputation as an erudite and zealous opponent of heresy was widely known, and wherever disputes involving Scripture arose, he was called to its defense. Without providing a date, Emecho described how at Mainz, some 40 heretics were discovered when one of their number, possessed by demons, went to Hildegard of Bingen for prayer and disclosed their whereabouts. Eckbert was invited by the local clergy to question them. Despite their ability to hide the heretical nature of their beliefs and their blatant obstinace, Eckbert exposed them as Cathars. After their condemnation, these Cathars were not burned but driven from the city, although one of their masters abjured his errors and returned to the Catholic faith.\textsuperscript{94} Although we may expect that Emecho exaggerated regarding Eckbert's abilities and reputation, his stature as an opponent of heresy must have been recognized throughout the Rhineland if he was called from Schönau, in the diocese of Schönau.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{93} I have accepted 1167 as the date of Eckbert's election as abbot based on the catalogue of Schönau's abbots and the report of Trithemius in the Chronica Monasterii Hirsauiensis; both are edited in Roth, Die Visionen, pp. 180-81 and 210-11.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{94} Roth, Die Visionen, p. 352; the episode is part of Emecho's vita of Eckbert.
\end{flushleft}
Trier, to Mainz.

Moreover, according to Johannes Trithemius' *Monasteri Hirsauiensis Chronica*, Eckbert engaged a Cathar in public disputation in Coblenz in 1167. The heretic, a native of Carden, was spreading a false doctrine concerning the body and blood of Christ, and because of his "subtlety of mind and fluency of his tongue was formidable before all the most learned." However, Eckbert's learning was such that he demonstrated the heretic wrong, after which he renounced his error and embraced the truth.95

Although there is still some doubt about the year of Eckbert's death, I believe it is clear from Emecho's testimony that he died on March 28, 1184,

---

95 Edited in Marquard, ed. *Opera historica*, and in Roth, pp. 211-12, as follows:

*Tantae autem eruditionis fuit, ut haereticum quendam Cardensem natione de corpore et sanguine domini male sentientem et pessime dogmatizantem, qui propter subtilitatem ingenii et linguae volubilitatem cunctis etiam doctissimis formidabilis erat, in publico conventu doctorum apud confluentiam [Coblenz: confluence of the Moselle and Rhine rivers] prima disputatione convicerit, et ab errore suo ad professionem ueritatis revocarit.*
on the Wednesday before Easter. Emecho reported that as early as two years before the fact, voices were heard and signs observed which portended Eckbert's death. These omens did not cause much concern, however, since the abbot was still "in middle age." Then, according to Emecho, on Palm Sunday of 1184, while Eckbert lay before the altar praying, the crucifix fell to the floor before his face, and very soon afterward, "he was seized from us." Such a statement may reflect genuine surprise at Eckbert's untimely death, or may have represented the standard hyperbole employed in writing the life of one's predecessor. Whatever the case, Emecho's testimony suggests that Eckbert was born in the late 1120s or early 1130s, which would


97 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 352: "Sed non sperabamus aliquid tale eventurum, quod adhuc in etate satis matura beatam vitam ducebat . . ."

98 Ibid.
place his age at death at perhaps 52 or 53.

Although Eckbert has been remembered primarily for his sermons against the Cathars, he was certainly more than a polemicist and left a good number of meditational tracts, scriptural commentaries, devotions, and hymns. As noted above, Eckbert's devotional work has often been tied to the tradition of the School of the Victorines.

A close comparison of Eckbert's work with that of Adam and Hugh of St. Victor might confirm this view, but that is beyond the scope of this work. Besides the *Sermones contra Catharos*, Emecho mentioned the devotional work of Eckbert, and singled out his tract entitled *Stimulus dilectionis*, proclaiming in his *vita* of Eckbert, "Whose heart would not be kindled toward the Lord Jesus by the sweet words of this little book. . .?"

99 The most complete listing to date of Eckbert's bibliography is still that of Roth, *Die Visionen*, pp. 209-342, who not only provides very complete citations for works in manuscript and print, but also editions of Eckbert's devotional works and letters. Also helpful, though much less detailed, are the descriptions of J.C. Didier, "Egbert de Schoenau," pp. 1474-75 and Kurt Köster, "Ekbart von Schönau," p. 437-38.

100 Such is the view of Roth, Barré, and Köster; see above, pp. 8-11.

101 Roth, *Die Visionen*, p. 359: "Cuius cor non accendatur ad dominum Jesum in dulcedine verborum illius libelli, qui intitulatur stimulus dilectionis?"
also listed three other works: the Sililoquium seu meditationes; Eckbert's commentary on the first chapter of Luke, Missus est Gabriel (named from the incipit of the work); and a commentary on the hymn Magnificat, in praise of Mary.¹⁰² Emecho also reported that Eckbert was working on a tract against the Jews when he died in 1184.¹⁰³ As we have seen, we have extant two letters from Eckbert to Rainhald of Dassel, one to Abbot Reinhard of Reinhausen, and a long account of his sister Elizabeth's death, addressed to his cousins at the convent of Andernach in 1164.¹⁰⁴ The remainder of Eckbert's corpus can be compiled from the list of Johannes Trithemius' Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, the detailed

¹⁰² Ibid.:

Ignitam cordis eius dilectionem ad ipsum dominum Jesum, quis non admiretur, in verbis illius, in quibus ad ipsum ardentissimo desiderio proclamavit in alio libello sic dicendo: "Verbum mihi est ad te o rex seculorum Christe Jesu"? Sed et elegantiam sermonum eius de ipsius pia matre, qui legit, non excitet ad diligendum eam, de evangelio, uidelicet Luce: "Missus est Gabriel angelus" et de cantico "Magnificat", quod ipsa in spiritu sancto pronunciavit.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 353: "Cum enim libellum quendam contra iudeos de domino Jesu et eius pia matre edidisset et iam in finem conclusionem aptaret, antequam perficeret ipsum opus, quasi subito elapsa est a nobis margarita nostra . . ."

¹⁰⁴ Edited in Roth, Die Visionen, pp. 263-78; 311-20.
and indispensable work of Roth, and the notations of Kurt Köster.

Roth's description of Eckbert's bibliography remains by far the most extensive. He listed the known manuscripts for all of Eckbert's works and described in some detail the single codex which contains most of the devotional writings, dating from the fifteenth century. At the time Roth wrote, all but two of Eckbert's works were extant in manuscript form: the *Sermones per annum* and his commentary on John's gospel, *In principium evangelii Johannis*. Since that time (1884), however, manuscripts of these works have been discovered; the *Sermones per annum* are in a codex of the twelfth century in the Trier Stadtbibliothek, and the *In principium* is found in both a Paris and Halle collection. Roth also edited of all Eckbert's works except the *Sermones contra Catharos* and the *Sermo panegyricus*, or *Sermo ad beatam virginem deiparam*. This last is not found among the list of Trithemius or Roth, but was apparently only later

---

105 Ibid., pp. 212-229.
attributed to Eckbert.¹⁰⁸

The following, then, is a list of Eckbert's corpus based on Trithemius, with additions noted. The dating for Eckbert's devotional works is very approximate; they could have been composed during an almost thirty year period, from 1155, when he became a monk, to his death in 1184. Dates have been assigned when possible.

1. **Adversum haereses** *(Sermones contra Catharos, 1163)*
2. **In principium evangelii Johannis*
3. **Super Magnificat, 1167-1184?**
4. **Super missus est angelus**
5. **De obitu sororis suae (1164)**
6. **Sililoquium seu Meditationes (1167-1184?)**
7. **Sermones per annum**
8. **Laudes salvatoris**
9. **Epistolae ad diversos (1159 to Rainhald; 1164 to Rainhald, 1164 to Reinhard of Reinhausen).**
10. **Opusculum de disputatione contra Judeos** (not in Trithemius' list, but noted by Emecho as in composition at Eckbert's death).
11. **Sermo panegyricus** (not in Trithemius; attributed in Migne to Bernard of Clairvaux).
12. Prayers and hymns (mentioned by Trithemius in *Opera pia et spiritualia* (Mainz, 1601; Roth, pp. 210).

To my knowledge, there has been no edition of any of the works cited above since the work of Roth (1884) and the *Patrologia Latina*, which contains

¹⁰⁸ Barré (*"Une prière d'Eckbert de Schönau, p. 414*), writing in 1952, listed this sermon as Eckbert's, as did Köster in 1978 (*"Eckbert von Schönau, p. 437*). The work appears in Migne as anonymous; PL 95, col. 1514-19 and PL 184, col. 1010-14.
several of Eckbert's devotional works.\textsuperscript{109} The Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (1725) also contains editions of the *De laude crucis*, Meditationes, and the *Stimulus amoris* (or *Stimulus dilectionis*).\textsuperscript{110} Moreover, as noted by Köster and Roth, certain of Eckbert's writings were for long attributed to other authors, including Anselm of Canterbury (*Stimulus dilectionis* and *Sililoquium seu meditationes*), the Venerable Bede, and Bernard of

\begin{itemize}
\item *De laude crucis*, PL 195, col. 103-06, taken from the edition of Bernard Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (Regensburg, 1725), 7, col. 13.
\item *Sermo ad beatam virginem deiparam* (or *Sermo panegyricus*), PL 95, col. 1514-19, where it is entitled "In Nativitate Beatae Mariae Virginis,", homilia LII of Paul, Deacon of Winfridus; and PL 184, col. 1010-14, entitled "Ad Beatam Virginem Deiparam", with Eckbert's authorship acknowledged.
\item *Sililoquium seu meditationes*, PL 158, col. 773-99, attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, Meditatio XII, De Christo; and PL 195, col. 105-14, where it is attributed to Eckbert, taken from Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica, 7, col. 21, "ex codd. Mellicensibus".
\item *Stimulus dilectionis*, PL 158, col. 748-61, attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, Meditatio IX, De Humanitate Christi, from "Ms. Oratorii Parisienses, et cum editione Gothica."
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{109} See Köster, "Ekbert von Schönau", p. 437-38. Those devotional works of Eckbert in the *Patrologia Latina* are as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item *De laude crucis*, PL 195, col. 103-06, taken from the edition of Bernard Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (Regensburg, 1725), 7, col. 13.
\item *Sermo ad beatam virginem deiparam* (or *Sermo panegyricus*), PL 95, col. 1514-19, where it is entitled "In Nativitate Beatae Mariae Virginis,", homilia LII of Paul, Deacon of Winfridus; and PL 184, col. 1010-14, entitled "Ad Beatam Virginem Deiparam", with Eckbert's authorship acknowledged.
\item *Sililoquium seu meditationes*, PL 158, col. 773-99, attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, Meditatio XII, De Christo; and PL 195, col. 105-14, where it is attributed to Eckbert, taken from Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica, 7, col. 21, "ex codd. Mellicensibus".
\item *Stimulus dilectionis*, PL 158, col. 748-61, attributed to Anselm of Canterbury, Meditatio IX, De Humanitate Christi, from "Ms. Oratorii Parisienses, et cum editione Gothica."
\end{itemize}

Clairvaux (Meditationes).\textsuperscript{111}

We must also discuss briefly Eckbert's role in the history of devotion during the twelfth century. His devotions to Mary and Jesus have been recognized as central to the development of the cult of the Sacred Heart of Mary and Christ during this period.\textsuperscript{112} According to Barré, Eckbert was for a time neglected by scholars of twelfth-century devotional literature,\textsuperscript{113} although one scholar has cited Eckbert's meditations as an example of how "Benedictine piety became more expansive and personal" during this time.\textsuperscript{114} J. De Ghellinck was less impressed with Eckbert's skill as a devotional author; although noting the historical interest of Eckbert's sermons against the Cathars and his record of Elizabeth's visions, De Ghellinck believed that his other works exhibited "simple didactic structure" and were in a "very much more terse

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Körster, "Ekbert von Schönau," p. 437; Roth, \\Die Visionen, p. 222.
\item Barré, "Une prière d'Ekbert de Schönau," p. 409.
\item Ibid.
\item U. Berlière, L'ascèse bénédictine des origines à la fin du XIIe siècle (Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1927): 75.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Eckbert's unique contribution to the devotion to Mary was his personification of her heart, according to Barré. In his view, such a sentiment was unprecedented for the mid-twelfth century, and only became common in the following century. As an example, he cited one of Eckbert's meditational works entitled *Salutatio ad sanctam mariam*:

Loquar ad cor tuum, o Maria, loquar ad cor tuum mundum, domina mundi, et adorabo ad templum sanctum dei ab interioribus anime mee. Salutabo ex precordiis meis immaculatum cor tuum, quod primum sub sole suscipere dignum fuit egredientem de sinu patris filium dei.

Moreover, Barré claimed that Eckbert was one of the first medieval writers not only to mention the heart of Jesus in a prayer, but to address a prayer directly to it. He cited a passage from the *Sermo panegyricus* (attributed to better-known authors but recognized by Barré as belonging to Eckbert) in which Mary is asked to intercede to the heart of Christ:

---


116 Barré, "Une prière d'Ekbert de Schönau," p. 413.


There is no doubt that Eckbert's contribution to the history of piety, especially to the cult of Mary, merits further attention.

To return to the quality of Eckbert's sermons against the Cathars as historical sources, I will show that his personal contact with Cathars over several years in Bonn and Cologne formed the basis for his sermons; moreover, although Eckbert's study of Augustine helped shape his belief that the Cathars had their origin in the Manichaeans, this belief may have been created in part by what the Cathars themselves said about Augustine. This judgement follows from both the quantity and quality of the encounters which Eckbert describes. First, however, a reassessment of the value of the *Sermones* in the historiography of medieval heresy (and medieval Catharism in particular) is needed, which will follow in the succeeding chapter. I will also place the work in a broader historical framework by outlining the growth of heresy and the Church's attempts to eradicate it in twelfth-century Europe.

119 Ibid., p. 414; see PL 95, col. 1518D.
Finally, I will study Eckbert's use in the *Sermones* of St. Augustine, to demonstrate that the latter's influence on his work has been exaggerated.
Chapter II

The *Sermones*: Review of the Scholarship

In 1947, Steven Runciman's *The Medieval Manichee* provided the fullest and most scholarly expression of a thesis which had gained considerable following in the first half of the century: that there was a direct link between the dualist tradition of the early Church and medieval Catharism.\(^1\) This notion had been denied by the great nineteenth-century authority of Catharism, Charles Schmidt, but was supported by such historians as H.C. Lea, A.S. Turberville, and Paul Alphandery.\(^2\) Lea, for example, accepted the proposal that the Manichaeans were identical with the later sect of the Paulicians and stated that "in


all essentials the doctrine of the Paulicians was identical with that of the Cathari.\(^3\) The Paulician belief in two coequal powers, God and Satan, who had respectively created the invisible and visible worlds; their rejection of the Old Testament; docetic view of Christ; belief in the transmigration of souls—all this, and more, convinced Lea of the ultimate derivation of Catharism from Manichaeism.\(^4\) Alphandery suggested that certain gnostic elements might have survived in little known medieval sects.\(^5\) Moreover, the sect of the Priscillians were considered by some an important element in this transition of Manichaeism or gnosticism.\(^6\) Like those before him, Runciman asked whether the various heretics to whom the label "Manichaean" was applied in eleventh and twelfth-century Europe really deserved this epithet, and his answer was affirmative. According to Runciman, when such eleventh-century chroniclers as Adhemar of Chabannes complained of Manichaeans, they correctly perceived the revival of the same heresy against

---

\(^3\) Lea, p. 41.
\(^4\) Ibid, pp. 41-42.
which Augustine had written in the late fourth and early fifth centuries.  

The issue of whether or not the Cathars were a revival of Manichaeism is relevant to our study of Eckbert of Schönau's Sermones because many scholars have argued that this identification of Cathars with Manichaeans formed the basis of his work. As a result, they have pictured Eckbert as heavily dependent on Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings for the detail he provides about the Cathars, although they have recognized that at some points he reflects a personal knowledge of contemporary Catharism. As to which specific doctrines Eckbert drew from Augustine and which from his own experience, there is no general agreement among historians. For example, some regard his reports of Cathar dualism and docetism as authentic, while others reject them as borrowed from Augustine. However, practically all those who hold this view of the Sermones agree that Eckbert's dependence on Augustine is most evident in his first sermon, in which it cannot be denied that he incorporated into the text passages from the De haeresibus. I maintain that Eckbert's purpose for doing so, however, was not to transfer Manichaean doctrines or

organization to the Cathars because he regarded the two as identical, but to present what he believed were the origins of Catharism by describing the ancient Manichaeans.

As will be discussed below, this misinterpretation of Eckbert's first sermon stems from the mistaken conviction that he thought the Cathars were Manichaeans, in the same way earlier Catholic polemicists had identified as Manichaeism any forms of dissent which resembled it. Although Eckbert noted the similarities between what the Cathars taught and what he had read of the Manichaeans in Augustine, he did not conclude that the two sects were identical; rather, he was convinced that the Cathars owed their origin to the Manichaeans but that over time they had developed many beliefs not found among their progenitors. It should be noted too that a minority of scholars, including Jean Duvernoy and Jeffrey Russell, accept much in the *Sermones* as genuine and emphasize the value of Eckbert's personal knowledge of Catharism rather than his use of Augustine. Nevertheless, my view that Eckbert's sermons rest primarily on first-hand knowledge of Catharism gained through contact with Cathars has placed me squarely against the opinion of the majority of scholars.
Before proceeding further on this theme, however, it will be helpful to provide some context by reviewing the main parts of Runciman's thesis and its fate at the hands of his successors. It is only within this wider issue of East-West contacts during the rise of Catharism that the debate surrounding Eckbert's work can be properly appreciated. If one accepts the *Sermones* as a largely reliable source, they represent our earliest substantial account of Catharism in the medieval West. Written in late 1163 or early 1164, they appear earlier than the first clear evidence for Catharism in Southern France, the report of the Council of Lomber in 1165. Moreover, the *Sermones* antedate our accounts of early Italian Catharism, which come from the thirteenth century. Not only because of its date but also because of its detail, Eckbert's polemic should occupy a key role in determining how much and how soon Eastern dualism influenced Western Catharism.

Runciman began his work by describing the gnosticism which existed alongside the early Christian church and which centered around the teachings of the heresiarchs Marcion (fl. ca. 150 A.D.) and Mani (d. 276 A.D.). The two forces most directly responsible for transmitting dualism to the
medieval West, however, were the popular literature of the gnostics and the Messalians. The latter were dualists living in fifth-century Armenia and around Edessa during the sixth century, who believed that through prayer each man must try to rid his soul of the wicked demon of material creation which inhabited it. The Messalians were eventually driven westward by the Arab conquests and settled in the region of Thrace.8

In Runciman's thesis, the next step in the chain of dualist transmission was represented by the Paulicians, a dualist sect which arose in Armenia and Asia Minor during the eighth century. They adhered to a moderate dualism; that is, they believed that the creator of the material world (whom they called "Demiurge") would eventually yield to a higher God. The Paulicians became powerful enough to establish their own small independent state at Tephrice on the Euphrates. Both they and the Messalians were important to Runciman because they arose from Manichaeism and prepared the way for Bogomilism.9

---

8 Ibid., pp. 5-25.

The Bogomils took their name from a Bulgar priest named Bogomil, who lived during the reign of the Emperor Peter of Bulgaria (927-967 A.D.). Runciman claimed that the integration of Messalian doctrines from Thrace with those of Bogomil was largely the work of the Bulgar priest Jeremiah, whom he considered the actual founder of the sect.\textsuperscript{10} Centered on the belief that all visible creation was the work of Satan (whom the Bogomils considered the elder son of God before his fall) and therefore evil, Bogomilism moved from Bulgaria into the Byzantine Empire, eventually penetrating Constantinople itself by the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{11} Its popularity stemmed from its ascetic rejection of material objects, with emphasis on prayer and fasting, and rejection of marriage, which contrasted favorably with the wealth and laxness of so many orthodox religious. Moreover, Bogomilism fed on nationalist Bulgarian resentment of the Greek Orthodox emperor and his official church, as well as on discontent among the poor Bulgarians toward the large landowning aristocracy of the region. Their repudiation of material objects as evil also led the Bogomils to reject the Orthodox objects of worship,

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 91.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 91.
including the churches themselves, and created a view of the cross as an abominable symbol of Christ's suffering. The Bogomils, further, rejected the Old Testament on the grounds that it was the revelation of the evil God, Satan, and although they accepted parts of the New Testament (most important were the Gospels and Pauline Epistles) their interpretation of Scripture was highly allegorical, with little concern for the literal sense. Finally, Bogomil christology was thoroughly docetic; Christ was regarded as God's younger son, whose image appeared for a time on earth not to redeem the world but rather to serve as an example of how men might free their souls from the prison in which it was held—the body. Bogomil cosmology explained how this state of affairs came to be.12

12 This summary of Bogomilism's primary tenets is based primarily on the still helpful interpretation of Dmitri Obolensky, The Bogomils (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948). For Bogomil cosmology, see the account of the Byzantine monk Euthymius Zigabenus (ca. 1118). I have utilized the edition in Migne, PG 130, col. 1289-1332; there is also an edition in J. Ficker, Die Phundagiagiten: Ein Beitrag zur Ketzergeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters (Leipzig, 1908): 89-111. Also important are the Bogomil treatises entitled The Secret Supper or Interrogatio Johannis, (which reached the Italian Cathars from the Balkans about 1190) and the Vision of Isaiah, part of an ancient gnostic apocalyptic work which circulated among the Bogomils by the twelfth century and found its way to Europe by the thirteenth. The Interrogatio Johannis is edited by I. Ivanov, Livres et legendes bogomiles, trans. of Bogomilski knigi i
Runciman believed that Bogomilism moved from Constantinople into Europe during the eleventh century primarily through Paulician missionaries, who were responsible for the growth of Flemish and Burgundian Catharism and also played an important role in the rise of dualism in twelfth-century Languedoc. These missionaries met with an already prevalent anti-clericalism and memories of ancient Manichaeism, which facilitated the growth of Catharism.\textsuperscript{13} Based on the presence of Nicetas, the Bogomil bishop of Constantinople, at the Cathar council of St. Felix-de-Caraman in Southern France in 1167, Runciman concluded that the French Cathars were "therefore the direct child of Nicetas and his council, and always retained his doctrines."\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, he argued that the Cathar rite of the "consolamentum" was largely based on the sacraments of the early church, which the Cathars had


\footnote{13}{Runciman, pp. 163-70.}

\footnote{14}{Ibid., p. 124.}
revived.\textsuperscript{15}

Such, in summary, is the chain of dualist tradition which Runciman forged, although scholars of the last forty years have moved increasingly away from his thesis. The main reason is simply that there is little direct evidence to support it. Runciman strained the limits of solid historical scholarship at several points in order to make what evidence he found fit his scenario. Too often, his arguments rested on speculative inferences from the sources available.

For example, Runciman created a conduit of dualism from the Paulicians to the Bogomils by arguing that Paulician missionaries from Thrace were chiefly responsible for the dualist views of Bogomil. For support, he turned to a letter of Pope Nicholas I written in 867 to Khan Boris of Bulgaria and to a treatise composed against the Paulicians in 869 by Peter the Sicilian, ambassador of the Byzantine Emperor Basil I. Pope Nicholas, in his letter, complained of the presence of Armenian and Greek missionaries in Bulgaria. Peter, two years later, warned the archbishop of Bulgaria that Paulicians were preparing to send missionaries into his territory. Based on these statements, Runciman

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp. 163-64.
wrote that "It is therefore probable that the missionaries mentioned by the Pope were Paulicians," although Nicholas did not call them such. In neither source is there evidence that Paulicians were proselytizing in Bulgaria during the ninth century, but Runciman inferred that they must have been. To buttress this thesis, he explained that the Paulicians in Thrace probably felt pressured by the conversion of the Bulgarians to the Orthodox Church and so took to missionizing as a means of preserving their own religious identity. Here, Runciman offered not even inference based on a source, but only speculation.

Despite the flaws in Runciman's thesis, its basic premise found adherents among his contemporaries. Among them was Antoine Dondaine, who argued in a number of work spanning 1939 to 1952 for the probability of Manichaean influence on eleventh-century European heresy via other dualist groups.

In 1939, Dondaine departed from the authoritative view of Charles Schmidt that there was

16 Ibid., p. 65.
17 Ibid., p. 66.
no contact between the Manichaeans and Cathars. According to Dondaine, the view of the medieval polemicists that the Cathars were actually "neo-Manichaeans" should not be rejected out of hand, even though, as Schmidt had argued, there seemed to be no mention or memory of Mani among the Cathars. Influenced by the work of Deodat Roche, Dondaine argued that for too long the question of Manichaean-Cathar contacts had been studied based almost solely on the sources of Catholic polemicists. This inquiry should be widened to include others works influencing the rise of what he called neo-Manichaeism: Bogomil works such as *The Secret Supper* and *The Vision of Isaiah*; Bogomil legends; the work of Faustus of Mileve, Augustine's Manichaean opponent; and the Manichaean writings discovered at Tourfan and Fayoum in Egypt.

---


20 Deodat Roche, *Le Catharisme* (Carcassone, 1937): 39. This work was originally a communication directed to the Congres des sciences historiques in 1937.

Although admitting that the Cathars made no mention of Mani, Dondaine suggested this silence was due to the intimidation of the courts of the Inquisition. He noted a single exception to this silence: Eckbert's contention that the Cathars celebrated an equivalent of the Manichaean "bemafest", which commemorated Mani's death, under the name "malilosa". Here, Dondaine believed Eckbert confused what he knew of the Cathars with what he had read in Augustine.22

Moreover, in his edition of the Cathar treatise Le Liber De Duobus Principiis, also published in 1939, Dondaine noted a "very close kinship" between the ancient Manichaeans and the Cathars, based on a comparison of their doctrines. He admitted, however, that a continuous chain of contact between them could not be established.23 Despite his skepticism toward the reports of "Manichaeans" in Western Europe by eleventh-century chroniclers, Dondaine remained confident that the Cathars were directly descended from the Bogomils and Paulicians, seen, for example, in the practice of all three sects of baptizing by laying on hands. Besides the


Bogomil and Paulician influences, which were ultimately Manichaean in origin, Dondaine also believed that Jewish and Christian (specifically Marcionite) gnosticism had helped produce Catharism.24

In 1949-50, Dondaine published the first critical edition of another important source for the rise of Catharism in the West, the Tractatus de Hereticis, compiled by the Italian inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria by about 1260. In the preface to this account of Cathar origins in Italy, Anselm provided a brief history of their rise in Bulgaria and subsequent move westward, explaining that Catharism began with Mani, then spread to Constantinople through Greek traders, from whence Frankish crusaders took the heresy to Europe.25 While Dondaine accepted this explanation and believed his thesis to be strengthened by it, later scholars have rejected its mention of Mani as legendary.26

Dondaine's views found opponents, and prominent

24 Ibid., pp. 53-7.


among them was the Italian historian Raffaello Morghen, who insisted that there was insufficient evidence to support continuity between Manichaean dualism and the heresies appearing in the West after 1000. While recognizing Dondaine's contribution in bringing to light important sources for Catharism, Morghen believed that his interpretation was too philosophical and doctrinal in nature. The importance of uniquely Western economic and social factors in the rise of Catharism had been underestimated by Dondaine, and when these forces were considered, the likelihood of any Manichaean influence was greatly diminished, despite the doctrinal parallels which could be found.

In a later work, Morghen maintained that those beliefs which medieval chroniclers labeled as "Manichaean" seemed characteristic of dualism in any period: for example, that all things invisible and good were created by a good God, while the visible and evil world was the work of the evil God.

Further, Morghen disagreed with Dondaine on whether

---

27 Raffaello Morghen, L'Eresia Nel Medioevo (Bari, 1951): 228-29.

28 Ibid., p. 229.

the treatise of Cosmas the Priest (ca. 970) against the Bogomils provided evidence that Catharism was derived from Bogomilism. Dondaine considered the prominence of the laying on of hands in both the Bogomil and Cathar rites of baptism a sign of this connection. Morghen, however, believed that Cosmas' work was more of a condemnation of the Bogomils' moral rigorism than a exposition of their beliefs. While admitting that there were doctrinal similarities between the Bogomils and Cathars, such as rejection of the Old Testament, emphasis on sexual abstinence, and refusal to worship the Cross, Morghen believed that such beliefs could have arisen independently, particularly in the religious environment of eleventh and twelfth-century Europe, similar to that in tenth-century Bulgaria, with its undercurrent of dissent.

Dondaine's reply to Morghen's criticism came in a 1952 article in which he questioned Morghen's historical methodology and re-emphasized his own thesis by detailing the doctrinal similarities


between the Bogomils and Western heretics of the eleventh century. Dondaine believed that Morghen, by eliminating the possibility of external influences on the rise of heresy in the medieval West, simplified a very complex issue. Moreover, Morghen's thesis was vulnerable because it envisaged only noble motives behind the spread of heresy; that is, the rise of heresy as a means of addressing social or economic complaints. For Dondaine, some heretics must have been motivated by less lofty goals, such as simply a feeling of pessimism.

Dondaine proceeded to detail parallel after parallel between eleventh-century heretics in the West and the Bogomils, both in doctrine and ritual. He maintained that this connection was particularly strong in the case of the Cathar "consolamentum", which he described at some length. While the Cathars might have been inspired to baptize by laying on of hands from a reading of the Acts of the Apostles, the rituals surrounding the act were too similar to those of the Bogomils to be explained by

33 Ibid., p. 50.
34 Ibid., pp. 59-61.
independent development.35

There were other contemporaries of Runciman besides Morghen who disagreed with his primary thesis. Hans Soderberg, for example, in a work published one year after The Medieval Manichee, concluded that "It is impossible to prove the direct historical line between the Manichaeans and the Cathars of Western Europe."36 Despite clear connections between Catharism and Bogomilism and also between the Bogomils and Paulicians, Soderberg maintained that Manichaeism disappeared in the West after the sixth century.37

There was room for compromise between the positions of Dondaine and Morghen, and this position was represented in the work of Arno Borst. In what is still considered an indispensable study of the Cathars, Borst noted what seemed a single stream of dualist influence moving from East to West during the centuries between the Manichaeans and Cathars. Yet, he emphasized that the basis of Western Catharism was not to be found in Bogomilism, but in an indigenous desire to return to the apostolic

35 Ibid., p. 68.


37 Ibid., pp. 25, 34-5.
Christian life, a desire which sprang from problems unique to the West.38

In a later work, Borst described how the heretics of eleventh-century Europe seemed to have adopted certain practices of both Western monasticism and Bogomilism. Unlike Dondaine, he placed the first appearance of Bogomil dualism in the West at Cologne in 1143 and no earlier.39 Borst believed that Catharism appealed particularly to the various groups of laity: crusaders, merchants, artisans, and peasants.40 His emphasis on the crusades as a vehicle for transmitting Bogomilism to the West was shared by other scholars, notably Christine Thouzellier, who believed crusaders returning from the Holy Land following the second

38 Arno Borst, Die Katharer (Stuttgart: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 12, 1953): 72, n. 2. Sharing Borst's position was Christopher Brooke, who believed that the evidence could not support the positions of either Dondaine or Morghen. However, Brooke saw possible Bogomil influence in the West before 1143, especially in the career of Peter of Bruis. See his "Heresy and Religious Sentiment: 1000-1250", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 41 (1968): 115-131.


40 Ibid., p. 275.
crusade must have brought dualism with them.41 Others, however, have regarded the crusades as insignificant in this regard and have instead concentrated on the trade routes between the West and Constantinople as the most likely routes of heresy, especially those along the Danube and Rhine.42

In contrast to Borst, who found some merit in the positions of both Dondaine and Morghen, Jeffrey Russell found no convincing evidence that Eastern dualism had influenced the development of Western heresy before the twelfth century. He explained the rise of doctrines similar to those of the Bogomils as the result of conditions indigenous to Western Europe. Russell admitted that after reading Morghen, he was convinced that dualism did not truly

---


42 See, for example, the view of R.I. Moore, Origins of European Dissent, p. 172.
appear in the West until the 1140's. Like Morghen, Russell was more skeptical than Dondaine of early medieval reports of "Manichaeans" in Western Europe. Out of 26 reports of dissent from 834 to 1167, Russell argued that only three might support the thesis of Runciman and Dondaine; that is, only three revealed any evidence of dualist influence from the East. The first occurred at Orleans in about 1022, the second at Liège in 1025, and the third near Cologne in 1143. Only in the latter account did Russell see clear evidence of dualism. He maintained that "there is no specific evidence that any missionaries from the Balkans arrived before the 1140's, and protests that trade routes between Italy and the Balkans were in existence, so that such intercourse was possible, must be admitted but dismissed as proving nothing."

While Russell, like Dondaine, noted many doctrinal similarities between eleventh-century


44 Ibid., p. 305.


46 Ibid., pp. 211-12.
heresy in the West and the Bogomils of the Byzantine Empire, he attributed these doctrines not to Bogomil influence but to movements of Western reform. The rejection of meat, abstinence from sex, repudiation of marriage, and the denial of the sacraments—all could be explained as a result of tensions indigenous to the West during this period.47 The desire to return to a purely scriptural church, purged of rites which hindered the individual's access to God, could account for the refusal to venerate the cross or pray to saints, as well as the rejection of sacraments performed by a corrupt priesthood. There was no evidence that Eastern dualists influenced the development of such views and no need to resort to such an explanation.48

Moreover, Russell maintained that few of the beliefs fundamental to twelfth- and thirteenth-century Catharism appeared in the West before 1160, including the notion of two co-equal and co-eternal gods, one good and the other evil. In fact, Russell suggested that even after 1160, dualism could have arisen in the West as a natural outcome of the aims of reformers: the restoration of the Gospel's teachings and the desire to separate oneself from

48 Ibid., pp. 211-12.
the world. Likewise, there was no evidence for belief in the transmigration of souls before the 1160s. Although the heretics captured and questioned at Goslar in 1051 refused to kill animals, Russell explained this as reflecting a devotion to Jewish dietary law rather than a belief in transmigration of souls. In contrast, Dondaine noted the similarity between this tenet of the Goslar heretics and the Bogomil refusal to shed blood and used the parallel as evidence for Bogomil influence on the West.

Writing about five years after Russell, R.I. Moore moved even farther from Runciman's thesis of continuity between Manichaeism and Catharism. Like Russell and Morghen, he did not believe the heretics of eleventh-century Western Europe were influenced by Bogomils and even doubted the existence of any coherent heretical movement in the West. Dondaine, Morghen, and Russell had all accepted a premise which Moore questioned: "that there was a heretical movement, or at least a coherent pattern of heresy,

49 Ibid., p. 191.
50 Ibid., p. 206.
in eleventh-century Europe."\textsuperscript{52} For support, he noted the silence in the sources concerning this heretical tradition between 1052 and 1100.\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, those accounts of heresy which did exist were so diverse and scattered that no movement of any kind could be discerned in them. Only in the early part of the twelfth century did the "continuous history of popular heresy" begin, when the Gregorian reformers began making their force felt in political and ecclesiastical affairs.\textsuperscript{54}

According to Moore, the most difficult problem facing the researcher in this field was to determine when mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the West before the 1150's at the earliest.\textsuperscript{55} But the doctrines of mitigated dualism first appeared in Western Europe. It was clear that absolute dualists were not active in the Western...
dualists were not easy to separate from the ideals of Western reformists. As an example, he described the belief of mitigated dualists that the evil God, who created the visible world, was not co-eternal or co-equal with the good God; in the end, the latter would triumph over all forces of evil. It would have been very difficult to distinguish such a teaching from mainstream Christian demonology and eschatology during the eleventh century. Thus, he dealt with the problem of Catharism's origins by conceding that no answer was possible. While admitting some possible influence from Bogomil ideas, he believed the surviving sources for eleventh-century heresy in the West were not sufficiently coherent to prove it.

In contrast to the prevailing skepticism toward any Bogomil penetration of the West before the 1140's, Malcolm Lambert offered what he saw as evidence of Bogomil contact with eleventh-and twelfth-century Western heretics. He considered it unlikely that those dissidents of the eleventh century described as Manichaeans had ever heard of regard Eckbert's Sermones as evidence of absolute dualism but maintained that they indicated the presence of mitigated dualism only. See Origins of European Dissent, p. 182.

56 Ibid.
Mani; moreover, Catholic writers applied this label to any heresy which seemed dualist, only because Augustine's description of Manichaeism was familiar and close at hand. Nevertheless, Lambert asserted that "it was by a rightful instinct that the label reappeared in the chroniclers from 1018, for from this time, if not earlier, a form of oriental dualism was exerting its influence on indigenous heresy."  

57 After reviewing the accounts of the heretics at Arras (ca. 1025) and the career of the wandering preacher Peter of Bruis (fl. 1118-1138), Lambert concluded that both showed signs of Bogomilism.  

58 The presence of four practices among these Western dissidents were especially important in establishing this connection: rejection of the Old Testament, refusal to venerate the cross, rejection of church music and singing, and the denunciation of church buildings themselves. Lambert maintained that "The conjunction of four doctrines seems a little too much to be explained by incubation or dissemination from other Western sects, and gives weight to the hypothesis of


58 Ibid., pp. 51-4.
external Bogomil influence."59

We must now turn to the role of Eckbert of Schonau in this continuing investigation of the origins of Catharism. As a source in this debate, I believe Eckbert's *Sermones* have often been misunderstood and thus not utilized as extensively as they should have been. While mentioned frequently in studies of Catharism's rise in twelfth-century Europe, and even accorded some measure of importance, they have also been assigned a relatively minor role. This attitude toward Eckbert's work is illustrated by the fact that there has been no edition of the *Sermones* since that published as part of the *Patrologia Latina* series, in 1855.60 Moreover, the most extensive recent study of them was an article by the Italian scholar Raoul Manselli published about twenty-five years ago. The lack of not only a critical edition but a thorough study of the *Sermones* can no longer be justified--Eckbert is too important a source.

brief and passing notice of heresy, like Everinus' letter to Bernard of Clairvaux or the accounts of many earlier medieval chroniclers. Of course, the fact that Eckbert's sermons occupy some 87 columns

59 Ibid., p. 54.

60 PL 195, col. 11-98.
in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* does not prove they are reliable or detailed. However, the work reflects the observations of one in close contact with Catharism over several years, one who had gained considerable knowledge of their public and private teachings as well as a familiarity with the arguments their adepts used to support those teachings. Moreover, Eckbert had learned details about certain Cathar rituals from former members of the sect, and he also possessed a basic understanding of its hierarchy and the major divisions within it.

In short, the *Sermones* are a remarkably detailed picture of Catharism's early struggle to gain a foothold in Western Europe, at a time when its membership was still highly fragmented. Eckbert encountered a bewildering array of doctrines not yet fully defined, often contradictory, revealing these internal divisions. Yet, despite facing such a dynamic and unsettled heresy, Eckbert succeeded in sorting it out sufficiently to present a coherent description of it, based on the knowledge he himself had gained from the Cathars and what he had learned from former Cathars. I do not believe, as many scholars do, that Eckbert was forced to achieve this coherence by borrowing extensively from Augustine's
anti-Manichaean writings. It is against this consensus of opinion, nevertheless, against which I place myself in the following pages.

Charles Schmidt displayed an ambivalence toward Eckbert which is found again and again among later historians, both of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He described Eckbert as having gained a fairly exact knowledge of the Cathars' beliefs through contacts with members and former members of the sect. However, having been struck by the analogies between Cathar and Manichaean doctrine, as described by Saint Augustine, he ascribed to the Cathars what he had learned from Augustine's anti-Manichaean work.\(^\text{61}\) Eckbert saw the Cathars as "a confused collection of errors and arbitrary interpretation."\(^\text{62}\) Like earlier polemicists, he was mainly concerned to refute those scriptural passages with which the Cathars supported their doctrines. Eckbert's scriptural prooftexts and arguments from common sense were often weaker than those of his opponents and were expressed in an uncultured and vulgar manner.\(^\text{63}\) According to Schmidt, despite Eckbert's considerable first-hand knowledge of

\(^{61}\) Schmidt, *Histoire et Doctrine*, p. 239.

\(^{62}\) Ibid.

\(^{63}\) Ibid., pp. 239-40.
Cathar doctrines knowledge of Cathar doctrines, his
description of them derived from Augustine.\textsuperscript{64}

It is this view of Eckbert as too much attached
to Augustine's work to be reliable which has
prevailed in the scholarship since Schmidt and which
must be challenged. As a corollary to this
misconception, there developed the notion that
Eckbert must have misinterpreted his own
considerable knowledge about the Cathars by
filtering everything through Augustine. There has
been no attempt since Schmidt to deny Eckbert's
close contact with the sect, and yet few scholars
have recognized that it was this contact, and not
his reading of Augustine, which formed the basis of
his polemic.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth
century, two works on the \textit{Sermones} appeared by
German scholars, the first of which perpetuated
Schmidt's view of them and the second of which
provided an invaluable study of Eckbert's life and
work.\textsuperscript{65} A. Nebe, writing in 1866, emphasized

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{65} A. Nebe, "Egbert, Abt von Schonau," \textit{Annalen
des Vereins fur Nassauische Alterthumskunde und
Geschichtsforschung}, 8 (1866): 245-292; F.W.E. Roth,
\textit{Die Visionen der heilige Elisabeth und die Schriften
der Abte Ekbert und Emecho von Schonau}. (Brunn:
1884, Wien-Wurzburg, 1886).
Eckbert's knowledge of Augustine's work as a source for his description of the Cathars, especially in the first sermon, in which he applied to the Cathars Augustine's description of the Manichaean hierarchy of teachers, each with twelve disciples, as well as deacons and presbyters. Despite Nebe's recognition that Eckbert had engaged the Cathars often in disputes, he nevertheless characterized the *Sermones* as heavily dependent on Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. In 1884, F.W.E. Roth's study of both Elizabeth (Eckbert's sister and a famous mystic) and Eckbert was published, including editions of Elizabeth's visions and Eckbert's devotional writings. While still indispensable today for its painstaking detail and information on the manuscript traditions for Eckbert's corpus, Roth's work was not primarily interpretative in

---

66 Nebe, "Egbert, Abt von Schonau," p. 270; *Sermones*, I, p. 15:

Ex numero discipulorum suorum duodecim elegit quos quasi apostolos suos habebat, ut in hoc haberet formam christi qui ex discipulis suis duodecim sibi elegit apostolos. Quem numerum imitatores eius et hodierna die obseruant, qui ex electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros et terciundecimum principem ipsorum, episcopos autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris et presbyteros ac diaconos, qui ab episcopis ordinantur et his electi inter uos uocantur.

nature and did not include an edition of the Sermones, although Roth edited Eckbert's devotional tracts, hymns, and letters, as well as the biography of him written by Emecho, his successor as abbot of Schonau.

Herbert Grundmann regarded Eckbert's Sermones as part of the general tendency of early medieval Catholic polemicists to identify any doctrine which resembled ancient Manichaeism, as reported by Augustine, as Manichaean. Besides citing Guibert of Nogent and Ralph of Coggeshall as examples of this pattern, Grundmann included Eckbert's appendix of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writing. He also argued that Eckbert did not know about Cathar dualism from first-hand sources, but only through Augustine, taking his report of it in the first sermon from Augustine's De haeresibus. I believe


69 Ibid., p. 26. In particular, Grundmann was referring to the following passage taken by Eckbert from Augustine's De Haeresibus 46:

Illi uero duo creatores esse docent, unum bonum et alterum malum, uidelicet deum et quendam immanem principem tenebrarum quem nescio quomodo rectius uocare possimus nisi
Grundmann, like many later scholars, misunderstood the function of Eckbert's first sermon and appendix, which were not intended to describe contemporary Catharism but rather its ancient origins in the form of Manichaeism.70

Antoine Dondaine's attitude toward Eckbert and the *Sermones* was very similar to that of Schmidt and Grundmann. Despite Eckbert's declaration of the quality of his sources, Dondaine advised prudence in utilizing the work, since "Eckbert confused his direct knowledge of the heresy with the information which he had found on the Manichaeans in Saint Augustine."71 As an example, Dondaine mentioned a passage which historians have often cited since as evidence of Eckbert's debilitating ties to Augustine--his mistaken identification of the Manichaean "Bemafest" with a Cathar celebration diabolum. Duas naturas fuisse dicunt ab eterno contrarias sibi inuicem, unam bonam et alteram malam et ex eis dicunt creata esse universa." *Sermones*, I, p. 20.

70 Although these sections of the *Sermones* will be discussed in more detail below, it is interesting to note that so many scholars have not mentioned the heading which prefaces Eckbert's series of passages from Augustine in the first sermon: "Vna secta hoc originem ducat." *Sermones*, I, p. 17.

71 Dondaine, "Nouvelles sources", p. 482.
which he called "Malilosa".\textsuperscript{72} Not only would it have been highly unlikely for the Cathars to have known about the "bemafest", Dondaine noted that the Manichaeans celebrated it in March, not in the Autumn, when Eckbert reported the "malilosa" was held. According to Dondaine, this statement was, among Catholic sources for Catharism, the "sole allusion to a direct tradition from the Manichaeans to the Cathars" and as such had to be treated with great skepticism.\textsuperscript{73}

Arno Borst noted the same inherent weakness in the Sermones as had Schmidt and Dondaine, yet still saw enough of value in them to describe them as the first systematic treatment of the Cathars in medieval Europe.\textsuperscript{74} In his view, Eckbert had carefully compared the doctrines of the Cathars with those of the Manichaeans and had formed a "scientific thesis": the Cathars were

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{72} Ibid., pp. 482-83. Eckbert's statement, Sermones, I, p. 15, is as follows: "Celebrant autem pro eo aliud quoddam festum in quo occisus est heresiarcha eorum manicheus, cuius proculdubio heresim sectantur qued beatus augustinus in libro contra manicheos bema appellari dixit. Meus autem recitator ab eis, quibus ipse fuerat commoratus, malilosa dixit uocari et autumpnali tempore celebrari."
  \item \textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p. 483.
  \item \textsuperscript{74} Borst, Die Katharer, pp., 6-7.
\end{itemize}
Manichaeans.75 According to Borst, this was part of a wider effort by Catholic writers to describe more exactly these new heretics by resorting to old labels. Eckbert, however, who knew that heretics of the eleventh- and early twelfth-century had already been branded "Manichaeans", was the first to try to systematically prove such a connection.76

Despite Eckbert's innovative methods, in Borst's view his identification of Cathars with Manichaeans caused serious errors which weakened his usefulness as a reliable source for the Cathars. As an example, Borst cited the passages in the first sermon which Eckbert took from Augustine's De Haeresibus concerning the Manichaean hierarchy. Eckbert applied Augustine's description of Manichaean bishops, presbyters, and deacons to the Cathars; this was clearly an attempt to apply ancient information to medieval conditions.77 Moreover, like Grundmann, Borst maintained that Eckbert's description of the two gods of the Cathars was taken from Augustine.78

75 Ibid., pp. 251-52.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid., p. 209, n. 25. For Eckbert's use of Augustine in this first sermon, see Sermones, I, pp. 14-19.
78 Ibid., p. 152, n. 5.
Despite these reservations, Borst was more receptive than previous scholars to the *Sermones* in his willingness to concede the existence of a Cathar festival called "malilosa", although he rejected Eckbert's identification of it with the Manichaean "bemafest." He suggested that the word "malilosa" might be the Latinization of the German phrase for "consolamentum"—"Losung des Makels". 79

Borst's perpetuation of the views of Schmidt and Dondaine toward the *Sermones* was particularly important because of the great influence which his general history of Catharism was to exercise on future scholarship. Still viewed by many as the

79 Ibid., p. 220, n. 26. There has been little, if any, acceptance of this suggestion by modern scholars, most of whom reject Eckbert's report entirely. I agree with Borst that some ceremony called "malilosa" probably did exist, especially since Eckbert claimed to have based his information on one of his informants; *Sermones*, I, p. 12: "Meus autem recitator ab eis quibus ipse fuerat commoratus, malilosa dixit uocari et autumpnali tempore celebrari." Cf. with Russell, *Dissent and Reform*, p. 222 (below, p. 18, n. 80).

Moreover, as will be discussed more thoroughly below, Eckbert indicates that the Cathars were aware of Augustine's writings and the use made of them by Church polemicists and that they themselves saw a link between their sect and the Manichaean. Perhaps Eckbert's attempt to connect the Manichaean "bema" with the Cathar "malilosa" was not simply a mistaken interpretation of his information but based in part on what the Cathars themselves claimed. *Sermones*, I, p. 19: "Produnt autem semetipsos quod sint de errore manichei in eo quod dicere solent quod beatus augustinus prodiderit secreta eorum."
best modern account of Catharism, I believe Borst's *Die Katharer* went far toward creating the still prevailing view of the *Sermones* as a potentially masterful work crippled by Eckbert's slavish dependence on Augustine. In turn, this misconception has been a large part of the reason that no critical edition or thorough study of the *Sermones* has appeared.

In the most extensive modern study of the *Sermones*, Raoul Manselli took an important step beyond the previous scholarship on Eckbert by clearly defining the historiographical problem facing the student of the *Sermones* and the methodology necessary to solve it. Like Borst, he asserted that for Eckbert, Manichaeans and Cathars were identical.\(^8\) He based this observation largely on an analysis of the first sermon and especially on Eckbert's statement that the Cathars professed the errors of the Manichaeans and believed that Augustine had betrayed the secrets of their sect.\(^1\) Moreover, Manselli believed that when describing the Cathars' docetic view of Christ, Eckbert was

---


transferring a Manichaean doctrine to the Cathars in order to make his description of their beliefs appear more complete. Although he acknowledged that the Drugunthian sect of the Bogomils were docetists and that Eckbert might have heard of their teaching, he nevertheless believed Eckbert's source for this information was Augustine.82

Still, Manselli, like those before and since, was aware of Eckbert's repeated contacts with the Cathars, both in Bonn and Cologne, and acknowledged the benefits of such contact, calling the sermons the result of a "long period of maturation and of multiple experiences, direct and indirect."83 Such contact was particularly evident in Eckbert's account of Cathar baptism, which was clearly a form of the "consolamentum" and based on first-hand information.84 Further, Manselli accepted as genuine Eckbert's description of the Bogomils'

82 Ibid., p. 332. See Sermones, XIII, p. 337:

Non est autem incredibile mihi, insani magistri insanos esse discipulos. Nam princeps erroris uestri, manes, saluatorem nostrum ita in humanitate apparuisset docebat ut uideretur quidem esse homo et non esset uere homo et quod nec natus uere fuisset de uirginis nec uere passus nec uere mortuus nec uere a morte suscitatus. . .

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid., pp. 333-36. For Eckbert's account, see Sermones, VIII, pp. 1-3.
allegorical interpretation of Genesis 2:17—that the fruit which God forbade Adam to eat was actually Eve and was therefore a prohibition against sexual intercourse.\(^{85}\) In Manselli's opinion, to determine the historical worth of the *Sermones*, one would need to isolate every reference to Augustine's works in the sermons and determine their function; only then could the historian begin to evaluate the value of Eckbert's other sources, which were both first- and second-hand in nature.\(^{86}\) Manselli's realization of this fact was his major contribution toward the study of the *Sermones*, although his description of them within the context of the mid-twelfth century and his review of Eckbert's background were certainly helpful.

Jeffrey Russell, writing during the same period as Manselli, was not as troubled as other scholars by Eckbert's reliance on Augustine and described the *Sermones* as "judicious and thorough, so that the book represents the earliest reliable source on the Catharists."\(^{87}\) Despite containing some spurious information, such as Eckbert's identification of the

\(^{85}\) Ibid., p. 330. For Eckbert's discussion and refutation, see *Sermones*, V, pp. 13-23.

\(^{86}\) Ibid.

\(^{87}\) Russell, *Dissent and Reform*, p. 220.
"Malilosa" with the Manichaean "bemafest", the sermons revealed that the two groups of heretics of whom Everinus wrote in 1143 had become one by 1163 and that they had become firmly established in the Rhineland. Russell believed that although Eckbert did not understand the dynamics within the Cathar ranks, he clearly reflected the presence among them of a small inner circle of dualists who controlled the sect and a much more numerous outer fringe of followers, motivated not by dualism but by the desire to reform the Church.

Moreover, Russell argued that this ruling minority kept their dualism hidden from their own followers, "while Reformist doctrines were preached for the general public to introduce people gently to dissidence and prepare them for the eventual reception of the dualist doctrines that formed the core of the sect's belief." As evidence, he cited Eckbert's report that some Cathars, the followers of one Hartwinus, allowed marriage between virgins,

---

88 Ibid., p. 222. While rejecting Eckbert's interpretation of the "Malilosa", Russell believed he was describing an actual feast, and may have been referring to the Cathar table ritual. He rejected Borst's notion that "malilosa" could have derived from a corrupted form of "Losung des Makels", a German phrase for the consolamentum.

89 Ibid., pp. 220-21.

90 Ibid., p. 86.
while others condemned it under any circumstances.\textsuperscript{91} Russell maintained that the dualist leadership denied marriage altogether because it perpetuated the bondage of the spirit to the body through procreation, a central theme of the Bogomils. Hartwinus' followers, however, motivated by the desire for moral reform among the clergy and in the church at large, would not have accepted this rigid position.\textsuperscript{92} Because Eckbert did not know of the dualists' reasons for repudiating marriage, he recorded the explanation, noted above, which they had passed on to the main body of believers: the fruit which God ordered Adam not to eat in Genesis 2:17 was Eve. Thus, God actually forbade all sexual intercourse with this command.\textsuperscript{93}

Since Russell believed that Eckbert had learned of such teachings through his contacts with renegade Cathars, he was more willing than previous scholars

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., p. 221; According to Eckbert, Hartwinus' followers also considered it proper for those virgins who married to have one child, after which they must separate. \textit{Sermones} V, pp. 23-24: "Ueniam et ad illud quod musitant quidam uestrum, uidelicet sequaces hartuuini quod coniugium solum iustum est in quo uirgines coniunguntur et quod unam tantum prolem ginnere debent et postea statim abinuicem discedere nec unquam postea deinceps ad coniugalem thorum conuenire."

\textsuperscript{92} Russell, \textit{Dissent and Reform}, pp. 220-22.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 222. See \textit{Sermones}, V, p. 77.
to accept as genuine those statements which at first glance seemed to be based solely on Augustine. For example, at the beginning of the twelfth sermon, Eckbert declared that the Cathars, like their founder Mani, taught that Christ only appeared to have human flesh and did not truly suffer, die, or rise again. While Manselli rejected this statement as evidence of Eckbert's dependence on Augustine and consequent confusion of Cathar with Manichaean doctrines, Russell accepted it. Despite Eckbert's mistaken assumption that all the Cathars were docetists and that they had inherited Mani's docetism, he was accurately reflecting the views of the Cathar leadership, those whom Eckbert called "perfecti" and "doctores".

Another representative of what we may call the "minority" view of Eckbert, along with Russell, is Jean Duvernoy. In his general history of Catharism, Duvernoy asserted that the value of Eckbert's work has been underestimated because he noted that some of the Cathars' doctrines were also found in Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. However, much

94 Ibid.; see Sermones, XII, p. 1.

95 Ibid., p. 222; for Manselli's view, cf. "Ecberto di Schonau," p. 324. An example of Eckbert's use of these terms is in the Sermones, V, p. 62: "Uobis loquor doctoribus et perfectis, non in sanctitate quidem, sed in errore et peruersitate."
more important than Augustine as a source were Eckbert's contacts with Cathars while a canon at Bonn, where he often disputed with them. In another work, which set forth his views against those of Christine Thouzellier on the origin of the word "Cathar", Duvernoy described the Sermones as a "source of the first order, intelligent and direct." Moreover, what little Eckbert borrowed directly from Augustine was used to illustrate the parallels he noted between the Cathars' errors and those of Mani.

Although Milan Loos viewed the Sermones more skeptically than did Russell, he too found evidence in them of a "select circle of initiates", among whom certain Bogomil doctrines were taught, including docetism and the belief that the material world was created by the Devil.

---


98 Ibid.

such teachings through his previous contacts with Cathars, but "It was only natural that the learned Benedictine should classify the obviously dualist doctrine of this contemporary sect as Manichaean, and indeed he attributed several specifically Manichaean ideas to the Cathars."\textsuperscript{100}

Moreover, Loos emphasized Bogomil influence on the Cathars to the point of arguing that the heretics against whom Eckbert wrote were actually Bogomils, the same sect about which Euthymius Zigabenus (ca. 1118) had written earlier in the Byzantine Empire. Based on Everinus' letter of 1143 and Eckbert's first sermon, Loos argued that by 1163, Bogomil missionaries had spread westward into Europe and were beginning to organize themselves into groups of "perfecti", who had received spiritual baptism, and "auditores", who were not yet baptized.\textsuperscript{101} Moreover, again citing Eckbert, Loos described these Bogomils as having teachers, each of twelve disciples, as well as bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Here, he evidently did not recognize that Eckbert was lifting from Augustine's \textit{De haeresibus} an account of the Manichaean hierarchy in

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 115-16.

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., p. 116.
order to clarify the origins of the Cathars.102

Christine Thouzellier shared the scholarly consensus regarding Eckbert's use of Augustine. She noted that "despite his personal connections with those whom he calls 'Cathars', the second appearance of the term in the West, his knowledge of the heresy was limited at this point because he identified his [Cathar] adepts with the Manichaeans."103 Nevertheless, Eckbert's contacts did provide him with some authentic information, particularly his description of the Cathar baptism, or "consolamentum." Moreover, Thouzellier accepted Eckbert's report of dualism among the Cathars, and

102 Ibid. A detailed comparison of these passages in the first sermon and chapter 46 of the *De haeresibus* is presented in chapter four below.

103 Christine Thouzellier, *Rituel Cathare* (Paris, 1977): 144-45. Thouzellier believed the first usage of the word was in a letter of Nicholas, bishop of Cambrai, written between 1152 and 1156, in which the phrase "heresis Cattorum" appears. Others have considered Eckbert's use of the word "Cathar" to be the first in the medieval West, such as Borst (*Die Katharer*, p. 251). Walter Wakefield and Austin P. Evans maintained that the word first appeared not in the *Sermones* but in the accounts of the examination and burning of the Cathar Arnold and his followers in Cologne in 1163, which Eckbert mentioned; see *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969): 687-88. Moreover, Wakefield and Evans, while aware of Nicholas of Cambrai's letter, dated it between 1164 and 1167 rather than between 1152 and 1156. This view is also found in Paul Bonenfant, "Un Clerc cathare en Lotharingie au milieu du XIIe siecle," *Le Moyen Age: Revue d'histoire et de philologie*, 69 (1963): 272-74.
considered him helpful for rightly identifying those among the Cathars who were absolute dualists, believing in two co-eternal and co-equal gods.\textsuperscript{104}

Douglas Radcliff-Umstead, in a discussion of the causes for Catharism's decline and disappearance, cited Eckbert's \textit{Sermones} as evidence that the Cathars' fate was not only due to the Albigensian Crusade and the Inquisition but to "the unresolved tensions and schismatic tendencies which even without merciless persecution disrupt and eventually destroy a collective movement."\textsuperscript{105} Like Russell, Radcliff-Umstead believed that between 1143 and 1163, the two distinct heresies which Everinus described had been forged into one by the effort of the dualist elite to enlist the support of the many

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid, 145. Thouzellier based this opinion largely on Eckbert's report in the first sermon that "Illi vero duos creatores esse docent, unum bonum et alterum malum, videlicet deum et quendam immanem principem tenebrarum quem nescio quomodo rectius vocare possimus nisi diabolum." \textit{Sermones} I, p. 20. Other historians, such as Grundmann and Borst, have rejected Eckbert's accounts of dualism as based entirely on Augustine, as noted above. (p. 28, n. 70, p. 30, n. 78) Moreover, Thouzellier's view that both absolute and mitigated dualists existed among the Cathars was shared by Radcliff-Umstead, "The Catharists and the Failure of the Community," p. 67 (below, p. 22) but denied by others, such as R.I. Moore, who maintained that Eckbert's information indicated the presence of mitigated dualism only; \textit{Origins of European Dissent}, p. 182.

\end{flushright}
reform-minded dissidents in the Rhineland. Eckbert revealed how the elite had to water down their dualism to gain such adherents, "grafting Reformist arguments for ecclesiastical and spiritual renewal onto a body of religious doctrine which did recall Manichaean radical dualism . . ." 106 This dogmatic tension created the kind of continual conflict which Eckbert noted: "And they are divided among themselves, since what is said by some of them is denied by others." 107 Despite his acceptance of much in the Sermones to support an intriguing thesis, Radcliff-Umstead shared the view of previous scholars that Eckbert saw the Cathars simply as a revival of Manichaeism, failing to recognize his more sophisticated view of the relationship between the two sects. 108

This ambivalence toward the Sermones was also reflected by Malcolm Lambert, in what is generally regarded as the best recent survey of medieval heresy. On one hand, Lambert called the sermons "a step forward in the progress of the Church's polemic against heresy, for they attempted to expound in

106 Ibid., p. 67.

107 Ibid. Sermones, I, p. 14: "Diuisi sunt etiam contra semetipsos, quia nonnulla que ab aliquibus eorum dicuntur, ab aliiis negantur."

108 Ibid., p. 66.
full the dogmatic basis on which the Cologne heresy rested.\textsuperscript{109} Moreover, he too believed that they provided evidence that reformist and dualist elements had become a single sect by 1163, although the dualist minority was still not in firm control of the sect.\textsuperscript{110} For Lambert, the divisions among the Cathars concerning marriage and baptism were signs that the reformists had not yet succumbed to Bogomilism, the presence of which was clear in Eckbert's description of a belief in transmigration of souls, docetism, and the creation of the world by the devil.\textsuperscript{111}

Despite yielding such information, however, Lambert noted that Eckbert's work "was largely vitiated by his fatal penchant for transferring bodily the doctrines of the Manichees of the fourth century, attacked by Augustine, to the account of the Cologne sectaries."\textsuperscript{112} As evidence for this view, Lambert cited the work of both Borst and Manselli, an example of how the prevailing view of the Sermones was transmitted from scholar to scholar.

\textsuperscript{109} Lambert, Medieval Heresy, p. 63.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid. Cf. with Russell's view that by 1163 this dualist core had gained dominance within the movement; Dissent and Reform, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.
scholar. Lambert was also more skeptical than Russell had been concerning Eckbert's knowledge of the Cathar leadership: "it is possible to infer merely that the first group at Cologne described in the 1140's by Everwin had survived, that it had dualist beliefs, and, further, that rationalist propaganda was being used to attract followers."\textsuperscript{113}

More recently, R.I. Moore has taken a position toward the sermons similar to that of Lambert and representative of the ambivalence which had consistently been expressed toward them. He described them as a "fore-runner of the inquisitorial treatises" of the thirteenth century but remained very skeptical about much in them.\textsuperscript{114} According to Moore, Eckbert's source for much of the \textit{Sermones} was hearsay; further, he wrote not so much to describe the Cathars but also to refute their beliefs and so gave the appearance of completeness to what was actually fragmented information.\textsuperscript{115}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{114} Moore, \textit{Origins of European Dissent}, p. 176.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid. While I disagree with this assessment, Moore's discussion of Eckbert's attitudes toward the Cathars was important because it had not previously drawn much attention from scholars. The subject of Eckbert's purpose and audience in the \textit{Sermones} is most interesting and will be considered below in detail. Suffice it to say here that while Eckbert clearly aimed at refuting the Cathars' doctrines and reviling them
Unlike Russell and Lambert, Moore did not believe that the two heresies described by Everinus in 1143 had become one sect by 1163. Unlike Everinus, Eckbert failed to realize that he was dealing with two heresies, not one, because "his intellectual training and preconceptions led him to place a monolithic interpretation on the evidence that he found."116 This was evident in his assertion that some Cathars allowed marriage between virgins and even the production of one child, while others condemned marriage altogether. Moore argued that no real Cathar would have accepted any type of personally, he also appears to have held out hope that some of them might be persuaded to return to the Church, especially since he had talked to deserters from the sect. Moreover, much of Eckbert's scathing verbal attacks were leveled only at the Cathar leadership, the "doctores" and "perfecti", while he saw their followers as victims who had been deceived by these leaders.

Further, Eckbert clearly intended that the Sermones be utilized by clergy to help their parishioners avoid being deceived by the Cathars. This would naturally have involved passing along his observations in their own sermons and letters to colleagues, but also utilizing his arguments in disputations with Cathars. That Eckbert envisioned such a use being made of the Sermones is indicated by his frequent practice of directly addressing the Cathar leadership and simulating a dialogue between them and himself. In my view, this was more than a literary device and reflects Eckbert's desire that his arguments serve as a type of scriptural handbook for other clergy in their encounters with Cathars.

116 Ibid., p. 177.
marriage.  

Moore also described Eckbert as dependent on Augustine at points while acknowledging that he had learned some information first-hand, particularly some of the sect's secret doctrines. "Eckbert, more frankly than any of his predecessors" believed that the Cathars owed their origin to Mani.  

An example of the methodological problems this view caused was his report that the Cathars celebrated the "bemafest" of the Manichaeans, taken from Augustine's *Contra Manicheos*, according to Moore. However, Eckbert, unlike Everinus, did connect the teachings he described with a dualist theology. For example, he reported that in private, the Cathars taught that meat must be avoided because it was made by the Devil, while in public they claimed it was the production of coition and must therefore be shunned.  

Moreover, Moore believed Eckbert's description of Cathar docetism was genuine and noted that his source was a former Cathar, despite his

117 Ibid.

118 Ibid., p. 176.

119 Ibid., p. 179.

120 Ibid., p. 180. See *Sermones*, I, p. 10-11: "Et hanc rationem quidem manifestius dicunt, sed in occultis suis quod peius est dicunt, uidelicet omnem carnem facturam esse diabcli ideoque nec in summis necessitatibus eam ullatenus gustant."
connecting it to Mani. He also ascribed more importance to Eckbert's report of docetism than had previous scholars, calling it "the first clear assertion of the docetist heresy in the west."\textsuperscript{121} Thus, while unwilling picture of Rhineland Catharism in the early stages of its development, with a theology still being shaped by contact with modified dualism in Bulgaria.\textsuperscript{122}

I believe that most of the scholarship discussed in the preceding pages has consistently misunderstood the Sermones in two respects. First, it has over-simplified Eckbert's use of Augustine and his conception of the relationship between Cathars and Manichaean. It has presented Eckbert as convinced that the Cathars were, in fact, Manichaean. Moreover, it has depicted him as borrowing wholesale from Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings and applying that information to the Cathars. Second, it has underestimated the importance of Eckbert's first-hand knowledge of Catharism, acquired through frequent disputation with both adherents of the sect and some who had deserted it.

In response to the first point, I will show

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 181.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., p. 172.
that while Eckbert regarded the Cathars as
Manichaean "in origin", this was very different from
identifying them as Manichaeans. I will discuss how
Eckbert constructed, for its time, a quite
sophisticated connection between the two sects,
based on the similarities between them which he had
noted. Moreover, I will clarify the purpose of the
passages in the first sermon which Eckbert took from
Augustine, not in order to apply it to the
contemporary Cathars but to illustrate their early
history. I will also discuss the function of the
appendix, containing excerpts from Augustine's work,
as part of this attempt to describe the origins of
the Cathars. Indeed, far from placing a "monolithic"
interpretation on the evidence he found, I believe
Eckbert used Augustine selectively, always
conscious of the fact that the Cathars, since the
time when they emerged in the form of Manichaeism,
had developed many teachings different from those of
their founder, Mani.

As to the second point, I will demonstrate that
Eckbert's description of the Cathars rests almost
exclusively on his own knowledge of them, gained
through years of disputation with them in Bonn and
Cologne and from reports by ex-Cathars. Granted,
Eckbert did not fully understand the doctrines or
organization of the Cathars, and he certainly was mistaken in proclaiming Mani the founder of the sect. Still, he knew enough to distinguish the Cathars from the Manichaeans he had read about, and he also knew enough of their secret teachings to recognize that there were at least two main factions among them, the inner circle of dualists and their group of followers. Moreover, Eckbert's notion that the Cathars were the offspring of the Manichaeans may have been based partly on what he heard from the heretics themselves. There is evidence in the Sermones that some Cathars, having been made aware by Catholic polemicists of the similarities between their doctrines and those of the Manichaeans, believed their sect to be connected in some way to that of Mani.¹²³

My methodology has been straightforward, if not simple. I have examined the Sermones closely for any reference, direct or indirect, from Augustine, and have considered Eckbert's use of those references. I have discovered no evidence of any wholesale borrowing, except in the first sermon, in which Eckbert was illustrating the origins of Catharism, as he understood them, and quite understandably resorted to his only source, ¹²³

¹²³ See above p. 31, n. 79.
Augustine. In the remaining sermons, despite occasional statements confirming this link between Cathars and Manichaean which Eckbert had created, his reports were based on his contacts with Cathars and ex-Cathars. Even in places where one would expect Eckbert to buttress his polemic with citations of Augustine, he did not do so, apparently preferring to leave his description sketchy rather than inaccurate. In short, I have attempted to follow the advice of Raoul Manselli—to isolate every reference in the Sermones to Augustine and determine what use Eckbert made of it. My conclusion has been that the Sermones are much more than a more collection of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings, pieced together with some fragments of knowledge. Rather, Eckbert clearly had the experience and insight necessary to embark on a polemic of his own.
Chapter III
Background to the Sermones: Catharism in the Rhineland

When Catharism appeared in the Rhineland during the mid-twelfth century, the church in Germany was distracted by internal and external problems which made conditions more favorable for the establishment and growth of heresy. Moreover, these problems must have made the message of the Cathar leadership, those whom Eckbert called "perfecti" and "doctores", more appealing, particularly because their life of austerity was in such contrast to that of many Catholic clergy and monks. These "perfecti" were dualists and rejected the Church and its sacraments because they were part of the material world, which had been created and was maintained by Satan. Still, their criticism of clerical abuses would have sounded much like those of indigenous reformers, and their knowledge of scripture was impressive. In fact, the dualist faction among the Cathars, those who had received baptism by the laying on of hands, was not interested in reforming the existing Church but in replacing it altogether and claimed that they, not the Roman Church, were
the true possessors of apostolic authority.

Although the Western Church had been the target of often virulent reproach and, on occasion, physical attack during the previous 150 years or so, it had not encountered this kind of challenge before, one which struck at the very heart of its existence.¹

Eckbert was right when he called the Cathars a "people very much destructive to the Catholic faith, which, just like worms, they destroy and corrupt."²

¹ There were, however, individual heretics who not only criticized the abuses of the Catholic clergy but also suggested that they had no need for them at all. For example, the Monteforte heretics of 1028 not only repudiated the pope but claimed to have one of their own, who daily visited their brothers, scattered through the world, bringing pardon for sins. Moreover, they claimed that "There is no other pontiff besides our pontiff, although he is without tonsure of the head or any mystery." See Alessandro Cutolo, ed. Landulphi senioris Mediolanensis historiae libri quatuor, II.27 in L.A. Muratori, ed. Rerum italicarum scriptores, new ed. (Bologna, 1900), 5, pt. 2, pp. 68-9.

Another example is the truly eccentric Eudo of Brittany (active ca. 1148) who called himself the Son of God and the ruler of the quick and the dead, ordaining bishops and archbishops from among his followers. William of Newburgh reported that "because his name was pronounced 'Eon' in the French tongue, he believed that the phrase recited in ecclesiastical exorcism, 'Through Him (eum) who shall come to judge the quick and the dead, and the world through fire,' referred to himself." From Richard Howlett, ed., Historia rerum anglicarum, I.13, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I (Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols., 1884-1889), 1, pp. 60-4, as translated in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, p. 143.

² Sermones, I, p. 3: "... gens perniciosa nimis catholice fidei, quam uelut tinee demoliuntur et corrumpunt ..."
It is important, however, to distinguish the teaching of the Cathar leadership from the beliefs of its rank and file. As we shall see, in 1163 there were Cathars who still hoped for the reclamation of the Church and did not share the claim of the dualist adepts to have superseded it. This was mainly because only a select group knew of these dualist teachings; only after receiving the "consolamentum" would a Cathar become eligible to learn such doctrines, and even then it might be several years before he became privy to them.3 Despite obvious gaps in his knowledge, Eckbert succeeded to a remarkable degree in sorting out the beliefs of both the dualist "perfecti" and those who had not been "consoled", whose aims still conformed to the reformist tradition in the West stretching back to the beginning of the eleventh century.

3 Eckbert noted that this period of probation could last as long as fifteen years and was based on a fear of being betrayed; Sermones, II, p. 29:

Nam ab ipsis quoque qui ueniunt ad uos fidem uestrnam ex qua saluandos uos esse speratis et occulta opera uestra longo tempore, ut dicunt, quindecim annis occult-tatis donec diu eos probaueritis, ita ut sperare possitis de eis quod non prodant uos.
Part I: Background to Heresy: The Church in Germany in the Mid-twelfth Century

Before describing these "dualist" and "reformist" elements evident in the *Sermones*, it is necessary first to outline those forces which were helping to undermine the moral authority of the twelfth-century Church in Germany and to make the alternative of Catharism more attractive to some. Two such forces will be emphasized: the struggle to achieve canonical reform, which was part of a wider program of clerical reform dating back to the mid-eleventh century; and the effects of the papal schism of the mid-twelfth century. Without some understanding of these developments, the threat of Catharism, so immediate to Eckbert, cannot be fully appreciated. It was within this context that two movements of dissent—Bogomil dualism from the East and Western reform—combined in the twelfth-century Rhineland to become a troublesome problem for the Church.

During the mid-twelfth century, Western Europe was witnessing a movement of reform aimed at correcting abuses among the Catholic clergy, including those attached to and supported by cathedral chapters. Its primary targets were the preoccupation with secular affairs and the lack of clerical celibacy.
Although the roots of this reform movement were complicated, they can be summarized. Its goals were both moral and political in nature. It is useful to consider R.F. Bennett's statement that during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085) there was a fundamental shift in the attitude of the Church toward society. No longer was the old ideal of withdrawal from the world the dominant force in the Church; rather, Gregory and the reform movement he inherited were driven by the belief that "the world should be ready to accept the claim of Christianity to be the moral basis upon which its affairs should rest."  

This vision of a morality shaped by the Church, called the "sacerdotal" view of society by Gerd Tellenbach, was based on the conversion of the world by a priestly order. It came into conflict, however, with the "monarchic" ideal, "based on the

---

conversion of the world by the action of a divinely-instituted kingship to which the clergy should be subordinate." The result was a political struggle which was expressed above all in the investiture contest, a struggle not over whether Christianity should remain the basis on which society should rest but, as Bennett put it, over "how it was to be attained and which of the rival conceptions of 'right order' was to be victorious."

By the mid-twelfth century, the political struggle between pope and emperor was not over, but the emphasis of reform seems to have shifted from institutional to moral goals. The papacy and its supporters, both lay and clerical, were attempting to establish a more austere and more spiritually effective lifestyle among the clergy, which included a call for clerical celibacy and the re-establishment of the common life for the class of clerics called canons. New monastic communities also arose to re-emphasize the rigors and merits of the common life. Others, however, sought reform far greater in scope, aiming at the return throughout the Church to the more simple themes of apostolic times: preaching and poverty. Malcolm Lambert has

5 Ibid., p. xi.
6 Ibid., p. x.
noted that "a first cause for the recrudescence of heresy in the West lay in the expectations roused by Gregorian reform and its failure to fulfill them."^ The devotion of some to the ideal of apostolic poverty led them beyond the boundaries of orthodox reform into open rebellion against the Church. Many such reformers, although labeled "heretics" by the clergy, were not heretical in a doctrinal sense but only because their fierce criticism of the clergy's lifestyle and belief in their right to preach threatened the Church's control of the approaches to God which was one of the successes of the Gregorian reform.

An important goal of both the Church and its critics was the reform of the system which supported many of the clergy, or canons, attached to cathedral churches.® Since the time of Charlemagne, it had become established practice for clergy attached to a cathedral to receive a fixed income from the

---


chapter's revenues, either in the form of a stipend or a prebend (benefice). Charles Dereine called this system the most important aspect of canonical organization during the Carolingian period. During the Council of Aix (816) regulations were established for the maintenance of discipline among these canons which, in theory, bound them to a common refectory and dormitory. In reality, however, they were often allowed to maintain their own homes outside the chapter, and the right to do so was frequently confirmed by both ecclesiastical and secular authorities. For many other canons, a lack of resources made adherence to a common life very difficult.

This well-established tradition of canons holding prebends came under increasing fire during the late eleventh century. By this time, the term "canon" itself had been redefined to mean not just any of the cathedral clergy but only those clerics with official positions in a cathedral church and with the right to elect their bishop. To reform

---


10 Ibid., p. 369.

11 Ibid., p. 371.
these "secular" canons along the lines of the primitive church, communal life and celibacy were essential. The decrees of Aix were considered the source of much of the trouble, granting to canons the right to own property and thus fostering their excessive worldliness. For the Gregorians, the holding of private property had been the first stage in a destructive process of secularization of the canonical life. They denounced the use of church income for purposes other than maintaining the liturgy and church buildings and serving the poor. Increasingly, lay lords monopolized the income from prebends to further their family interests, creating the need to hire often unqualified clerics to meet the basic needs of the proprietary church. Reformers also criticized the refusal of many canons to become priests, as well as their propensity for holding more than one prebend. Moreover, young canons were drawn from a feudal nobility which prized hunting and warfare, occupations which were

12 By the twelfth century, the phrase "canonici" was commonly used to denote these "secular" canons. By contrast, those who adopted a common life and rule were labeled the "canonici regulares", despite objections by Benedictines like Hugh of Amiens that this was redundant. See John C. Dickinson, The Origins of the Austin Canons and their introduction into England (London: S.P.C.K., 1950): 61.

13 Ibid., 375-76.
difficult for many to give up. Finally, marriage among canons was not uncommon, a practice considered by reformers to be one of the evils resulting from the secularization of canonical life.\(^\text{14}\)

Despite attempts at reforming canons during the eleventh century, most of them at first refused to give up their prebends or way of life, remaining faithful to what Dereine called the "Carolingian tradition".\(^\text{15}\) In the Holy Roman Empire, in particular, there was resistance to reform, seen by many as an unwarranted novelty.\(^\text{16}\) For example, in 1075 Pope Gregory VII re-issued the prohibition of clerical marriage and simony, and in the same year the bishop of Passau was threatened with bodily harm by some clergy in his diocese who opposed celibacy.\(^\text{17}\) Those clerics who were willing to give up prebends and private residences in their pursuit of the communal life found it necessary to leave their chapter. Sometimes they established

\(^{14}\) Dereine, "Chanoines", p. 374.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 375. Cf. this view with the more recent observation of Alfred Haerkamp that "the reform of the secular canons took root early" in Germany. See his Medieval Germany, p. 189.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 382. Also see Charles Dereine, La réforme canoniale en Rhénanie (1075-1150), Memorial d'un vouage d'études de la Société Nationale des antiquaires de France en Rhénanie (Paris, 1953).

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 191.
themselves in existing parish churches, helping to
revive a church on the outskirts of a city;
sometimes, they founded new churches.\textsuperscript{18} One early
center of reform was Rottenbuch, where, during the
twelfth century, Richard of Springiersbach (d. 1158)
developed what has been called a "new monastic
ideal."\textsuperscript{19}

By the early twelfth century, however,
canonical reform was making gains in Germany,
especially through the work of dynamic reformers
such as Conrad, archbishop of Salzburg, and
Hildebald of Gurk.\textsuperscript{20} Norbert, a canon at Xanten,
left the court of Henry V and became a wandering
preacher and in about 1120 founded his own community
of canons in Prémontré. Between this time and 1126,
Premonstratensian houses were founded in the
dioceses of Laon, Cambrai, Münster, Mainz, and Metz.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 382.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 189. See also F. Pauly,
Springiersbach. Geschichte des Kanonikerstifts und
seiner Töchtergründungen im Erzbistum Trier von den

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. On the regular canons in twelfth-
century Germany, see Stefan Weinfurter, "Neuere
Forschung zu den Regularkanoniker im Deutschen Reich
Zeitschrift, 224, (1977): 379-97; Karl Bosl,
Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und
Seelsorge in Kirche und Gesellschaft des
europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts (Bayerische Akademie
der Wissenschaft, 1979); and Dereine, La réforme
canoniale en Rhénanie.
and by the middle of the twelfth century, there were close to 150 of them throughout Germany. Lay support for such foundations was important and was usually expressed by the founding of hospitals, especially along trade and pilgrimage routes, to minister to travelers.

Whether or not regular canons continued parochial work varied with each situation. Where long-established chapters had been reformed, regular canons often continued to serve parish churches, while in other areas they were content to concentrate on the divine offices. This same variation prevailed among newly founded canonical communities; in fact, some chapters acquired and served several parochial churches. The life of service for canons was blessed by Pope Urban II, who confirmed the right of regulars to administer all


22 Dereine, "Chanoines," p. 385; Haverkamp, Medieval Germany, p. 190, noted that the proliferation of hospitals illustrate the canons' "concern with the important centers or communications networks, and thus with the needs of the urban population."

the sacraments at the Council of Nimes.24

In Germany, parochial work among regular canons was very common. For example, the archbishops of Mainz during the twelfth century regularly gave to Augustinian canons the right to preach and administer all the sacraments. There were some dissenting voices, however, such as the anonymous author of the *De vita apostolica*, who, in the first quarter of the twelfth century, reproached regular canons for making preaching an important part of their apostolic life.25

As a canon in the chapter of St. Cassius at Bonn during the 1150's, Eckbert was clearly unreformed.26 He had a private residence within the

---

24 Ibid., p. 393.

25 Ibid., p. 394. For the *De vere vita apostolica*, V; PL 170, col. 631. This dialogue in defense of Benedictine life was attributed to Rupert of Deutz by Migne and by several later scholars. However, this view has been rejected; see, for example, John Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983): 300, whom I have followed here.

city, and appears to have enjoyed the income from a prebend. In a letter written in 1164 to Abbot Reinhard of Reinhausen, Eckbert explained that while at Bonn, "the heavenly provider poured an abundance of temporal goods into my hand". Moreover, Eckbert was not a priest during his time at St. Cassius; he did not take holy orders until 1155. Further evidence for Eckbert's dependence on the established prebendary system comes from Emecho, who reported that after having decided to enter the monastery of St. Florianus at Schönau in 1155, Eckbert returned home to Bonn to "arrange his affairs" with his household and to inform his family of his decision. Moreover, certain members of his

27 Eckbert described a discussion at his "house" in Bonn about the body and blood of Christ with a man whom he suspected of being a Cathar in Bonn; Sermones, XII, p. 312: "Fuit mihi concertatio de his rebus quadam uice in domo mea bonne, cum quodam uiro, qui suspectus erat nobis quod esset de secta katarorum, . . . ."


29 See Emecho's vita of Eckbert in Roth, Die Visionen, p. 349.

30 Ibid., p. 350: "Reversus itaque Bunnam, ut de rebus suis ordinaret, familiaribus suis, quos sincero semper affectu dilexerat, secretum propositi sui detexit."
household,

having learned of this and wondering and considering this sudden change in so important a man, since they knew what sort of man he had been in the clergy and what he could be, but ignorant and fearful of what sort he was going to become in a monastery, began to persuade him that he should continue in that certain and good life which he had embarked on and which he knew and should not attempt an unknown way of life.31

Further, Eckbert admitted that he did not record the visions of his sister Elizabeth, "because of the bad opinion of slanderers which made me slow and sluggish, and because of my occupation with the chapter's business, and also the lack of parchment."32

The picture of Eckbert the canon which emerges from the available sources is a fairly typical one

31 Ibid.:  
Quo cognito et admirantes tanti viri subitam mutationem considerantes, qualis in clero fuisset et esse posset, ignorantes vero et timentes, qualis in monastica vita futurus esset, suadere ei ceperunt, ut in via certa et bona, quam ingressus fuisset et quam novisset, securus curret et ignotum vivendi genus non attemptaret.

32 Ibid., p. 318:  
Fateor autem, quia multa magnifica ac valde miranda, et que multorum edificationi proficere possent, in negligentiam ire permisi, tum pro malicia detrahentium, que tedio et inercia me affecit, tum pre occupatione claustralis negotii, tum etiam pre penuria pergameni.
for twelfth-century Germany, where it was common for younger sons of the nobility to be placed in cathedrals or royal chapels which offered the prospect of a career to those with connections and talent. Given the fact that such promotions often depended on contacts with royal circles, Eckbert's friendship with Rainhald of Dassel during their school days in Paris may well have helped gained him a position at St. Cassius.

Moreover, during the canonical reform of the mid-twelfth century, a conflict developed between the papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor over the true source of imperial rule. As a consequence, there was a schism between two rival popes and what appeared to many as a loss of papal authority. After becoming a monk at Schönau, Eckbert became a critic of the abuses of the very system which had previously supported him. He was particularly concerned not only with the prevalence of simony and absenteeism, but also the desultory effects of the papal schism which lasted from 1159 to 1177.

---


34 Ibid., p. 174.
In the Treaty of Constance (1153), Frederick Barbarossa promised to serve as the defender of the papacy. By 1157, however, a new imperial policy toward the papacy was emerging, given voice in the general assembly held at Besançon in that year. Frederick and his closest advisor, Rainhald of Dassel, emphasized the principle that only from God, and not through any human intermediary such as the pope, did the emperor derive the right to govern. Thus, the emperor was under no obligation to protect the papacy and need not lend military assistance to the papal state.35 In 1159, upon the death of Pope Hadrian IV, two claimants emerged. Victor I was backed by Frederick and acclaimed pope by a body of the Roman people. Alexander III, however, was elected by a majority of the college of cardinals. In a schism which lasted 18 years, both papal rivals excommunicated each other and their followers;

although Alexander's election was more legitimate according to canon law, Frederick refused to withdraw support from Victor.\textsuperscript{36}

Eckbert's outrage and disappointment at such a state of affairs is clear in a letter written to Rainhald of Dassel soon after the latter become archbishop of Cologne in 1159. He lamented that

Dispute has erupted among the princes of the principality of the church, which is the mother of all, and they have rent the unity of the high priest, having broken the bond of ecclesiastical peace, so that one devours the other, one destroys the other, one excommunicates the other.\textsuperscript{37}

Despite Albert Hauck's assertion that support for Victor IV was widespread throughout Germany, Eckbert showed no favor toward either of the two papal contestants.\textsuperscript{38}

For Eckbert, the schism created an atmosphere in which the moral abuses of the German clergy could

\textsuperscript{36} Fuhrmann, \textit{Germany in the Middle Ages}, pp. 148-49; 157-62.

\textsuperscript{37} Roth, \textit{Die Visionen}, p. 315:

\textit{Ecce enim effusa est contentio super principes principalis ecclesie, que omnium mater est, et sciderunt unitatem summi sacerdocii, ruperunt vinculum pacis ecclesiastice, ita ut invicem mordeant, invicem se interficiant, anathematizando alter-utrum.}

\textsuperscript{38} For the reaction to the papal schism by the German clergy, see Albert Hauck, \textit{Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands}, 4 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954): 255-58.
flourish. He admonished Rainhald, his former
schoolmate, not to neglect his spiritual duties, and
in his view, the love of money lay behind all such
neglect, seen in the prevalence of simony and
absenteeism. Upon reminding Rainhald of his
elevation to a "holy and terrible" position of
spiritual authority, which "has led many to ruin",
Eckbert urged him to follow the example of the
early fathers of the Church in Germany, such as
Maternus and Severinus, who were true successors of
Peter in their holiness, priests who sought the
glory of the Lord, not their own.

Eckbert also warned Rainhald that all of the
riches and honors he had obtained were nothing but
"the golden goblet in the hand of the great harlot,
full of the wine of abomination, with which the
whole world becomes drunk."

---

39 Roth, Die Visionen, pp. 312-15.
40 Ibid., p. 312:

Locus, qui te expectat, sanctus et terribilis est, et multis cessit in ruinam,
aliquantis etiam in resurrectionem. Sanctus est et sanctos requirit, amatores Christi,
vicarios Petri, successores veros Materni,
Severini . . . qui et vite sanctitate et
fidelibus celi meruerunt.

41 Ibid., p. 312. "Prestat divicias, prestat
honores, et fomenta voluptatis. Et hec, quid sunt
nisi poculum aureum in manu meretricis magne, plenum
vino abominationis, quo inebriat omnem terram?"
Eckbert was drawing on Rev. 17:1-6 here.
widespread buying and selling of Christ and the Holy Spirit, Eckbert argued that "the zealous of the Lord have become weak-minded" and unable to attend to spiritual affairs.\(^42\) Just as Samson, due to the allure of fornication, lost his strength to Delilah,\(^43\) so Rainhald must guard against being dragged down by the chain of money, so that instead of being overcome by it, he might use it for good and holy works.\(^44\) Thus, if Rainhald cannot adhere to the "rule of the poor in spirit", he should at least heed the words of Paul to Timothy: "Instruct those who are rich in this world's goods not to be proud, and not to fix their hopes on so uncertain a thing as money, but upon God, who endows us richly with all things to enjoy."\(^45\)

Despite Eckbert's admonition, Rainhald showed little interest in ecclesiastical affairs as

\(^42\) Ibid., p. 314: "Zelus etenim domini in mentibus eorum elanguit, et non est, qui negotiis Christi sincere intendat."

\(^43\) Ibid., (Judges 16).

\(^44\) Ibid., p. 313:

At si aut non vis aut nequis solvere vinculum federis, quo astriectus es felicitati mundane, illud summopere caveto, ne dominetur tibi, sed potius tu illam sapienter in servitutem redige, et serviat tibi in omne opus bonum et sanctum.

\(^45\) Ibid. 1 Timothy 6:17.
archbishop of Cologne. His predilection for politics and war was typical of the Rhineland bishops of the twelfth century, as was his absenteeism. In fact, during his eight-year term as archbishop, Rainhald was absent from Cologne except on two brief occasions: in 1159 to raise troops for a military campaign in Italy, and in 1165 to deliver to the city the relics of the Three Wise Men, taken from Milan. This latter achievement was his only real legacy as archbishop.  

In a letter to Rainhald written sometime in 1164, Eckbert addressed the problem of pluralism and the resulting neglect, claiming that the instruments of divine praise are broken off in nearly all the churches, and no one takes a position in only one church, serving three or four churches at the same time, hurrying with great necessity to matters known and unknown, or to their own business.  

Instead of caring for their churches, these


47 Roth, Die Visionen, p. 319-20:

Atque hac occasione omnes pene ecclesias divine laudis organa suspenduntur, et nemo considerat, vix in unaquaque ecclesia tribus aut quatuor ministrantibus continue, aliis ur gente necessitate ad congnatos et notos, sive ad negociationes suas discurrentibus.
ministers neglect them, or give their care over to lay rulers in return for a favor, and thus "fill the stomachs of foreigners". To those who seek bread, they offer in a return a stone or a serpent.

Moreover, in the Sermones, Eckbert undertook a lengthy defense of the Catholic clergy against the charge that their sins, especially simony, invalidated their authority and nullified the Catholic faith itself. In contrast, the Cathars claimed to have always been the true priesthood. It is no doubt a reflection of the state of the clergy in Germany that Eckbert made no effort to deny accusations that simony and other abuses were widespread in the Church. Instead, he concentrated

48 Ibid., p. 319:

Hi enim dum curant, que sua sunt, bona ecclesiarum aut per incuriam negligunt, aut in suis voluptatibus consumunt, aut in laicas manus pro seculari favore, aut obsequio conferunt, atque ita de abscos- ditis filiorum adimplent ventres alienorum.

49 Ibid.: "Seguis autem filiorum petierit panem, pro pane lapidem, aut scorpionem, aut serpentem illi porrigunt . . ."

50 Sermones, XI, p. 237: "Accedamus nunc et ad illud discuiciendum quod dicitis ordinem sacerdocii defecisse apud nos et nusquam inueniri ueros sacerdotes nisi inter uos." Eckbert spoke of clerical abuses in general in the first half of this sermon but devoted roughly the second half to a discussion of simony. See Sermones, XI, pp. 273-94.
on demonstrating that the depravity of the priest does not affect the efficacy of the sacraments he administers.\textsuperscript{51}

While one should not exaggerate the weakness of the German clergy based on a few dissenting voices (the denunciation of simony was nothing new) it is clear that morale was shaken by the papal schism and that the prebendary system was still flourishing as late as the 1150's. These conditions must have increased the appeal of Catharism in the Rhineland

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., XI, p. 259, in which Eckbert sets forth the main Cathar argument and his own rebuttal:

Forte ad hoc respondetis, 'Fatemur quidem quod illi primi predicatorum fidei christiane de quibus dictum est uere sacerdotes dei fuerunt et alios ad sacerdotium ordinare potuerunt sed multos successores in episcopalibus cathedris habuerunt, quorum uita tam praua et tam abhominabilis exitit, ut nec ipsi possent sacerdotale officium habere nec alios ad hoc possent ordinare ac per eos sacerdotium omnino interiit.'

Eckbert replied with the following argument which drew an analogy between unworthy priests and Balaam, Caiphas, and Judas (Ibid., pp. 259-60):

Pro quibus responddeo idipsum quod supra de romanis pontificibus dictum est non esse hoc impossibile ut magistri ecclesiarum habeant aliquaque dona spiritualia pertinencia ad utilitatem eorum quos regere habent, qui tamen ipsi eisdem donis coram deo indigni sint et non ipsismet proficiant ad salutem, sicut propheticus spiritus balaam et caiphe de quo et supra locuti sumus et apostolica potestas iude non ipsi provenit ad utilitatem sed aliiis.
and aided its securing a foothold there by the 1160's.

Part II: Catharism in the Rhineland: The Dualist Tradition

Before proceeding with a discussion of the dualist and reformist traditions which by 1163 formed Catharism in the Rhineland, it will be helpful to consider just what the term "Cathar" means, which is not always clear. Should it be applied to those who joined the sect because it called for the kinds of reform in which they believed, but who were never dualists? Or should it be applied only to the leadership of the sect whose aims were far more radical than the reform of the Church? I have chosen to label both factions "Cathars" because I believe that by 1163, despite some clear doctrinal differences, they had become a single movement. As shown below, Eckbert provides evidence that between 1143 and 1163, reformists and dualists (the latter influenced by Bogomilism), had achieved a precarious alliance in the Rhineland, so that the two distinct heresies which Everinus of Steinfeld had noted in 1143 had been transformed
into one. 52 Eckbert, who knew much more than Everinus about the beliefs of both groups, nevertheless referred to both as the "katari" although he was aware of the differences in their ranks.

To understand this division of the Cathars into two main factions, it is essential to review the history and beliefs of the Bogomils, a dualist sect which arose in tenth-century Bulgaria. For the dualism among some of the Rhineland Cathars almost certainly came from Bogomil missionaries, either directly or indirectly, (in the latter case probably from Lombardy). By the 1160's, there were well-established Cathar churches in Italy and Southern France, where Bogomils had been active already for some years. 53 Moreover, as we will see below, there

---


53 Such is clear from the two texts which describe the origins of Catharism in Italy, edited by Antoine Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie, I: Le 'De Heresi Catharorum; II: Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; III: Catalogue de la hiérarchie cathare d'Italie," 19-20, Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum (1949-50). Although composed in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, several decades after the events they described took place (during the 1150s
is evidence pointing to the arrival of Bogomilism in Germany by 1143. Therefore, to discuss Cathar "dualism" requires an understanding of Bogomil dualism.

The Bogomils took their name from the Bulgarian priest Bogomil, generally considered the founder of the sect, active during the reign of the Tsar Peter (927-969). The main source for the beliefs and practices of the early Bogomils is the treatise written against them by Cosmas, an Orthodox priest of Constantinople, in about 972. From Cosmas we learn that Bogomil and his followers, in a period of social unrest and ascetic fervor among Bulgarian Christians, preached a dualist rejection of the material world. They believed the visible world

and 1160s), both accounts confirm the important role played by missionaries from various Bogomil churches from the Byzantine Empire.


55 The background of social, religious, and political unrest which, while it may not have produced Bogomilism, certainly contributed toward its success, is described by Obolensky, The Bogomils, pp. 72-79; 84-93; 101-10. See also Steven Runciman, The Medieval Manichee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948): 63-66; 87-91.
was the creation of Satan, whom they identified as the God of the Old Testament. In contrast, the good God was the creator of everything spiritual, including man's soul.56

The Bogomils also appeared to live very holy lives, although Cosmas assumed that this was only an act to attract ignorant hearers:

The heretics in appearance are lamb-like, gentle, modest and quiet, and their pallor is to show their hypocritical fastings. They do not talk idly, nor laugh loudly, nor do they manifest any curiosity. They keep themselves away from immodest sights, and outwardly they do everything so as not to be distinguished from the Orthodox Christians, but inwardly they are ravening wolves... Like a wolf that wants to seize a lamb, they pretend at first to sigh; they speak with humility, preach, and act as if they were themselves in heaven.57

The Bogomils also accused the Orthodox clergy of failing to live by the precepts which Paul laid down to Timothy and claimed that instead, "'They are given to drink, rob, and secretly commit sin and there is nobody to prevent them... The bishops cannot stop the priests from doing wrong.'"58


56 Peters, Heresy and Authority, pp. 113-14; Obolensky, The Bogomils, p. 122.

57 Peters, Heresy and Authority, p. 109.

58 Ibid., p. 111. See I Timothy 3:2-4, 8-10.
Moreover, according to Cosmas, the dualism of the Bulgarian Bogomils was at first "mitigated" rather than "absolute"; that is, they believed that only the good God had existed for all eternity. Such is clear from their view of Satan as a fallen angel, according to the Christian tradition; an unjust steward of God; and as the younger son of God, based on the parable of the prodigal son.59 Absolute dualism, in contrast, posited the eternal co-existence of two gods, equal in power, one good and the other evil, one the creator of everything spiritual and the other creator of everything material.60

According to the Bulgarian Bogomils, then, the soul was entrapped in an evil body of flesh and was obliged to seek its return to God through a rigid

59 Peters, Heresy and Authority, pp. 113-14; Obolensky, The Bogomils, pp. 122-23. By the mid-twelfth century, absolute dualism had arisen in Bulgaria and was represented in the West in the work of Nicetas, head of the Bogomil church in Constantinople, who helped established absolute dualism in Southern France.

60 This notion was characteristic of Paulician dualism, in which there were two such independent and equal powers, according to the work of Peter of Sicily (ca. 872) and the report of Theophylact, patriarch of Constantinople (ca. 940-50). On the Paulicians, see Nina Garsoian, The Paulician Heresy (The Hague & Paris, 1967) and "Byzantine Heresy: a Reinterpretation," Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 15 (1971): 101-12. Also see Obolensky, The Bogomils, pp. 29-42; 111-18.
asceticism. Toward this end, they condemned marriage as leading to the production of offspring, which only perpetuated the bondage of the soul to the body. They also repudiated the eating of meat as the unclean product of sexual intercourse. Moreover, the Bogomils rejected the Orthodox clergy and every material object of worship used by them, such as the cross, saints' images, and church buildings.

During the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Bogomilism moved beyond Bulgaria, first into Thrace and Macedonia. After 1018, when Macedonia became a province of the Byzantine Empire, the Bogomils spread into Constantinople itself and into Asia Minor. The primary source for Bogomil belief and practice in the Byzantine Empire during the eleventh century is a letter written in about 1050 by Euthymius, a monk of Constantinople. Euthymius wrote to his home diocese of Acmonia, in Western Asia Minor, concerning the danger of

---

61 Peters, Heresy and Authority, p. 114; and Obolensky, The Bogomils, p. 115.

62 Peters, Heresy and Authority, pp. 113-17; Obolensky, The Bogomils, p. 130.

63 Obolensky, The Bogomils, pp. 174-83.
Bogomils to that region. When compared to Cosmas' treatise, Euthymius' description reveals that Bogomil cosmology and christology were becoming refined. For example, Euthymius wrote of the eight heavens of the Bogomils, the eighth of which was the visible world, ruled over by the Devil, who had made man. Moreover, Euthymius is the first known source which clearly states that the Bogomils reject the resurrection of the dead, Christ's second coming, and the Last Judgement.

Euthymius of Acmonia also recorded the development of an order of worship among the Bogomils, which does not appear in Cosmas' treatise. Euthymius described worship meetings centered around the recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

During the early twelfth century, there

---


65 PG 131, col. 57; Ficker, Die Phundagiagiten, pp. 33-7.

66 Ficker, Die Phundagiagiten, p. 38.

67 Ibid., pp. 48-9.
occurred a crucial event for the continued growth of Bogomil theology and cosmology: its penetration into Constantinople.\textsuperscript{68} Here, under the influence of Byzantine monasticism, the Bogomils continued to emphasize the need for strict asceticism. Furthermore, the development of their theology was no doubt stimulated by an atmosphere of theological speculation. Sometime between 1100 and 1118, the Orthodox monk Euthymius Zigabenus wrote a profile of several heretical groups active within the Byzantine Empire at the request of Emperor Alexius Comnenus (1048-1118). In this work, entitled the \textit{Panoplia Dogmatica}, Zigabenus provided the fullest and most objective account of Bogomilism which we possess.\textsuperscript{69}

First, according to Zigabenus, the Bogomils were still mitigated dualists. They taught that Satan was the first-born son of God (and thus created by God) and the elder brother of Christ. And, just like the Bulgarian Bogomils of the tenth century, they identified Satan as the older brother

\textsuperscript{68} Obolensky, \textit{The Bogomils}, p. 197.

\textsuperscript{69} Edited in J. Ficker, \textit{Die Phundagianiten}, pp. 89-111 and in Migne, PG 130, col. 1289-1332 with Latin translation. I have utilized the edition in Migne and so have not listed parallel passages in Ficker. See also the discussion in Obolensky, \textit{The Bogomils}, pp. 205-18.
in the parable of the prodigal son.70

Second, Zigabenus revealed in more detail than any previous source the Bogomil teachings on the creation of the world and Christ's role on Earth. They believed that Satan had retained his creative powers after being cast out of Heaven and had subsequently created the visible world, including the body of man. He was unable, however, to breathe life into man and asked God to do so. In return, Satan promised that man's soul should belong to both God and himself. Satan then created Eve and had intercourse with her, from which union Cain was born.71

It is also clear from Zigabenus' work that the Byzantine Bogomils were docetists. They believed that Christ came to earth in a non-material body, emerging not from the virgin's womb, but through her ear. He only seemed to perform the works described in the Gospels and appeared to die and rise again.72 For the Bogomils, Christ's mission on Earth was to take away the divine power of Satan, not to redeem humanity.73

70 Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII.1; PG 130, col. 1296.
71 Ibid., 7, col. 1295-98.
72 Ibid., 23, col. 1317-18.
73 Ibid., col. 1319-20.
Further, according to Zigabenus, the Bogomils rejected the Christian doctrine of the Trinity and Christ's position in it as the eternal Word of God, or Logos. Rather, they believed that Christ had existed separately from God the Father for a period beginning 5,500 years before the creation of the world and ending with His seeming ascension from earth into Heaven. Zigabenus also provided the most complete description of Bogomil baptism up to that time, which featured two different periods of purification and instruction for novices. The baptism itself centered around the Lord's Prayer and the laying on of hands.

From the death of Alexius Comnenus in 1118 until about 1140, the Bogomils were actively pursued and suppressed in much of the Byzantine Empire. However, between 1140 and 1147, there apparently was a fresh outbreak of the heresy, centered in Constantinople itself. In 1140, the monk Chrysomalus was condemned as a Bogomil. In August 1143, two Orthodox bishops from Southeastern Asia Minor were convicted of Bogomilism by a Church synod. Later in that year, the monk Niphon was charged with Bogomilism in Constantinople and was

74 Ibid., 3, col. 1294A.
75 Ibid., 16, col. 1312C.
imprisoned. When, in 1146, the patriarch Cosmas released him, the patriarch was denounced as a Bogomil by his enemies and deposed. Thus, in Constantinople even a suggestion of Bogomilism could bring swift punishment, although elsewhere in the Empire, such as Asia Minor and Macedonia, the Bogomils remained relatively unchecked.76

Part III: Catharism in the Rhineland:
The Reformist Tradition

Having summarized the main features of Bogomilism, it is necessary to describe in more detail the goals of what I have called "reformist" heresy in the West during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.77 In attempting to make sense out of the bewildering variety of dissent, scholars have noted some important differences between heresy in the eleventh century and that in the twelfth century.

First, those heretics active between 1000 and 1050 (after which practically nothing appears in the sources until 1100) did not usually question the authority of the Church to confer the sacraments.


77 I take the term from Jeffrey Russell, Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965): 3, who used it to mean those "whose enthusiasm for the reform of the Church led them to extremes."
Their primary concern was to escape the world in order to practice their own brand of asceticism. For example, the clerics discovered at Orleans in about 1022 believed they enjoyed a monopoly of true wisdom, granted to them by the Holy Spirit. Seen by some scholars as subject to Bogomil influence and by others as clearly Gnostic in orientation, this group nevertheless was not very visible, proselytizing secretly among those who were drawn to them by their reputation for holiness and generosity.

78 Noted by Lambert, Medieval Heresy, p. 39.

79 The Orleans episode cannot be easily classified and has drawn a wide spectrum of interpretations. At one end is Dondaine, who saw clear evidence of Bogomil influence in several of the beliefs ascribed to the Orleans group: docetism; rejection of baptism, confession, and the Eucharist; baptism by the imposition of hands; condemnation of marriage; and the refusal to eat meat. Moreover, he attributed mitigated dualism to these heretics; it was not openly stated in the sources but evident nonetheless. See his "L'origine de l'hérésie médiévale," Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia, 6 (1954): 60-61.

At the other extreme was Russell, who sought to explain the Orleans heretics as springing entirely from Western conditions. While admitting that the doctrines cited in the sources sounded Catharist in origin, these beliefs were actually based on a kind of rational skepticism. For example, they held that the virgin birth was contrary to reason and that they could not believe in the resurrection, since they had not been there. See his Dissent and Reform, pp. 27-35.

Most other scholars have come down somewhere between these two positions. Herbert Grundmann called the Orleans group an example of a "learned heresy" with a very limited sphere of influence. See his "Hérésies savantes et hérésies populaires au moyen âge," in Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe.
Second, eleventh-century heretics were not usually aggressive proselytizers and were not eager to confront ecclesiastical authority. In fact, in some of the sources the heretics who are interrogated appear quite naive, surprised to discover that their views should cause alarm. For example, in about 1028 Archbishop Aribert of Milan, upon hearing of a heresy at Monteforte, summoned one of their number before him for questioning. According to Landulf the Elder, when the archbishop asked this man, Gerard, about his life and morals, he answered, "I give boundless thanks that you take pains to examine me so carefully . . . I will lay bare to you my life and the faith of my brethren in the same spirit in which you inquire into them."80

---

pré-industrielle, 11e-18e siècles, ed. Jacques Le Goff (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1968): 210. R.I. Moore described the heretics as gnostics, unconnected with any contemporary heretical tradition, either Western or Eastern. Rather, they "had removed themselves so completely from the world of other men's reality that they were not, according to the strict letter of the canonical definition, heretics at all." Origins of European Dissent, p. 29. Also see discussion by Ilarino Da Milano, Eresie Medioevali, Scritti Minori, Studi e Ricerche Dell'Istituto di Storia (Rimini: Maggioli Editore, 1983): 121-28.

80 Cutolo, ed., Landulphi Senioris, p. 67-68: "'Deo omnipotenti Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto gratias refero immensas, quod tam studiose me inquirere satagitis. . . Vitam meam et meorum fratrum fidem qualicunque animo ea sciscitatis, vobis edicam." I have followed the translation from Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, p. 87. For discussion of the incident, which
Although Landulf regarded this cooperation as evidence of the cunning and shrewdness of the heretics, there is no reason to doubt his sincerity, especially since this attitude appears in other sources from the period.

By contrast, heretics of the twelfth century were more enthusiastic in their condemnation of the Church, which sometimes led to physical violence. Malcolm Lambert has noted that twelfth-century heretics were more aggressive and more willing to translate their beliefs into action than those of the previous century. Examples would include the destruction of crosses by Peter of Bruis' followers and the rebellion in Le Mans against the bishop under the influence of Henry of Lausanne.\(^{81}\)

resulted in the seizure of the heretics by leading laymen of Milan and the burning of some of them, see Dondaine, "L'origine de l'hérésie médiévale," pp. 60-61, who sees Bogomilism in the heretics' condemnation of marriage, abstention from meat, and rejection of the Catholic view of the Trinity. Cf. Borst, *Die Katharer*, pp. 78-79, who likens the lifestyle of the Monteforte heretics to that of the Franciscans; and Moore, *Origins of European Dissent*, pp. 31-34, who concludes that both Neo-Platonism and Greek monasticism influenced their views. Cf. Borst, *Die Katharer*, pp. 78-79, who likens the lifestyle of the Monteforte heretics to that of the Franciscans. See also Russell, *Dissent and Reform*, pp. 35-38.

Despite the danger of imposing artificial coherence on widely varying beliefs and practices, it is possible to note certain very fundamental goals shared by almost all those dissatisfied with the Catholic Church during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. These were, first, the desire


82 There are three excellent general reviews of eleventh- and twelfth-century heresy in the West in English: Lambert, Medieval Heresy. Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976) is still the best survey of medieval heresy; R.I. Moore, The Origins of European Dissent (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, rep. 1985) is very useful when used with Lambert; Jeffrey Russell, Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), presents the thesis that conditions in Western Europe were much more important in producing heresy than contact with Bogomilism. Although Russell's conclusions have been increasingly challenged, his analyses of individual heretical episodes are invaluable. Older surveys which are still helpful are Herbert Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1935; rep. Vaduz: Kraus, 1965) and Arno Borst, Die Katharer (Stuttgart: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 12, 1953); also see Raoul Manselli, Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII (Rome, 1953) and Raffaello Morghen, L'Eresia Nel Medioevo (Bari, 1951).

Among the many works on the origins of medieval
to return the Church to a state of purity and simplicity based on the life of Jesus and the apostles, as revealed in the Gospels. Of course, this required the dismantling and re-building of the Church as it existed. According to Herbert Grundmann, this ideal of doing away with much of the institutional Church in order to re-create it was the only theme which underlay all of Western heresy in this period: "... all the heretics of the Middle Ages were convinced that they understood and that they realized best the Christianity and the


Church which they condemned.83 This "apostolic" life was to be based on a literal reading of the New Testament and to be encouraged by unrestrained preaching.84

Second, there was a spirit of revolt against what dissenters saw as the moral corruption of the Catholic clergy, due primarily to its excessive interest in material affairs. For this reason, many such critics of the Church rejected the validity of the sacraments administered by an immoral priest, initiating a dispute which, in terms of the arguments put forth, recalled the Donatist controversy.

83 Grundmann, "Hérésies savantes et hérésies populaires au moyen âge," in Hérésies et sociétés, p. 211.

Third, as part of the desire for the apostolic life, many reformers practiced a rather austere asceticism. During the eleventh century, such enthusiasts were mainly content to work out their salvation in private; in the twelfth century, however, this asceticism was often coupled with a claim to have replaced the Catholic clergy as the true Church. While attracting followers from every social class, they appealed particularly to those people who were most mobile, such as the poor and wandering artisans, especially weavers.85

85 It is no longer fashionable to see medieval heresy as an expression of social or economic grievances, and given the lack of any clear evidence connecting religious motivations with social and economic goals, scholars are more reluctant than in the past to make any unqualified statements on the subject. Still, there is no denying that, as Moore has noted, there was an association between heresy and "the mobile poor, and particularly with the artisan crafts which were compatible with a wandering life . . ." (Origins of Medieval Heresy, p. 174.) On the general issue of social and economic change and heresy, see Janet Nelson, "Society, theodicy, and the origins of medieval heresy," pp. 77, for whom major social changes operated as "push factors" by creating a necessary response by the medieval Church. Also see C.N.L. Brooke, "Heresy and Religious Sentiment, 1000-1250," Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research, 41 (1968): 115-31 and the discussion in Lambert, Medieval Heresy, 114-18. For the social context of heresy in Italy, C. Violante, "Hérésies urbaines et hérésies rurales en Italie du 11e au 13e siècle," in Hérésies et sociétés, pp. 171-98. For Catharism and Southern France, I have utilized Andrew Roach, "The Cathar Economy," Reading Medieval Studies, 12 (1986): 51-71 and E. Griffe, Les debuts de l'aventure Cathare en Languedoc (1140-1190) (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969): 20-71.
One characteristic result of the denunciation of the Catholic clergy as immorals was the rejection of the sacraments they administered. At Schere, near Lombers, in 1076 or 1077, the priest Ramirhdus was seized and burned by the bishop's attendants for rejecting the Eucharist because of the simony of the clergy who administered it.86

By 1163-64, when Eckbert wrote his sermons, "weaver" and "heretic" were becoming synonymous among religious authorities in Western Europe, a process which had begun at least by 1130. The development of this association in the sources of the twelfth century are discussed by R. I. Moore, "St. Bernard's Mission to the Languedoc in 1145," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, 47, no. 115 (1974): 1-8. Moore argued that by 1145 "textores" was used as a term for heretics in general, not necessarily Cathars, and that even as late as 1165 weaving and heresy were "thought of as closely associated rather than as identical." ("St. Bernard's Mission," p. 7) That the opposite was true, at least in some places, is suggested by Eckbert's report that the Cathars in Flanders were called "Piphles" and those in France "Tesserant", because they practiced weaving (texerant). Moreover, Eckbert believed that weavers were active among the Cathars of the Rhineland, describing them as meeting in "weavers' shops" (textrinis; see Sermones, I, p. 8). Grundmann believed that this designation of heretics as weavers arose from the fact that heretics became weavers, not that weavers became heretics. See his Religiöse Bewegungen, pp. 32-34. This thesis has been challenged, for example by Borst, who maintained that those already engaged in weaving often became heretics in part because of their mobile lifestyle. See his "La transmission de l'hérésie au moyen-âge," in Hérésies et sociétés, 273-77.

This repudiation of the efficacy of the Eucharist, when offered by sinful priests, was common among reformists. According to the canons of Utrecht, the wandering preacher Tanchelm, active in the Low Countries between about 1110 and 1115, proclaimed that "what is consecrated in the Lord's meal by the action of priests is nothing, to be called pollutions, not sacraments; [he claimed] that the virtue of the sacraments proceeds from the merits and sanctity of the ministers." The clear implication of Tanchelm's position was that in many cases the clergy was useless. This attitude also appeared in the Rhineland during the twelfth century.

---


This letter to Frederick, archbishop of Cologne, is the principal source for Tanchelm's teachings and should be treated with caution, since there was during this period a struggle between the Utrecht canons and the Flemish bishopric of Tournai over control of part of the bishopric of Utrecht. Malcolm Lambert, among others, has suggested that considered in this context, the letter might be more accurately regarded as a slanderous distortion of Tanchelm's reforming activities and that he was not the radical opponent of the Church that appears in the sources. See his Medieval Heresy, 55-7. A similar view is expressed by Russell, Dissent and Reform, pp. 56-68, 269. Cf. the view of Tanchelm as a messiah figure in Norman Cohn, The Pursuit of the Millennium, rvsd. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press): 46-50.
century. One of the heretical groups detected near Cologne in 1143 rejected all the sacraments, except adult baptism, because they believed the priests who administered them had been corrupted by excessive interest in worldly affairs. They had therefore lost their claim to the apostolic succession.\textsuperscript{88} Moreover, in about 1150, the priest Albero of Mercke, near Cologne, began to preach that the Catholic priesthood possessed only the appearance of the true sacraments. When the Eucharist was offered by a sinful priest, it was of no value. In fact, Albero maintained that demons were present at the Mass.\textsuperscript{89}

Connected with the rejection of the Eucharist on Donatist grounds was the denial of the doctrine of the Real Presence, which was probably also motivated by a movement of anti-materialist skepticism which one scholar has called "primitive rationalism."\textsuperscript{90} It appears that during the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were some people who, based on a literal-minded approach to life, could

\textsuperscript{88} PL 182, col. 678D-79A.


\textsuperscript{90} Lambert, Medieval Heresy, p. 47.
not accept the concept of Christ's body offered up century after century for the faithful to consume. Such an attitude is seen in Orleans in 1022, where the heretics denied the presence of Christ's body and blood in the host and when pressed for their reasons, stated, "We were not there, so we cannot believe these things are true." Dondaine has considered this view evidence of Bogomil dualism at work among them; Jeffrey Russell, however, has rejected such external influence, arguing that they should be seen as "neither Catharists nor witch cultists, but as men both intellectual and enthusiastic, combining intellectual skepticism with a faith in the guidance of the Spirit within . . . "

The denial of the Real Presence also appeared in twelfth-century Germany. According to the Gesta Treverorum, those accused of heresy at Ivois (diocese of Trier) in 1122 "denied that the


92 "L'Origine de l'hérésie médiévale," p. 61.

93 Dissent and Reform, p. 35.
substance of the bread and wine which the priests bless on the altar is really changed into the body and blood of Christ."94

Another sacrament commonly rejected by some in the reformist tradition, probably partly on the grounds of being irrational, was infant baptism.95 Many believed that baptism could not benefit an infant who could not understand the rite, based primarily on the risen Christ's instructions to the disciples that "Those who believe it [the Gospel] and receive baptism will find salvation; those who do not believe will be condemned."96 This scripture may have combined with a spirit of common sense which led dissidents to the same conclusion,

94 George Waitz, ed., Gesta Treverorum, MGH, SS, 8, p. 193: "Ivodii, quod Trevericae diocesis appendicium est, fuerunt eo tempore heretici, qui substantiam panis et vini, quae in altari per sacerdotes benedicitur, in corpus Christi et sanguinem veraciter transmutari negabant . . .”

95 See, for example, the heretics interrogated by the Synod of Arras in 1025, who maintained that baptism is useless for "the child who neither wills it nor concurs with it, knows nothing of faith and is ignorant of his need for salvation, does not beg for rebirth in any sense, and can make no confession of faith . . ." Edited in Acta synodi Atrebatensi a Gerardo Cameracensi, in Paul Fredericq, ed., Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae, 5 vols. (Ghent, 1899-1902), I, p. 4 as translated in Moore, The Birth of Popular Heresy, p. 17.

96 Mark 16:16. This verse and the story of the Ethiopian eunuch's baptism by Philip in Acts 8:26-40 were cited often against the practice of infant baptism.
although there is no direct evidence for this. An example of this view includes the heretics of Soissons in 1114, who considered "void the baptism of infants who do not understand, no matter what the sponsors." 97 Likewise, the heretics at Ivois in 1122 held that the baptism of infants did not confer salvation on them. 98 Henry the Monk, (active ca. 1115-1135) also rejected infant baptism, claiming that children who died before the age of understanding were nevertheless saved. 99

This disavowal of the sacraments also usually involved an asceticism modeled on that of Christ and the apostles. The rejection of marriage and sexual intercourse was at the heart of this austerity. It represented not only a reaction against the clergy's incontinence but a positive goal of those who sought a more personal approach to God than the Church could offer. The heretics which Adhemar of


98 Waitz, Gesta Treverorum, p. 193.

Chabannes labeled Manichaeans (1018) were said to have "feigned chastity" while indulging themselves in every kind of vice.\textsuperscript{100} Those seized and questioned by the bishop of Arras-Cambrai in 1025 were said to have "despised lawful marriage."\textsuperscript{101} The heretics of Monteforte (1028) valued virginity above all else and, although some of their number were married, they were expected to remain celibate, regarding their wives like a mother or sister.\textsuperscript{102} This refusal to marry, and the call for virginity among those already married, was prevalent in the twelfth century as well. The motives behind such practices became more complicated, however, since by the 1140's dualist doctrines, spread by Bogomil missionaries, were present alongside these reformers of the Church. These dualists rejected marriage because it led to the production of offspring, which perpetuated the material world which was Satan's

\textsuperscript{100} Jules Chavanon, ed., \textit{Ademari Chronicon}, III.49 in \textit{Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire}, 20 (Paris, 1897): 173: "Abstinentes a cibis, quasi monachi apparebant et castitatem simulabant, sed inter se ipsos omnem luxuriam exercebant . . . ."

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Acta synodi Atrebatensi}, p. 3: "Verum quia ad noticiam episcopi pervenerat, . . . legitima connubia execrari . . . ."

\textsuperscript{102} Cutolo, ed., \textit{Historiae Mediolanensis}, p. 68.
creation. A case for such dualist influence might be made as early as 1114 in Soissons, where the heretics labeled Manichaeans were reported to have condemned marriage and the production of children.103

Moreover, reformists of this period very often abstained from eating meat as part of the asceticism they adopted and encouraged. The refusal to eat meat was reported in Aquitaine in 1018, at Châlons-sur-Marne about 1043, at Soissons in 1114, at Cologne in 1143, at Perigeux in about 1160.104 It is easy to understand such abstention as part of the path to the apostolic life which reformists so highly prized. However, by the twelfth century a new motive for such abstention emerges which may

---

103 Labande, ed., Guibert de Nogent, p. 428.

104 For the heretics at Châlons-sur-Marne, see Herigeri et Anselmi Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium, II.62-64, Rudolp Koepke, ed., MGH, SS, VIII, pp. 226-28; translation and discussion in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 89-93 and Moore, Origins of Western Dissent, pp. 36-38.

For the Cologne heretics, see the letter of Everinus of Steinfeld to Bernard of Clairvaux, PL 182, col. 678B: "In cibis suis vetant omne genus lactis, et quod inde conficitur, et quidquid ex coitu procreat." For the heresy at Soissons, see Labande, ed., Guibert de Nogent, p. 428; and for Pérgueux, see Epistola de haereticis Petragoricis, PL 181, col. 1721-22: "Carnes non comedunt, vinum non bibunt, nisi permodicum tertia die . . . " Translation and discussion in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 138-39.
reflect the influence of Bogomilism. For example, in 1114 Guibert of Nogent wrote that the heretics detected near Soissons "reject foods of all sorts which are the product of coition." This notion could have arisen from the reformist emphasis on celibacy, but the idea that meat was to be avoided because it was the product of sexual intercourse seems to fit better with the anti-materialism so fundamental to Bogomil theology. Celibacy was very important to Western reformists as well, but the view that intercourse itself was unclean seems alien to that tradition. Moreover, by the twelfth century, the earlier notion that even sex between spouses was sinful except when performed for the purpose of procreation, not pleasure, was beginning to change.

Despite these hints of dualist influence at Soissons in 1114, the first really unequivocal evidence that Bogomilism had penetrated Western Europe comes from near Cologne some 30 years later.

105 Ibid.: "... edulia omnium quae ex coitu nascuntur, eliminant..."

106 See Jean Leclercq, Monks on Marriage, A Twelfth-Century View (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982): 21, who quotes Bernard of Clairvaux's De praeccepto et dispensatione as an example of this change in attitude: "... it is no little virtue not to touch a woman, but if a man embrace his own wife there is surely no fault in it."
In 1143, the dualist and reformist traditions outlined above operated side by side, and were recognized as two distinct heresies for the first time. Everinus, provost of the Praemonstratensian monastery at Steinfeld, wrote a letter to Bernard of Clairvaux describing the main beliefs of both groups, which were made known when some of them were captured and interrogated. Some of the heretics were burned, in Cologne and in Bonn. One group aimed at correcting abuses within the Church and espoused doctrines which were common to many other such reformers in twelfth-century Europe. The second group, however, desired not merely to reform the Catholic clergy but to replace it altogether and there are unmistakable signs that it was influenced to some degree by Eastern dualism. It is


108 For the burnings in Cologne, see Everinus' account, PL 182, col. 677B-C. For the burnings at Bonn, see G.H. Pertz, ed. Annales Brunwilarenses, MGH, SS, 16, p. 727, which reports under the year 1143: "Apud Veronam [Bonn - editor's note] presidente Ottone comitæ igne consumpti sunt tres, malentes mori quam cedere sacrosancte catholice fidei."

109 The lack of skepticism by scholars toward Everinus' report has surprised me. For example, see Moore, Origins of European Dissent, p. 169 and Raoul Manselli, Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII (Rome,
probably too simplistic to identify these two groups as "reformist" or "dualist"; their beliefs do not appear coherent enough for such classification. Still, we can distinguish reformist and dualist influences at work among these movements.

Moreover, I am convinced that between 1143 and 1163, when Eckbert composed his sermons, these two

1953): 89-109. There is every reason to regard most of his account as reliable (he had apparently taken part in the interrogation of the heretics); however, I believe Everinus' division of the dualist group into "auditores", "credentes" and "electi" could well have been taken from Augustine's division of the Manichaean into "auditores" and "electi" in the De haeresibus, (the term "credentes" is not found here). The fact that the clergy of Liège, in 1145, used these same terms should evoke the same skepticism, given the propensity of medieval chroniclers to identify any doctrine suggestive of dualism with Manichaism. Cf. Lambert, Medieval Heresy, pp. 60-61, who accepts this part of Everinus' account. Eckbert did not use these labels to refer to the Cathars, although he was well acquainted with Augustine's writings and quoted his description of the Manichaean hierarchy in his discussion of Cathar origins.

Scholars have generally accepted Everinus' letter as the first concrete evidence of Bogomil influence in the medieval West; see E. Griffe, Les débuts de l'aventure Cathare, pp. 38-39, who maintains that Everinus demonstrates the Bogomil link to Catharism and speaks of a "Cathar" church organized around Cologne by 1143, better organized than the Cathars in Toulouse during the same period. The Bogomil influence on these Cologne heretics is also accepted by Borst, Die Katharer, pp. 90-91, Thouzellier, "Hérésie et Croisade", p. 858, and Lambert, Medieval Heresy, 60-61. Cf. Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen, pp. 20, 25, who emphasizes the extent to which Everinus' heretics were part of the Western movement of poverty and the apostolic life, but who sees evidence of Manichaean dualism in his account as well.
groups, at first mutually hostile, merged into a single body and can, in 1163, be called "Cathars". Such a union may seem illogical, but a similar situation prevailed among the Lombard Cathars during the mid-twelfth century, according to the De heresi catharorum (written between 1200 and 1215) and the Tractatus de hereticis, written about 1266 by the inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria. Both sources described how, at first, the Lombard Cathars were unified under the rule of Bishop Mark (a gravedigger), who received his authority from Nicetas, head of the Bogomil church at Constantinople (absolute dualists). Upon hearing that Nicetas had died in a manner which questioned his authority, Mark sought re-ordination from the Bogomil church in Bulgaria (mitigated dualists). Thus began a process whereby the Cathars in Lombardy were divided first into two and afterwards into six factions, while still retaining a sense of


solidarity based on certain common beliefs. An examination of Everinus' letter is essential to understanding the somewhat similar situation which was developing among the Rhineland Cathars by 1163 (although involving dualists and reformists rather than absolute and mitigated dualists).

The first group of heretics which Everinus described for Bernard claimed to follow a life of asceticism and poverty. Further, they maintained that in their poverty, they alone were the true apostles of Christ and accordingly held all things in common. They also maintained a strict regimen of prayer and fasting and refused to eat anything produced by copulation. Boasting that they had endured frequent persecutions, they described themselves as being driven from place to place.

Regarding the sacraments, these heretics were secretive, yet did reveal that they believed the Church did not truly possess them, only "a kind of shadow and the tradition of men." They described

112 Ibid., p. 306. A desire for unity led the various sects in Italy to ask a bishop located "ultra montes" (presumably a French bishop) to choose a single figure as head of the various churches in Italy.

113 PL 182, col. 677-78.

114 Ibid., 678B: "Nos vero, dicunt, in sacramentis non tenere veritatem, sed quamdam umbram et hominum traditionem."
their own form of communion:

They openly confessed to us that daily at their table, when they eat, after the manner of Christ and the apostles, they consecrate their own food and drink into the body and blood of Christ through the Lord's Prayer, and that thereby they nourish their own members and the body of Christ."115

Furthermore, according to Everinus, "they do not bother with our baptism"116 and instead of baptism by water, practiced a baptism in fire and the Spirit, adducing Christ's words in Matthew 3:11:

"He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire."117 This was done through the laying on of

115 Ibid.: In sacramentis suis velo se tegunt: tamen nobis aperte confessi sunt, quod in mensa sua quotidie cum manducant, ad formam Christi et apostolorum, cibum suum et potum in corpus Christi et sanguinem per Dominicum orationem consecrant, ut inde se membra et corpus Christi nutriant.

The last part of this passage can be understood in two ways: "ut inde se membra et corpus Christi nutriant." I have taken "membra" to refer to the bodies of the heretics rather than the "membra" of Christ. Cf. Peters' translation, Heresy and Authority, p. 92: "... to nourish themselves therewith, as being the members and body of Christ."

116 Ibid., col. 678D: "De baptismo nostro non curant."

117 Ibid., col. 678C:

Confessi sunt etiam manifeste se praeter aquam, in ignem et spiritum baptizare, et baptizatos esse: adducentes illud testimonium Joannis Baptistae baptizantis in aqua, et dicentis de Christo: "Ille uos
hands, according to Luke's description of Paul's baptism by Ananias, in which water was not utilized. Everinus added,

And whoever among them has been so baptized they call elect [electum] and has the power to baptize others who have been found worthy and to consecrate the body and blood of Christ at their meals. For first, through the laying on of hands they receive those of their number who are called listeners [auditores] into the number of believers [credentes], and in this way he is permitted to be present at their prayers until sufficiently tested that they make him an elect. These heretics also condemned marriage,

baptizabit in Spiritu sancto et igne. . . ."

In the phrase, "Confessi sunt etiam manifeste se praeter aquam", I think it more logical to translate "praeter" as "instead of" rather than the more usual meaning of "besides", given Everinus' statement that "De baptismo nostro non curant."

119 Ibid., col. 678D:

Et quemlibet sic inter eos baptizatum dicunt electum, et habere potestatem alios qui digni fuerint baptizandi, et in mensa sua corpus Christi et sanguinem consecrandi. Prius enim per manus impositionem de numero eorum, quos auditores vocant, recipiunt eum inter credentes: et sic licebit eum interesse orationibus eorum, usquecum satis probatum eum faciant electum.

although Everinus stated that "I could not learn from them the reason, either because they dared not reveal it, or, more probably, because they did not know it." 120 Finally, and most important in linking them to Bogomilism, this group claimed, during their interrogation, that "their heresy had been concealed from the time of the martyrs and had continued in Greece and some other lands. And these are those heretics who call themselves apostles, and who have their own pope." 121

120 Ibid., col. 678D: "Nuptias damnant, sed causam ab eis investigare non potui; vel quia eam fateri non audebant, vel potius quia eam ignorabant."

121 Ibid., col. 679D:

Illi vero qui combusti sunt, dixerunt nobis in defensione sua, hanc haeresim usque ad haec tempora occultatam fuisse a temporibus martyrum, et permanisse in Graecia, et quibusdam aliis terris. Et hi sunt illi haeretici, qui se dicunt apostolos, et suum papam habent.

In this context, "Greece" no doubt refers to the Byzantine Empire. The "papa" may well refer to the head of the Bogomil church at Constantinople, since during the 1160s, Nicetas, who held this position, visited Italy and Southern France to ordain new Cathar bishops by the laying on of hands ("consolamentum") and to renew the ordination of already existing bishops. See, for example, the account of the Cathar Council of St.-Felix-de-Carman in Toulouse (ca. 1167): "Incarnationis Dominice, in mense madij, in diebus illis Ecclesia Tolosana adduxit Papa Niquinta in Castro Sancti Pelicij et magna multitudo hominum et mulierum Ecclesiae Tolosanae . . . vt acciperent consolamentum quod Dominus Papa Niquinta coepit consolare." Edited by Franjo Sanjek, "Le rassemblement hérétique de
The belief that this first group described by Everinus were connected to or influenced by Bogomilism rests, first, on his statement that they claimed an ancient origin in Greece and other lands, which almost certainly refer to the Byzantine Empire, where Bogomils had been entrenched for at least a century by 1143, both in Constantinople itself and across Asia Minor. Moreover, Everinus' description of their baptism in fire and the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands is similar to the account of Bogomil baptism by Euthymius Zigabenus, who was writing only about twenty-five years before Everinus. Another argument for this Bogomil connection is Everinus' admission that he could not find out why the heretics rejected marriage because they either concealed the reason or were ignorant of it. Perhaps the reason was because of a dualist rejection of all material objects as evil, a belief

Nicetas' position at Constantinople and trip to Tuscany is recorded in the Tractatus de hereticis of the thirteenth-century Italian inquisitor, Anselm of Alessandria, but which describes the development of Catharism in Italy during the twelfth century; edited by Dondaine, "Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie," p. 309: "Postea venit quidam qui vocabatur Papas Nicheta, qui episcopus erat illium de Constantinopolim, et dixit: 'Vos estis tot quod bene expedit quod debetis episcopum.'"
which they wished to keep secret or perhaps which they did not understand.

According to Everinus, there was a second heresy active around Cologne, altogether distinct from the first. In fact, it was the conflict between these two groups which caused them both to be detected.122 These heretics were similar to the first in their emphasis on apostolic poverty, which its members believed the Catholic Church had abandoned. They declared that the body and blood of Christ was not consecrated at the altar because no priests were consecrated. The "apostolic dignity" of the chair of St. Peter had been lost because of its involvement in secular affairs, and thus archbishops and bishops, who likewise lived secular lives, could not pass on a consecration they had never received.123 Accordingly, they condemned all the sacraments except adult baptism, rejecting infant baptism on the grounds of Christ's words in Mark 16:16: "Those who believe and receive baptism

\[\text{122 Ibid., col. 678D.}\]
\[\text{123 Ibid.:} \]
\[\text{Isti negant in altari fieri corpus Christi, eo quod omnes sacerdotes Ecclesiae non sunt consecrati. Apostolica enim dignitas, dictum, corrupta est, implicans se negotiis saecularibus . . .}"\]
will be saved."\textsuperscript{124} They did not, however, claim to practice their own sacraments or to have replaced the Catholic clergy as the "true" apostles of Christ.

Further, this faction did not believe in purgatorial fire and considered prayers for the dead unnecessary. In their view, since the sinner was completely forgiven by the act of repentance, he need not engage in penance. In fact, any rituals not based on the practice of Christ and the apostles were superstitions.\textsuperscript{125} At death, they believed that the soul went immediately to eternal rest or eternal punishment, citing Ecclesiastes 11:3 for support: "Whether a tree falls south or north, it must lie as it falls."\textsuperscript{126} Like the first group, they rejected marriage, but their reasons were clear. They

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., col. 679A: "Et ita evacuant sacerdotium Ecclesiae, et damnant sacramenta, praeter Baptismum solum . . . De Baptismo parvulorum fidem habent, praeter illud de Evangelio: 'Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, saluus erit.'"

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., col. 679C: "... caeterasque observantias in Ecclesia, quas Christus et apostoli ab ipso discendentes on condiderunt, vocant superstitiones."

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid:

Purgatorium ignem post mortem non concedunt; sed animas statim, quando egrediuntur, de corpore in aeternam vel requiem, vel poenam transire, propter illa Salomonis: "Lignum in quacunque partem ceciderit, siue ad austrum, siue ad aquilonem, ibi manebit."
considered all marriage as equal to fornication, except between virgins, which was sanctioned by 
Christ's words to the Pharisees: "What God has joined together, man must not separate."¹²⁷

Part IV: Rhineland Catharism in 1163: Dualist and Reformist Divisions

Based on what has been said above about the dualist and reformist traditions in the medieval West, it can now be demonstrated how they had combined themselves in the Rhineland between 1143 and 1163. For, whereas Everinus wrote of two distinct heresies, in conflict with another, these two groups somehow coalesced into a single body within the next twenty years. However, this alliance was a tenuous one, and the same doctrines which divided reformists from dualists in 1143 still existed in 1163. In the process of defending this premise, I will attempt to place into one category or the other the beliefs of the Cathars as recorded by Eckbert. Of course, it should be remembered that there were no doubt Cathars whose views did not fit neatly into either category. Still, I believe that the strategy of looking for "reformist" and "dualist" elements in the Sermones provides a

¹²⁷ Ibid. Matt. 19:6
generally accurate picture of Catharism near Cologne from 1143 to 1163.

At several points, Eckbert wrote of the secret doctrines of one group of Cathars, doctrines which included belief in two creators and two creations: the Devil, who made all flesh, and God, who made everything immaterial. The teachings Eckbert ascribed to this faction correspond well to Bogomilism; moreover, some of the doctrines he noted must have belonged only to this group, even though Eckbert attributed them to all the Cathars. Apparently, admittance to this inner circle and its doctrines was made via the baptism of fire and the Holy Spirit, although there may have been a probationary period required of the believer even after being baptized. Those members of the sect who remained unbaptized, uninitiated to its inner mysteries, seem to have been mainly reformists. Their aims correspond to the native tradition of dissent in the West which can be traced back to the early eleventh century. Thus, I believe that much of what Eckbert reported can be categorized as "dualist" or "reformist".

The most obvious sign of Bogomil influence in the Sermones is dualism, which Eckbert included among the secret doctrines of the Cathar "perfecti"
and "doctores". For example, he wrote that the Cathars condemned the eating of meat, but not all for the same reason. In public, "they say that the eating of flesh must be forbidden because all flesh was born from intercourse, and because of this they judge it to be unclean."\textsuperscript{128} Secretly, however, "they saw what is worse, namely, that all flesh was created by the devil, and thus not even in the greatest necessity can they eat any of it."\textsuperscript{129} In this case, it appears that some Cathars were concealing their dualistic reasons for rejecting meat, while offering in public a rationale which they believed would be more acceptable to reformists: as a product of sexual intercourse, meat is unclean and must therefore be avoided. As noted above, this belief had appeared earlier in the twelfth-century West, although it seems to fit better with the dualism of the Bogomils than the reformist emphasis on celibacy. Still, avoiding open references to dualism would have enabled the Cathar leadership to blend in easily with the

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Sermones}, I, p. 10: "... uitandum esse esum carnis dicunt quia concubitu nata sit omnis caro et ex hoc immundam esse arbitrantur."

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., pp. 10-11: "Et hanc rationem quidem manifestius dicunt sed in occulis suis quod peius est dicunt, uidelicet omnem carnem facturam esse diaboli ideoque nec in summis necessitatibus eam ullatenus gustant."
reformists active in the Rhineland during this period. Moreover, the Cathar "perfecti" not only hid these doctrines from their Catholic opponents but from their own followers.

Eckbert's report of dualism has been frequently rejected as the result of his identification of the Cathars with the Manichaeans as described by Augustine. It is true that in the first sermon, Eckbert quoted the account of Manichaean dualism in Augustine's De haeresibus. Moreover, he believed that this dualism originated with Mani; in the seventh sermon devoted to the topic of "creation of flesh", Eckbert declared that "the prince of your error, Mani, forbade the eating of flesh because, he said, all flesh had been created by the Devil . . ."\(^\text{130}\) Despite the apparent damage to Eckbert's credibility based on these passages, I have accepted his statement as genuine, for reasons which will be detailed in the following chapter.

As demonstrated above, the belief in two creations was central to Bogomil theology from its rise in tenth-century Bulgaria to its development in the twelfth-century Byzantine Empire. Moreover, the

\(^{130}\) Ibid., VII, p. 117: "Scimus autem quia princeps erroris uestri, manes, talem habebat uitandarum carnium rationem, quod dicebat omnem carnem creatam esse a diabolo . . ."
tenth-century Bogomils avoided eating meat for the same reasons which Eckbert ascribed to the Cathars. According to Cosmas the priest, the Bogomils declared not only that the Devil created everything material but also that he ruled over and maintained it. Moreover, the Bogomils refused to marry, eat meat, or drink wine because the Devil had ordered mankind to do these things.\textsuperscript{131}

Another sign of Bogomil influence in the \textit{Sermones} is the attitude of some Cathars toward the Catholic clergy. According to Eckbert, they claimed that "the priestly order has vanished among us [the clergy], and that true priests have never been found, except among you."\textsuperscript{132} As evidence, the Cathars pointed to the sins of the Roman popes and cardinals, rampant since the earliest days of the Church, maintaining that they had always been "avaricious and proud."\textsuperscript{133} Moreover, the Cathars

\begin{itemize}
 \item \textsuperscript{131} Peters, \textit{Heresy and Authority}, pp. 113-14.
 \item \textsuperscript{132} \textit{Sermones}, XI, p. 237: "quod dicitis ordinem sacerdotii defecisse apud nos et nusquam inueniri ueros sacerdotes, nisi inter uos."
 \item \textsuperscript{133} Ibid., p. 242:

\begin{quote}

Dicitis forte, "Nescimus sub quo papa acciderit iste defectus, sed hoc scimus quod ex multis temporibus omnes qui dicebantur romani pontifices et cardinales semper auari fuerunt et superbi et multis ex causis indigni sacerdotio christi et ex hoc certi sumus quoniam uerum sacerdotium apud ipsos
\end{quote}
\end{itemize}
accused the contemporary Catholic clergy of having lost its power of consecration because of simony.\textsuperscript{134} Eckbert devoted much energy to defending the inviolability of the sacraments, whatever the sin of the priest who administers it. He did not, however, try to refute the charge of simony itself, an abuse which he himself had earlier condemned while a monk at Schönau.\textsuperscript{135}

As discussed above, despite all the criticism directed against the Church by Western reformists, the notion of actually replacing the Church was not part of the tradition. It was, however, part of the Bogomils' teaching. According to Euthymius Zigabenus' Panoplia Dogmatica (ca. 1110-1118) the Byzantine Bogomils called the Orthodox Church the church of Herod, while labeling their own the synagogue of Bethlehem, since they said that "Christ, or the word of God, is born there, by which non est."

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., p. 273: "De symoniacis episcopis forsitan eandem objectionem nobis facitis que supra de hereticis inducta est."

\textsuperscript{135} See Ibid., pp. 274-94 and Eckbert's letter to Rainhald of Dassel written soon after the latter's election as archbishop of Cologne (1159). Edited in Roth, Die Visionen, p. 315; see above, p. 19.
the true faith is preached."\textsuperscript{136}

This same wholesale rejection of the Church was also reported among the heretics near Cologne in 1143; the similarity between their view and that described by Eckbert provides further evidence for the direct link between the two. According to Everinus, one group of heretics claimed to be the true Church,

because they alone follow the steps of Christ, and continue in the imitation of the true apostolic life, not seeking the things of the world, not possessing a home nor lands, nor any property, just as Christ did not possess them, nor did he concede them to his disciples. . ."\textsuperscript{137}

The Catholic clergy were false apostles, "whereas we and our fathers, having been born apostles, have continued in the grace of Christ, and will continue to the end of the world."\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{136} Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII, 28; PG 130, col. 1321C-22C: "Synagogam suam appellant Bethlehem. In se enim Christum dicunt nasci, seu Verbum Dei, quo fidei ueritas praedicatur."

\textsuperscript{137} PL 182, col. 677D:

\textit{Dicunt apud se tantum Ecclesiam esse, eo quod ipso soli vestigiis Christi inhaereant; et apostolicae vitae veri sectatores permaneant, ea quae mundi sunt non quaerentes, non domum, nec agros, nec aliquid peculium possidentes: sicut Christus non possedit, nec discipulis suis possidenda concessit.}

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., col. 678A:

Pseudoapostoli adulterantes verbum Christi,
Moreover, there are strong similarities between the baptism in the accounts of Everinus and Eckbert and that practiced by the Byzantine Bogomils. According to Everinus, the group claiming origins in the East confessed that instead of water they baptize and have been baptized in fire and the Spirit, adducing that testimony of John the Baptist, baptizing in water and saying of Christ, 'He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire'. . . . And that such baptism should be performed by the imposition of hands they have sought to show by the testimony of Luke, who, in the Acts of the Apostles, describing the baptism of Paul, . . . did not mention water, but only the imposition of hands . . . 139

According to Eckbert, the Cathars also practiced a similar "baptism in fire". He heard about this ceremony from "a certain man who was knowledgeable about your [the Cathars'] secrets, and

quae sua sunt quaesiverunt, vos et patres vestros exorbitare fecerunt: nos et patres nostri generati apostoli, in gratia Christi permansimus, et in finem saeculi permanebimus.

139 Ibid., col. 678B–C:

Confessi sunt etiam manifeste se praeter aquam, in ignem et spiritum baptizare, et baptizados esse: adducentes illud testimonium Joannis Baptistae baptizantis in aqua, et dicentis de Christo: "Ille uos baptizabit in Spiritu sancto et igne" . . . Et talem baptismum per impositionem manuum debere fieri conati sunt ostendere testimonio Lucae, qui in Actibus Apostolorum describens baptismum Pauli, . . . nullam mentionem fecit de aqua, sed tantum de manus impositione . . .
about the way you rebaptize. Based on this informant's testimony, Eckbert described the ritual:

Lights are placed abundantly all around; the supplicant stands in their midst with great reverence, circled by them, since a holy act is performed, although it is more pleasing to the Devil than to God. The unfortunate one who is to be baptized, or katharized, is placed in their midst and is assisted by the archcathar [archicatharus], holding in his hand a little book designated for this purpose. Placing the book on the supplicant's head, the archcathar says blessings, which are actually curses, while those standing around say other prayers, and thus complete the rite, making him a son of Gehenna, not of the kingdom of God.

Both Everinus and Eckbert were clearly describing some form of the Bogomil baptism, the "teliosis", which was the model for the the "consolamentum" among the Western Cathars. Euthymius Zigabenus recorded the features of the ritual:

140 Sermones, IX, p. 161: "... sicut audiui de quodam qui expertus fuerat secreta uestrar, tali modo rebaptizatis."

141 Ibid., pp. 162-63:

Locantur luminaria copiose in parietibus cunctis; statatur per ordinem in circuitu cum reverentia magna quoniam sancta res agitur que tamen magis complaceat diabolo quam deo. Statuitur i medio infelix ille qui baptizandus, siue katharizandus est, et assistit ei archicatharus, tenens in manu libellum deputatum ad hoc officium. Quem inponens uertici eius, dicit benedictiones que potius maleditiones uocande sunt, orantibus ceteris qui circumstant et faciunt filium gehenne, non regni dei, sicque perficitur ille baptismus.
They say that our baptism is from John, for it is made in water, but that their own is of Christ, for it is made through the Spirit. First they prescribe a time for confession, and purification, and continual instruction. Then they place the gospel of John upon his [the novitiate's] head, and invoke the Holy Spirit, and recite the Lord's Prayer. And after his baptism they again assign a time for a more exact ceremony, and a more temperate life, and more pure prayer. Then they demand testimony as to whether he has observed these requirements. Which, if the men and women should affirm, they lead him to a better known initiation; for they place the miserable one toward the rising sun, and again place the gospel upon his head, and lay their profane hands upon him, the men and women who are present, and sing wicked hymns in which they give thanks for the wicked tradition he has observed.142

While Eckbert did not mention a time of purification preceding the Cathar baptism or the

142 Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII, 16; PG 130, col. 1311-12:

two-part baptism practiced by the Bogomils, the essential features of his account agree with those of Zigabenus. Moreover, the "consolamentum" of the Lombard Cathars during the twelfth century was very similar, according to Anselm of Alessandria. This rite also included the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the laying of the Gospel on the recipient's head.\textsuperscript{143} This was apparently the same baptism brought to the Cathars of Languedoc in about 1167 by Nicetas, Bogomil patriarch of Constantinople. The proceedings of the Council of St. Felix-de-Caraman reported that those men chosen by the local churches received the "consolamentum" and "the order of bishop."\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{143} Dondaine, "Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie," pp. 313-14.

\textsuperscript{144} See Sanjek, "Le Rassemblement de St.-Felix-de-Caraman," p. 775, for example: "Raimundus de Casalis accept consolamentum et ordinem episcopi." The historicity of the Council is accepted by most scholars, although some prefer a date sometime between 1167 and about 1174, doubting that of 1167 attached to the proceedings of it. See, for example, Dondaine, "Les Actes du concile albigeois," Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati, 5 (1946): 324-55; Manselli, L'eresia del male, pp. 169-74; and Griffe, Les Débuts . . . , pp. 67-76; In opposition to this consensus are R.I. Moore and Yves Dossat. Moore rejected the assumption that Nicetas crossed the Alps and dated the arrival of absolute dualism in France to 1175 or 1176; see his "Nicétas, émissaire de Dragovitch, a-t-il traversé les Alpes?", Annales du Midi, 85 (1975): 85-90; see also Dossat, "A propos du concile cathare de Saint-Felix: les Milingues," in Cathares en Languedoc, Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 3 (Toulouse: Privat, 1968): 201-14 and J.
The Bogomil rite also served as the model for the "consolamentum" of the Cathars in Southern France. Although the first detailed description of the French baptism was written in about 1280, long after it had developed, scholars believe it reflects much earlier Catharist practice. In this Provençal version, the ritual readings and prayers preceding and following the consolation itself had been greatly elaborated compared to earlier accounts, but its main features correspond to that of the Italian and German Cathars: John's gospel was placed on the supplicant's head, the Cathar perfect placed their hands on him, and prayers were recited.

Moreover, the unconditional condemnation of marriage is another sign of Bogomil, rather than reformist, influence. As we have seen, Everinus Duvernoy, "Les 'Actes de Saint-Felix' sont-ils des faux?", Cahiers études Cathare, 19, no. 40 (1968-69): 16-20.


146 Edited by Léon Clédat, Le Nouveau Testament traduit au XIIIe siècle en langue provençale, suivi d'un rituel cathare (Paris: Mm. Lumière, 1887): 470-82. See the translation and discussion in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 483-94.
knew that one group of heretics condemned marriage, but could not
discover why. Whether this silence was due to a desire for secrecy or
ignorance, it fits well with the secret dualist teachings among the
Cathars which Eckbert described. He reported that one faction among
the Cathars condemned marriage under all circumstances and promised
eternal damnation to those who remained married after joining the sect.147

From several former Cathars, he learned of the reason for this total
prohibition:

You say that the fruit from which God ordered the first man, in paradise, not to
eat was none other than the woman whom He had created; concerning her, you
say that God ordered Adam not to have intercourse with her, and he mingled with
her against the command of God, which was [not] to eat from the forbidden tree.
Based on this, you prove that the entire human race, which was propagated from them,
was born in fornication, and that no one can be saved, unless he has been cleansed
through the prayers and holy works of those who are called "perfect" among you.148

147 Sermones, I, p. 9.
148 Sermones, V, pp. 77-78:

Dicitis enim quod fructus ille de quo preceptit deus primo homini in paradiso ne gus-
taret ex eo, nichil aliud fuit nisi mulier quam creauerat. De ipsa dicitis ade pre-
ceptit dominus ut non commiseretur ei et commixtus est ei contra preceptum dei, quod erat gustare de uetito ligno. Ex hoc ergo probatis omne genus humanum quod de eis pro-
pagatum est natum esse ex fornicatione et neminem posse saluari nisi purgatus fuerit
Evidence for connecting this secret teaching of the Rhineland Cathars to Bogomilism comes first from its appearance among the Cathars of Lombardy, whose contact with the Byzantine Bogomils has been documented. Bonacursus, a one-time Cathar bishop who had returned to the Catholic Church, provided the clergy of Milan with a description of Cathar beliefs sometime between 1176 and 1190. He reported that "the union of Adam and Eve was, in their words, the forbidden fruit." 149

Further, this allegorical interpretation of Genesis 2:1-7 appears to come to the Lombard Cathars via the Bulgarian Bogomils who were mitigated dualists. According to the anonymous author of the De Heresi Catharorum, a history of Catharism's early development in Italy written early in the thirteenth century, the mitigated dualists among the Lombard heretics said that Satan "made Eve and caused Adam to sin through her. And they say that what was

per orationes et sanctificationes eorum qui inter uos perfecti uocantur.

149 PL 204, col. 776, where the work is entitled Vita haereticorum: "Conjunctio Adae cum Eva, ut dicunt, fuit pomum vetitum." The more commonly used title is Manifestatio haeresis catharorum quam fecit Bonacursus. See the discussion by P. Ilarino de Milano, "La 'Manifestatio Heresis Catarorum Quam Facit Bonacursus'", Aevum, 12 (1938): 281-333.
meant by the eating of the forbidden fruit was fornication."\textsuperscript{150} This group of Cathars followed the "order" of Bulgaria, according to the author.\textsuperscript{151}

The Bogomils themselves, both in tenth-century Bulgaria and in the twelfth-century Byzantine Empire, forbade all marriage.\textsuperscript{152} Moreover, like the Cathars of Lombardy and the Rhineland, the Byzantine Bogomils viewed the human fall from grace as the result of sexual intercourse, although in their version Satan, as creator of the world, combined with Eve, not Adam. The Bogomil version is in the treatise \textit{Interrogatio Joannis}, written in Bulgaria sometime during the eleventh century and carried to the Cathars of Concorezzo, in Northern Italy, near the end of that century. Set in the form of a dialogue between Christ and John the Apostle at the Last Supper, this work is a valuable source for Bogomil cosmology and eschatology. In one passage,

\textsuperscript{150} A. Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare," \textit{Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum}, 19 (1949): 310: "Et fecit sibi evam, ut per eam faceret eum peccare. Et dicunt quod comestio ligni prohibiti fuit fornicatio."

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid.

John asks why Adam and Eve fell from grace, and Christ replies:

The Devil entered paradise and planted a reed in the middle of paradise and from his spittle made the serpent and ordered him to remain in the reed, and thus the Devil hid knowledge of his deceit, that they might not see his deception. And he came to them saying: "From every fruit which is in paradise you may eat, but do not eat from the fruit of iniquity." Afterwards the wicked Devil entered into the evil serpent and deceived the angel who was in the form of a woman and poured out over her head the desire for sin, and he made Eve desire as though she were a burning furnace. And at once the Devil, leaving the reed, in the form of the serpent, had intercourse with Eve, using the serpent's tail. For this reason, they are not called sons of God, but sons of the Devil and sons of the serpent, doing the will of their father and doing diabolical works until the end of the age. 153


Diabolus introivit in paradisum et planta­vit arundinem in medio paradisi, et de sputo suo fecit serpentum et praecepit ei in arundine manere. Et sic Diabolus ab­scondevit sapientiam suae fraudis, ut non viderent deceptionem suam. Et introibat ad eos, dicens: "de omni fructu comedite, qui est in paradiso, de fructu iniquitatis ne comedatis. Postea malignus Diabolus, intrans in serpentem malum, et decepit angelum, qui erat in forma mulieris, et effundit super caput eius concupiscentiam peccati, et fuit concupiscentia Evae sicut fornax ardens. Statimque Diabolus, exiens de arundine in forma serpentis, fecit con­cupiscentiam suam cum Eva cum cauda ser­pentis. Ideo non vocantur filii Dei, sed filii Diaboli et filii serpentis voluntates patris facientes diabolicas usque ad sae­culi finem.
Despite the clear differences between this account and that of Eckbert, their themes are the same—human sin was actually the result of illicit intercourse, not the eating of the forbidden fruit. The fact that Satan did not even figure in Eckbert's version reveals, I think, a desire to edit out the overtly dualist depiction of Satan as creator of the material world. Given the similarities between the accounts of this teaching in the *Sermones* and in both Bonacursus and the *De heresi catharorum*, I believe that this editing must have taken place in Lombardy, after which the simpler and less dualistic form of the story moved on to the Rhineland Cathars. Furthermore, based on the common themes of the Bogomil and Cathar versions, as well as the direct link between the two provided by the *De heresi catharorum*, we can posit a line of transmission from the Byzantine Bogomils to the Lombard Cathars, and then, via the well-established trade routes northward through the Alps, to the Rhine valley. Moreover, this allegorical interpretation of Genesis 2:1-7 was not the only Bogomil doctrine to have moved westward along this same route.

Another example of the public and private teachings espoused by the dualist leadership of the
Cathars concerns the refusal to eat meat. According to Eckbert,

Those who have perfectly entered their sect forbid all flesh, not for the reason of monks, or of others, who, living spiritually, abstain from it, but because they say that the heat of flesh must be forbidden because all flesh was born from intercourse, and because of this they judge it to be unclean. And, indeed, they state this reason openly, but in their secret meetings, they say what is worse, namely, that all flesh was created by the devil, and thus not even in the greatest necessity can they eat any of it.\footnote{Sermones, I, pp. 10-11:}

In this case, the Cathar "perfecti" and "doctores" tried to conceal their dualistic basis for rejecting meat. They offered in public a rationale which, although more dualistic than reformist, was probably considered as more acceptable to reformists, since it had appeared in the West before: as a product of sexual intercourse, meat is unclean and must be avoided. We have encountered this view at Soissons in 1114

\footnote{Sermones, I, pp. 10-11:}

Carnem omnem uitant qui perfecte sectam illorum ingressi sunt, non ea causa qua monachi aut alii spiritualiter uiuentes ab ea abstinent sed idcirco uitandum esse esum carnis dicunt quia de concubitu nata sit omnis caro et ex hoc immundam esse arbitrantur. . . Et hanc rationem quidem manifestius dicunt sed in occultis suis quod peius est dicunt, uidelicet omnem carnem facturam esse diaboli ideoque nec in summis necessitatibus eam ullatenus gustant.
and at Cologne in 1143 and have noted the similarities between it and the refusal of the Bulgarian Bogomils to eat meat, since it was a product of the procreation which perpetuated the imprisonment of the spirit in the body.\textsuperscript{155} Although Euthymius Zigabenus did not attribute this refusal of meat to the Byzantine Bogomils, he did report that they fasted on the second, fourth, and sixth day of the week until the ninth hour of the day, but when invited to dinner, they drank and ate like elephants.\textsuperscript{156}

There is still another Cathar teaching in the \textit{Sermones} which betrays the influence of Bogomilism. Eckbert first heard of it during the interrogation of the Cathar Arnold and his followers at Cologne in 1163. According to Eckbert, they said

that human souls are none other than those apostate spirits, which were cast out from the kingdom of Heaven in the beginning of the world, and that in human bodies, they are able to earn salvation through good works, but only if they belong to their sect.\textsuperscript{157}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{155} Peters, \textit{Heresy and Authority}, p. 114.
\item \textsuperscript{156} \textit{Panoplia Dogmatica}, XXVII.25; PG 130, col. 1319D.
\item \textsuperscript{157} \textit{Sermones}, I, p. 16:
\end{itemize}

\textit{Dicebant enim animas humanas nichil aliud esse nisi illos apostatas spiritus qui in principio mundi de regno celorum electi sunt et eos in humanis corporibus posse}
While there are no exact parallels to this belief in Bogomil sources, Zigabenus also recorded an explanation of how the fallen angels would eventually return to Heaven by inhabiting human bodies.

They say that the angels who fell from their place, when they understood that Satan claimed to be the Father, were filled with anger at the generation of men and shamelessly saw the daughters of men and took them as their wives, by which the seed of them would be returned to Heaven to the places of their fathers.\footnote{Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII.9; PG 130, col. 1306:}

Although Zigabenus provided details which are not in Eckbert's account, the themes are the same. Either the teaching had reached the Rhineland Cathars in a

\begin{verbatim}
per bona opera promereri salutem sed hoc non nisi inter eos qui ad eorum pertinent sectam.
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{Cf. Genesis 6:1-2, 4:}

When mankind began to increase and to spread all over the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of the gods saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; so they took for themselves such women as they chose. . . . In those days, when the sons of the gods had intercourse with the daughters of men and got children by them, the Nephilim were on earth.
simplified form, or perhaps Eckbert knew only the main features of the story.

In another passage, Zigabenus described the Bogomils' belief that demons inhabited human bodies:

The Bogomils say that demons flee from them alone, as though an arrow from the quiver, and that each of them inhabit human bodies and instruct them in evil deeds and to pursue wicked works, and when they have died, they [the demons] stay within their remains and await resurrection, so that they are punished together with them and indeed do not leave them.\textsuperscript{159}

I believe the doctrine of fallen angels reported by Eckbert ultimately derived from the Bogomils, although only after undergoing considerable revision. The immediate source of this belief was probably the Lombard Cathars, for they taught something very similar to it. According to the \textit{De heresi catharorum}, they believed that human bodies are in part animated by those evil spirits whom the devil created and in part by those souls that fell. Those souls do penance in these bodies, and, if not saved in one body, a soul goes into another body.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 13; PG 130, col. 1309C-10C:

Dicunt Bogomili daemones tanquam arcus sagittam a se solis aufugere, singulos autem reliquis hominibus singulis inhabitare et facinora edocere, et ad flagitia et impia facta perducere, et cum mortui fuerint, in ipsorum reliquis insidere, et sepulcris assistere, atque resurrectionem exspectare, ut una cum illis punctionur, ac ne in supplicio quidem eos deserere.
and does penance.\textsuperscript{160}

Likewise, the Cathars of Southern France developed their own version of this Bogomil theme. According to Pierre de Vaux-de-Cernay, the Cathars invented some unheard-of notions, saying that our souls are those of angelic spirits who, being cast down from heaven by the apostasy of pride, left their glorified bodies in the air, and that these souls themselves, after successively inhabiting seven terrestrial bodies of one sort or another, having at length fulfilled their penance, return to those deserted bodies.\textsuperscript{161}

There are other teachings attributed by Eckbert to the Cathars which cannot be so easily classified as either Bogomil or reformist. One of these is docetism, which Eckbert assumed must have come from Mani. He began his discussion of this belief by admitting that in the previous sermon, in defense of the Real Presence of Christ,

\begin{quote}
I have constructed an edifice without foundation, for they who know you well say that you deny the humanity of the saviour. If
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{160} Dondaine, "Hiérarchie cathare d'Italie," (1949), pp. 309-10:
\end{flushright}

\begin{quote}
Et dicunt quod corpora humana partim vivificantur ab illis spiritibus malignis, quos diabolus creavit, et partim ab illis spiritibus animabusque ceciderunt. Et in istis corporibus agunt ille anime penitentiam et si in una corpore non salvantur, anima intrat aliud corpus et agit penitentiam.
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
this is so, in vain have I spent the effort to dispute with you concerning the body and blood of the Lord. However, it is not surprising to me that the disciples of an insane master are insane. For the prince of your error, Manes, taught that our saviour appeared in such a form that He seemed, indeed, to be a man and was not truly a man, and that He was not truly born from a virgin, nor truly suffered, nor truly died, and was not truly raised from the dead.162

Although Eckbert believed Mani to be the source of the Cathars' docetism, the Bogomils are a much more plausible source, not only because they were docetists but because they passed this belief on to the Cathars of Lombardy. In this case, as with other of the secret doctrines described by Eckbert, the Lombard heretics appear as likely intermediaries between the Byzantine Bogomils and the Rhineland Cathars. According to Zigabenus, the Bogomils of the twelfth-century were docetists. They taught that Christ descended from Heaven and "entered through the right ear of the Virgin, took on flesh,

162 Sermones, XIII, p. 337:

Edificium sine fundamento, ut opinor, construxi. Nam qui bene uos noscunt saluatoris humanitatem negare uos dicunt. Quod si ita est, uane operam consumpsi disputans uobiscum de corpore et sanguine domini. Non est autem incredibile mihi, insani magistri insanos esse discipulos. Nam princeps erroris uestri, manes, saluatorem nostrum ita in humanitate apparuisset docebat ut uideretur quidem esse homo et non esset uere homo et quod nec uere natus fuisset de uirgine nec uere passus nec uere mortuus nec uere a morte suscitatus . . .
of which, indeed, he seemed to consist of in appearance, and which seemed to be similar to a human body, although it was of perfect and divine material."163

According to the De heresi catharorum, not all of the Lombard Cathars were docetists, just those who followed the teaching of the order of the "Sclavini."164 This sect claimed that "Christ did not really put on flesh, nor did He eat or drink, nor was He crucified, killed, and buried; that everything He did as a man was only semblance, not actuality, and only seemed to be real."165 However,

163 Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII.8; PG 130, col. 1301C: "... descendisse de coelis, et per aurem Virginis dexteram influxisse, carnem induisse, quae aspectu quidem videatur ex materia constare, et humani corporis esse similis, cum tamen revera materiae sit expers ac divina."


165 Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare," I (1950): 311: "Et dicunt quod christus non in veritate carmne suscepit, nec comedit, nec bibit, nec crucifixus, nec mortuus, nec sepultus est, et omnia que secundum humanitatem fecit, non erant in veritate set in apparencia, quia sic videbatur."
those following the heretics of "Bulgaria" believed that Christ was human and that He actually did what he appeared to.\textsuperscript{166} Moreover, Bonacursus, the former Cathar, listed docetism among the errors of the sect in his statement to the clergy of Milan.\textsuperscript{167}

It can be argued that the docetism of the Rhineland Cathars arose independently from the Bogomils, using the same argument which has been made for the independent rise of dualism in the medieval West.\textsuperscript{168} Further, there are two clear reports of docetism in the record of dissent in the West, one from the eleventh and one from the twelfth century. In 1022, the heretics discovered by Arefast were accused of denying Christ's

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{166} Ibid. The phrase "Bulgaria" referred to those mitigated dualists among the Lombard Cathars who followed the teaching of Mark of Lombardy who had, in turn, "received his orders from Bulgaria" according to the author. It has been suggested that this "Bulgarian" sect of Bogomils was actually located in Yugoslavia, near present-day Skoplje; see Wakefield and Evans, \textit{Heresies of the High Middle Ages}, p. 690, n. 10 and Borst, \textit{Die Katharer}, p. 244.
\item \textsuperscript{167} PL 204, col. 776: "... de Christo dicunt, quod non habuit animatum corpus, non manducavit, neque bibit, sed nec aliqua secundum hominem fecit, sed videbatur ita."
\item \textsuperscript{168} See for example, Russell, \textit{Dissent and Reform}, pp. 188-229, and "Interpretations of the origins of medieval heresy," \textit{Medieval Studies}, 25 (1963): 26-53; see also the excellent discussion in Wakefield and Evans, \textit{Heresies of the High Middle Ages}, pp. 6-23.
\end{itemize}
humanity. In 1114, the heretics whom Guibert of Nogent believed to be Manichaeans were said to "believe that the dispensation of the Son of the Virgin is an illusion." Rather than interpreting these two episodes as signs of a nascent docetism indigenous to the West, I believe it much more likely that the Bogomils were the ones responsible for its appearance at Soissons in 1114 and afterward. To postulate a Bogomil presence in the West as early as 1022, based on the docetism of the Orleans heretics, strains the evidence too far. I believe it is best to explain this episode as an isolated expression of gnostic and perhaps Neo-Platonic influence.

It now remains to identify and discuss those teachings of the Cathars which can be classified as


170 Labande, ed., Guibert de Nogent, p. 428: "Eius vero talis dicitur esse summa: dispensationem Filii Virginis fantasma fatentur. . ." The docetism of these heretics, and their rejection of anything produced by intercourse were signs of Bogomil influence, according to Malcolm Lambert, Medieval Heresy, p. 55, and Thouzellier, "Hérésie et croisade au XIIe siècle," p. 858, who also sees Bogomil influence present at Liège in 1143 and Mont-Aimé in 1145. R.I. Moore, however, considered it likely that Guibert invented this denial of the virgin birth and the refusal to eat meat (among other beliefs) to fit with his assumption that this was a long hidden Manichaeans sect of the common people; see his Origins of European Dissent, p. 68. Cf. the views of Russell, Dissent and Reform, pp. 78-81 and Borst, Die Katharer, p. 84.
reformist in origin, as belonging to a long tradition of dissent in the West. There is no need to try to account for these doctrines by positing Bogomil or dualist influence; they fit well into an already established pattern of heresy in Western Europe. Moreover, there are also clear parallels between these Cathars and one of the groups discussed by Everinus in 1143.

A good example of how the Rhineland Cathars were divided along reformist and dualist lines is their view of marriage. We have already seen that one group among them rejected marriage under any circumstances, based on the belief that the human race was born in fornication. However, Eckbert noted two other views of marriage which appear elsewhere among twelfth-century Western heresy. First, some said that "a husband and wife remaining together can in this way be saved, only if they abstain from the conjugal act."171 Moreover, there was still another group of Cathars who allowed marriage between virgins but stipulated that the

171 *Sermones*, V, p. 69: "Dicitis forte, 'Possunt quidem aliquomodo saluari, uir et mulier simul manentes, sed no aliter nisi abistineant ab opere coniugali.'"
partners separate before they died. As shown above, this emphasis on virginity, even for the married, had appeared in the West both in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Moreover, its appearance among the heretics of 1143 provides evidence of the survival of Catharism around Cologne between that time and 1163. In fact, Everinus and Eckbert presumably dealt with some of the same people.

Another example of this reformist element in the Sermones, and of the connection between the heresies of 1143 and 1163, concerns infant baptism. As shown above, the reformists of 1143 condemned every sacrament except baptism because of the sins of the clergy, reserving it for those who could understand it, and thus rejecting infant baptism. Twenty years later, according to Eckbert, the Cathars taught "that baptism is of no use for infants who are baptized, since they are not able to seek baptism of their own will, and since they

172 Ibid., I, p. 10: "Approbare quidem se dicunt quidam ex eis, illorum coniugium quam virgines conueniunt, sed nec illos saluari posse dicunt, nisi ante finem uite sue abinuicem separantur . . ."

173 PL 182, col. 679B.

174 Ibid., col. 679A-B.
cannot profess any faith."\footnote{175} This explanation was the one offered publicly, but in secret the Cathars had other reasons for opposing infant baptism, namely "that no baptism in water is useful for salvation. And for this reason they rebaptize in some secret manner those who pass into their sect, which they call a baptism in the Holy Spirit and in fire."\footnote{176} Thus, it seems clear that in secret, the Cathar leadership condemned infant baptism based on a dualist anti-materialism. However, their uninitiated followers did not know of this teaching, and so were taught to reject infant baptism using perfectly good reformist arguments.

Still another sign of reformist influence on the Cathars is their rejection of purgatorial punishment and their belief that prayers or services

\footnote{175} Sermones, I, p. 11: "Baptismum nichil prodesse dicunt paruulis qui baptizantur, quia per se ipsos baptismum petere non possunt et quia nullam fidel possunt profiteri."

\footnote{176} Ibid.: Est autem aliud quod inde communius sed occultius locuntur, uidelicet quod nullus baptismus in aqua prosit ad salutem. Vnde et eos qui ad sectam illorum transierunt, suo quodam occulto modo rebaptizant quem baptismum in spiritu sancto et igni fieri dicunt.
for the dead were thus useless. This attitude had appeared before in the West, although not often. In 1025, the heretics questioned by Bishop Gerard of Arras-Cambrai rejected prayers for the dead. In the twelfth century, Henry of Lausanne declared that prayers for the dead were useless, "for they are all either damned or saved as soon as they die." Peter of Bruis, possibly a follower of Henry's for a time, made the same argument concerning the dead. In 1143, as shown above, one of the two heretical groups near Cologne argued

177 Ibid., p. 12:
Non enim recipiunt quod credit universalis ecclesiae, uidelicet esse quasdam purgatorias penas in quibus anime quorundam electorum ad tempus examinantur pro peccatis suis de quibus in hac uita per condignam satisfactionem ad plenum purgate non sunt. Propterea ergo arbitrantur superfluum et uanum esse orare pro mortuis, elemosinas dare, missas celebrare, et irredit pulsationes campanarum quas facimus que tamen pia ratione in ecclesia fiunt, ut uiui ad orandum pro mortuis commoneatur et ad memoriam proprie mortis excitentur.

178 Acta synodi Atrebatensi, p. 4.


that there was no purgatorial fire, arguing that "when the soul leaves the body it passes at once either to eternal rest or eternal punishment," and citing Ecclesiastes 11:3 in support.181

According to Eckbert, the Cathars rejected prayers for the dead based on this same verse, among others. They interpreted this verse to mean that if the soul moves toward peace, it will remain there forever, and if it moves toward punishment, it will likewise stay there forever. Eckbert explained that the Cathars had mistakenly interpreted the scripture by taking it out of context. When read with the previous verse, it clearly stated that upon death some few believers may go directly to Heaven, but that most, while destined for Paradise, must suffer punishment for sins not remitted during their lives.182

Another of the verses cited by the Cathars in support of their view of the dead was Luke 23:43, in which Jesus tells the thief on the cross, "Truly, I

181 PL 182, col. 679D:

Purgatorium ignem post mortem non concedunt; sed animas statim, quando egrediuntur, de corpore in aeternam vel requiem, vel poenam transire, propter illa Salomonis: "Lignum in quamcunque partem ceciderit, siue ad austrum, siue ad aquilonem, ibi manebit."

182 Sermones, X, pp. 191-94.
say to you, today you will be with me in paradise."
Eckbert admitted that if the thief was truly penitent and cleansed of all sin, he could have been taken directly to Heaven. But he claimed that the Cathars mistakenly applied this special circumstance universally, to apply to every sin.183

There is another Cathar doctrine whose source is puzzling, but which I have assigned to the reformist tradition: the rejection of the Catholic communion and its replacement by another form of communion. Eckbert did not attribute this practice to the dualist leadership but to all the Cathars:

they believe that the body and blood of the Lord can in no way be consecrated or received by us through communion; however, they say that they alone, in their meals, consecrate the body of the Lord. But in these words, they are deceitful, for they do not mean that true body of Christ, which we believe was born of the Virgin and suffered on the cross, but they call their own flesh the body of the Lord, and in this way, they say that when they nourish their own bodies with the food of their table, they consecrate the body of the Lord.184

183 Ibid., pp. 183-84.
184 Ibid., I, pp. 13-14:

Corpus domini et sanguinem nullo modo nostra consecratione fieri aut a nobis per communicationem percipi posse credunt. Se autem solos in mensis suis corpus domini facere dicunt sed in uerbis illis dolum habent. Non enim uerum illud corpus significant quod de uirgine natum fuisse credimus et quod passum est in cruce sed sui ipsius carnem corpus
This curious doctrine does not appear to have come from the Byzantine Bogomils, for I have found no practice from which it could be derived. According to Zigabenus, the Bogomils condemned and despised the Lord's Supper, labeling it a sacrifice to demons, who, they believed, inhabited the Orthodox churches. Moreover, they allegorized the elements of communion: the bread was the Lord's prayer and the wine was the New Testament.\textsuperscript{185}

The alternative of placing this ritual within the reformist tradition is not wholly satisfactory either, and might lead one to deny its authenticity. In fact, Jeffrey Russell considered Eckbert's testimony unreliable on this point, claiming that "It is unlikely that real Catharists would have held such ideas; either Eckbert was mistaken or the heretics said this in mockery of the Christian sacrament."\textsuperscript{186}

The problem cannot be dismissed so easily, however, because, as shown above, there was a similar form of communion reported among the domini uocant. Et in eo quod sua corpora nutriunt cibis mense sue corpus domini se facere dicunt.

\textsuperscript{185} Panoplia Dogmatica, XXVII.17; PG 130, col. 1313C.

\textsuperscript{186} Dissent and Reform, p. 224.
heretics around Cologne in 1143. Moreover, Everinus placed this belief among those heretics with Bogomil connections, and not among those of local derivation, who rejected the Eucharist because of the sins of the clergy. This would argue for assigning the practice to the dualist "perfecti" and "doctores" of whom Eckbert wrote, since other of their doctrines correspond so closely with the "Bogomil" faction of 1143. In this case, however, I believe Everinus may well have confused the two groups with which he was dealing, attributing what was actually a reformist practice to those influenced by Bogomilism. In my view, it is more likely that this interesting form of Holy Communion developed out of the rejection of the Eucharist which already existed in Western Europe. From the belief that the priest's sins invalidated the efficacy of the host, apparently some reformers in the Rhineland developed what they considered a more pure and apostolic form of the sacrament, inspired by the Gospels. This same impulse may have appeared earlier in Western Europe; the heretics of Orleans, in 1022, claimed to cleanse their adherents of sin by a lying on of hands. Those condemned at Arras

187 See above, p. 43; PL 182, col. 678B.
188 Guérard, ed., Vetus Aganon, p. 111.
in 1025 rejected baptism by water and instead washed each other's feet.\footnote{Acta synodi Atrebatensi, p. 4. There is some question as to the accuracy of this statement by the Synod of Arras. It is part of a list of errors refuted by the bishop which appears to have been inserted in the record of the synod's proceedings. This list does not agree in all respects with the doctrines abjured by the heretics before the synod. I have regarded the statement about the washing of feet as probably derived from some earlier interrogation of the heretics, following the suggestion of Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, p. 84.}

Another example of this skepticism at work among the Rhineland Cathars concerns their rejection of the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ. Although the dualist leadership rejected the idea because they were docetists, there appears to have been another faction of heretics for whom the very notion of the Real Presence was illogical. Eckbert reported that one well-known Cathar, when interrogated on his deathbed, claimed that Christ's body would have to have been as big as a mountain to have fed so many.\footnote{Sermones, XII, pp. 328-29: Vir quidam nostri temporis qui infamatus erat quod de cataria uestra gustasset, cum interrogetetur in extremis suis, an uellet dari sibi corpus domini, dixisse memoratur, 'Si esset illud corpus tante quantitatis, ut est petra mons est secus renum erenberti iamdudum esset consumptum ex quo primum cepit manducari.'}

In another passage, he recalled a dispute with a Cathar who asked how the...
Christian clergy could distribute the body of the Lord when they lived so "irrationabiliter". In addition to the sense of immoral, I believe the word in this context also implies "irrationally" or "illogically".

This repudiation of the Real Presence was also expressed in the belief that the Mass itself is only a commemorative act, based on a literal interpretation of Jesus' command to his disciples to "Do this in remembrance of me". This meant that before his death, Christ did indeed give up his body and blood to the disciples, but that after His death and resurrection, this sacrifice could only be commemorated. The miracle of transubstantiation had occurred only once, during the Last Supper. While this attitude has no exact parallels within the reformist tradition, there had already appeared doctrines which seem to point to it. The heretics active around Perigueux in 1147 claimed that the

---

191 Ibid., XII, p. 312: "... et dicebat ita de eis, 'Quomodo potest fieri ut qui tam irrationabiliter uiuunt distribuant in ecclesia corpus domini?'"

192 Raffaello Morghen also cited this use of "irrationabiliter" to mean not only moral fault but something wrong from the point of view of reason. See his *Medioevo Christiano*, p. 254.

193 Luke 22:19

194 *Sermones*, XII, pp. 305-09.
sacrament was only a useless piece of bread.\textsuperscript{195} 

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide a context in which to place Eckbert's sermons, in terms of events within the Rhineland and forces impinging on it from outside. Two such internal forces were the struggle by the Church to reform canonical life and the preaching of the apostolic life by those who envisioned a much more fundamental reform of the Church than did its hierarchy. From outside the Rhineland, two other forces combined with these during the mid-twelfth century, intensifying them. These were the papal schism and the arrival of Bogomilism in Western Europe. For Eckbert, the schism was partly responsible for growing abuses like simony and absenteeism. He believed that such problems could only be corrected when the Church itself was healed. Second, by the 1140's, Bogomil dualism (if not Bogomil missionaries themselves) had reached the Rhineland. Its adherents at first clashed with the already existing reform movement, remaining altogether distinct from it. By 1163, however, this had changed. Based on views which at first sight appeared quite similar, these the two movements had

\textsuperscript{195} Heriberti monachi \textit{epistola de haereticis Petragorici} in PL 181, col. 1722.
merged into a single heresy.

Whether or not this union was the result of a purposeful campaign by the dualists, it appeared to Eckbert as very perplexing and very dangerous, especially because the Cathars seemed to be as holy and as learned as the Catholic clergy (if not more so). Further, Eckbert realized that those Cathar doctrines most destructive to the Church, those of the dualists, were kept well hidden from the general populace, and in fact from most of the heretics themselves. Under these circumstances—a particularly complex heresy which was making gains at a time when the Church was preoccupied with its own problems—Eckbert produced a very lucid description of the Cathars. Moreover, this achievement rested not on his use of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings, but on his own considerable knowledge of the Cathars. This proposition will be considered in the following chapter.
Chapter IV
Augustine and the Sermones

In the previous chapter, the argument was presented that Eckbert's description of the divisions within the Cathar community is remarkably accurate, considering the complicated strands of dissent from which it was formed. Of course, accepting this statement means accepting Eckbert as a reliable witness. I have done so, since I am convinced that his own encounters with the Cathars, over a number of years, formed the basis of his polemic against them. Previous scholars have exaggerated his reliance on Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings, and as a consequence a very elucidating source for Catharism's early development in Western Europe has been neglected.

In the balance of this chapter I will defend and illustrate this thesis using two strategies. First, I will examine and interpret the purpose of Eckbert's first sermon, in which he described the origin of the Cathars. Second, I will study Eckbert's refutation of those doctrines which the Cathars and Manichaeans had in common, for these are
the places in which Augustine's influence is most likely to be evident.

Eckbert's first sermon in the series of fourteen must be examined in some detail, since I believe that it is largely responsible for the scholarly view of the _Sermones_ as dependent on the work of Augustine. It will be shown that although this opening sermon does contain material derived from Augustine, primarily from the _De haeresibus_, Eckbert's purpose was not to describe contemporary Cathars, but ancient Manichaeans. He wanted to demonstrate to the educated reader that the Cathars' origins were to be found among the Manichaeans, so that they could be more easily detected and refuted. This purpose was facilitated not only by describing the similarities between Cathars and Manichaeans but also by documenting their differences, by illustrating how the Cathars had evolved into a quite different heresy than that of their progenitors.

While it is true that Eckbert was the first medieval heresiologist to posit an explicit connection between the Cathars and Manichaeans, he did not regard them as identical.¹ In fact, the

¹ During the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the identification of heretics in general with Manichaeans was common, but I have found no evidence
relationship which Eckbert fashioned between these two heresies represented a considerably more sophisticated attempt than that displayed by earlier writers. His attempt to prove (rather than simply to assume) the link between Mani and the Cathars, based on the writings of Augustine and his own knowledge, was an important step in the direction of the later inquisitorial accounts of heresy.

Furthermore, the *Sermones* must be carefully examined for any evidence that Eckbert borrowed from, or paraphrased, Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. Where evidence of this is found, its purpose must be explained. The Rhineland Cathars

that any writer before Eckbert specifically linked Cathars and Manichaeans. The report which comes closest to such an association was probably that of the Council of Rheims in 1157, which condemned a sect it labeled "Piphilis" or "weavers", declaring that

> Quoniam impurissima Manichaeorum secta tergiversatione lubrica sub specie religionis apud imperitissimos se occultans, simplicium animas perditum ire molitur, et per abjectissimos textores, qui saepe de loco fugiunt ad locum, nominaque commutarunt ...

Despite the identification of these heretics with weavers, (textores) which is also found in Eckbert (see *Sermones*, I, p. 9), there is no evidence that these "Manichaeans" around Rheims were identified as Cathars. See the discussion in H. Maisonneuve, *Etudes sur les origines de l'inquisition*, 2nd ed. (Paris: 1960): 108-18. I have utilized the Latin edition in James Fears, *Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung im Hochmittelalter* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1968): 59.
and the ancient Manichaeans did in fact deny some of the same teachings of the Church, although their motives were generally very different. In his defense of the Church's doctrines against the Cathars, Eckbert would have had ample opportunity to borrow from Augustine's arguments against the Manichaeans. But in fact he did not do so. As examples, I shall concentrate on the following doctrines denied by both Manichaeans and Cathars: the condemnation of marriage, the refusal to eat meat, the dualistic view of creation and the world, and the denial of Christ's humanity. I believe that these beliefs represented for Eckbert the most visible connections between Cathars and Manichaeans and thus must play an important part in confirming, or disproving, his dependence on Augustine. If Eckbert's description and refutation of these doctrines is found to be largely independent of Augustine, his credibility as a source must be strengthened.

It is clear that Eckbert posited a direct link between the Cathars and the Manichaeans. In the section of the first sermon entitled "Whence the Origin of the Sect derives", Eckbert wrote:

It is known and is not concealed from the ears of the people that the sect about which we write has its origin from the Manichaean heresiarch, whose
doctrine was cursed and completely poisonous and is rooted in that perverse people.  

More specifically, Eckbert considered the Cathars the off-shoot of the Manichaean sect called "catharistae" by Augustine.  

2 *Sermones*, I, p. 17:  

Sciendum uero est et non celandum ab auribus vulgi quoniam indubitanter secta eorum de quibus agimus originem accept a manicheo heresiarcha, cuius doctrina maledicta erat et tota uenennosa et radicata est in populo isto peruerso.  

3 *De haeresibus*, 46, from the edition by Liguori Müller, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine*, vol. 90 of *The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1956): 90. The "Catharists" were one of the three groups of Manichaeans which Augustine described, the other two being the "Mattarians" and the "Manichaeans". Augustine explained the origin of the "catharistae" as another word for "purifiers" [purgatores], stemming from the need of the Manichaean perfect to purge or cleanse from their bodies the part of the divine power imprisoned within them:  

Divinas enim virtutes quantum possunt imitari se putant ut purgent Dei sui partem; quam profecto, sicut in omnibus corporibus caelestibus et terrestribus atque in omnium rerum seminibus, ita et in hominis semine teneri existimant iniquitatem. Ac per hoc sequitur eos, ut sic eam etiam de semine humano, quemadmodum de allis seminibus quae in alimentis sumunt, debeant manducando purgare. Unde etiam Catharistae appellantur, quasi purgatores, tanta eam purgantes diligentia ut se nec ab hac tam horrenda cibi turpitudine abstineant.
of these," Eckbert wrote, "these undoubtedly follow, about whom we speak now." Rather than enumerate all the errors of this sect in the sermon, Eckbert added a collection of relevant texts from three works of Augustine to the end of the Sermones: the De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum, the Contra epistolam manichaei quam vocant fundamenti (called the Contra manicheos by Eckbert); and the De haeresibus. His purpose was to provide further background to the origins of the Cathar sect, so that "those who should read might be able to recognize this entire heresy more completely, as though from the beginning, and should understand why this heresy is considered to

4 Sermones, I, p. 23: "Quorum doctrinam et uitam indubitanter sectantur isti, de quibus nunc sermo nobis est."

5 De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum was written in the year or two after Augustine's baptism in 388 A.D., the second book of which refuted Manichean dualism and immorality. Edited in Migne, PL 32, col. 1309-78. Written in 397 A.D., the Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti contained excerpts of a letter attributed to Mani, an important part of the Manichaean canon of writings, upon which Augustine commented. Edited by J. Zycha, CSEL, 25 (1891): 195-234. The De haeresibus, written in 428 or 429 A.D., at the request of Quodvultdeus, a deacon at Carthage, comprised descriptions of 84 heresies, for which Augustine relied on both earlier works of church history and the writings of heretics of his own day. Edited by Müller, The De Haeresibus, with English translation and by R. Vander Plaetses and C. Beukers, CCSL, 46 (1969): 283-345.
be the foundation of all heresies." He regarded such information as useful in protecting those "vacillating spirits of naive men, who, having been deceived by their [the Cathars'] tricky speech, judge them to walk according to the truth." Despite the close relationship which Eckbert posited between Manichaeans and Cathars, a closer look at the first sermon will show that he did distinguish between them and that he did not lift whole passages from Augustine and apply them to the contemporary Cathars.

First, while proclaiming that the Cathar heresy derived from Mani, Eckbert clearly distinguished between the two heresies and was aware that over time changes in Manichaean teaching had occurred. He acknowledged that the Cathars have mixed many things with the teachings of their masters, which are not found among the heresies of that man [Mani]. For they are divided against themselves, since some things which are said by some are denied by

---

6 *Sermones*, I, p. 24: "... ut qui legerint possint quasi a fundamento totam hanc heresim plenius agnoscere et intelligent quoniam hec heresia omnium heresum sentina est."

7 *Sermones*, I, p. 5: "... ad confirmandos uacillantes animos seductibilium hominum qui, dolosis sermonibus illorum decepti, ambulare eos secundum ueritatem existimant."
Thus, unlike some earlier chroniclers, Eckbert did not label contemporary heretics "Manichaeans." For example, in about 1018, Adhemar of Chabannes wrote that "Manichaeans appeared throughout Aquitaine leading the people astray."9 In 1022, Adhemar wrote of ten canons of Orleans who appeared to be very religious but who were found to be Manichaeans.10 Moreover, between 1043 and 1048, Anselm, a canon at the cathedral of Liège, reported that in the diocese of Chalons,

there were some countryfolk who, eagerly following the perverse dogmas of the Manichaeans, met together in secret assemblies, performing I know not what obscene acts and things shameful to mention, engaging in a certain solemn rite, and falsely saying that the Holy Spirit is given by a sacrilegious imposition of hands, whom, in order to support their faith in their error, they most falsely claimed to have been sent by God, in no others except in their heresiarch Mani, as though Mani himself were no other than

8 Ibid., pp. 17-18: "Multa tamen permixta habent doctrine magistri sui que inter hereses illius non inueniuntur. Divisi sunt etiam contra semetipsos quia nonnulla que ab aliquibus eorum dicuntur ab aliis negantur."


10 Ibid., pp. 184-85.
the Holy Spirit . . ."11

That Manichaeans were actually present in

eleventh-century Europe has been dismissed by modern

scholarship.12 Clearly, these two chroniclers

11 Rudolp Koepke, ed., Herigeri et Anselmi
Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium, 2, MGH, SS, 8, p.
226:

Aiebat enim in quadam parte diocesis suae
quosdam rusticos esse, qui perversum Mani-
cheorum dochma sectantes, furtiva sibi
frequentarent conventicula, nescio quae
obscura et dicto turpia, quodam sua
sollennitate actitantes et per sacrilegam
manum impositionem dari Spiritum sanctum
mentientes, quem ad astruendam errori suo
fidem non alias a Deo missum quam in here-
siarche suo Mani, quasi nichil aliud sit
Manis nisi Spiritus sanctus, falsissime
docmatizarent, incidentes in illam blas-
phemiam, quam iuxta veritatis vocem et
hic et in futuro impossible est remitti.

12 Although the great nineteenth-century
authority on the Cathars, Charles Schmidt, denied
any link between the ancient Manichaeans and the
medieval Cathars, the idea that Manichaeism had
survived in some form into the Middle Ages found
supporters during the first half of the twentieth
century. Included among them was H.C. Lea, History
of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages (New York,
1887-88; rpt. and abridgement, Margaret Nicholson,
New York, 1961): 41-42; Paul Alphandéry, "Le
Gnosticisme dans les sectes médiévales latines,"
Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 7
(1927): 395-411; and Antoine Dondaine, "Nouvelles
sources de l'histoire doctrinale du néo-maniéisme
au moyen âge," Revue des sciences philosophiques et
théologiques, 28 (1939): 465-88. The most thorough
exposition of this thesis was Steven Runciman's The
Medieval Manichee (Cambridge: Cambridge University

During the 1950s', however, Runciman's thesis
that Manichaeism had been transmitted via gnostic
sects to medieval Europe was challenged, most
notably by Hans Söderberg, La Religion des Cathares
(Uppsala, 1949): 22, and Raffaello Morghen, who saw
utilized a familiar heretical tradition to describe no evidence of continuity between Manichaean dualism and the heresies appearing in Western Europe after 1000. See his L'Eresia Nel Medioevo (Bari, 1951): 228-29 and "Problèmes sur l'origine de l'hérésie au moyen-âge," in Jacques Le Goff, ed., Hérésies et sociétés (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1968): 122-23. Arno Borst, in what is still regarded as a seminal work on the Cathars, noted what seemed a continuous stream of dualist influence from the Late Roman Empire to the twelfth century as well as the many ways in which Bogomilism influenced Cathar belief and ritual. Still, Borst emphasized the importance of indigenous Western reform movements in the rise of Catharism and the extent to which these reformists modified the Bogomil doctrines which they encountered. See his Die Katharer (Stuttgart: Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 12, 1953): 72, n. 2, 173-202, and "La transmission de l'hérésie au moyen âge," in Hérésies et Sociétés, p. 273.

Since the 1960s, most scholars have moved further from Runciman's thesis, rejecting the notion of "medieval Manichaism" and becoming more skeptical of eleventh and twelfth-century chroniclers who tended to explain any unfamiliar and vaguely dualist heresy in terms of Manichaeism. The view that contacts between Eastern dualism and Western heresy only began in the first half of the twelfth century has gained wide acceptance. See, for example, Herbert Grundmann, Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter (Berlin: Historische Studien, 1935; rept. Vaduz: Kraus, 1965): 24-27; Jeffrey Russell, Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), and "Interpretations of the Origins of Medieval Heresy," Mediaeval Studies, 15 (1963): 26-53; and R.I. Moore, "Origins of Medieval Heresy," History, 55 (1970): 32-35. Among those scholars who would place the entrance of Bogomil dualism into Western Europe earlier, during the eleventh century, are Malcolm Lambert, Medieval Heresy. Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976): 33, 51-54. However, despite continuing debate over how early Bogomil or dualist influence can be detected in the heresy of the medieval West, no credence is now given to the notion that these Western heretics represented the surviving remnants of ancient Manichaism.
contemporary forms of dissent of which they probably had only a cursory knowledge.

Moreover, it appears that Eckbert's view of the Manichaeans as the progenitors of the Cathars derived, in part, from the Cathars themselves, not just from his reading of Augustine. In the first sermon, he reported that the Cathars "betray the fact that they themselves are of the error of Manichaeus, in that they are accustomed to say that the blessed Augustine revealed their secrets."¹³ No doubt, the Cathars were steadily confronted with texts from Augustine during disputations with Catholics like Eckbert and were forced to explain why so many of their own beliefs appeared among the Manichaeans. Eckbert's statement suggests that their response was similar to that of Church polemicists—they assumed a connection between themselves and the Manichaeans. Indeed, if Eckbert correctly reported what the Cathars said about Augustine, it appears that some of them even identified themselves as Manichaeans. It is most likely that the Cathar leadership, those whom

¹³ *Sermones*, I, p. 24: "Produnt autem semetipsum quod sint de errore manichei in eo quod dicere solent quod beatus Augustinus prodiderit secreta eorum . . ."
Eckbert referred to as "doctores" and "perfecti", developed this notion based upon their arguments with Christian opponents and perhaps their own reading of Augustine. Thus, when Eckbert wrote that the Cathars followed the doctrine and life of that sect of Manichaeans called the "catharistae", he may have been reporting what the Cathars themselves claimed. In fact, the question of how

---

14 It was to these "doctors" and "perfect" that Eckbert addressed his arguments throughout the sermons; see, for example, *Sermones*, V, p. 62: "Uobis loquor doctoribus et perfectis, non in sanctitate quidem, sed in errore et peruersitate." Moreover, it seems clear that only after some years in the sect could one advance to the level of the doctors and perfect. Eckbert wrote that the Cathar leadership concealed certain secret teachings of the sect from those who joined for as long as fifteen years, out of fear that they would be betrayed. See *Sermones*, II, p. 29:

Nam ab ipsis quoque qui ueniunt ad uos fidem uestra uxor ex qua saluandos uos esse speratis et occulta opera uestra longo tempore, ut dicunt, quindecim annis occultatis donec diu eos probaueritis, ita ut sperare possitis de eis quod non prodant uos.

This period of what amounted to probation was to become characteristic of the Cathars during the thirteenth century, when a period of instruction, or "abstentia", was required before the reception of the "consolamentum". See Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976): 121-22.

The rite of passage to the level of the "perfecti" and "doctores" was almost certainly the spiritual baptism of the Cathars, conferred by the laying on of hands, an early form of what later was called the "consolamentum", the central rite of Catherism in both France and Lombardy.
much the Cathars knew about Augustine, and how they responded to the arguments drawn from his work merits much more attention.

Second, while Eckbert did incorporate passages from Augustine into his first sermon, it was for the purpose of describing what he considered their origins, as is clear from the subtitle of this section: "Whence this sect takes its origin." This was the same reason that Eckbert compiled an addendum of Augustine's anti-Manichaean works. He believed that becoming familiar with the early history of the contemporary Cathars could help his readers recognize them in their current form. For this task, Eckbert naturally turned to Augustine, probably his only available source. It is noteworthy that in few places outside the first sermon do we find such borrowing, since Eckbert's knowledge of the Cathars was based heavily on first-hand sources.

An example of the confusion which a reading of Eckbert's first sermon can cause is the following passage, concerning the origin of the Manichaean sect and its organization. In it, Eckbert was drawing from Augustine's *De haeresibus*, but he was

15 *Sermones*, I, p. 17: "Unde secta hoc originem ducat."
Moreover, this Manicheus, about whom I should now speak a little, was born in Persia, and indeed was called "Manes" at first, while afterwards he was called "Manicheus" by his disciples, so that he would not appear to be insane. However, he was so insane that he called himself the Holy Spirit and said that he had been sent by Christ into the world, just as He had promised when He ascended into Heaven. And in fact he also called himself an apostle of Christ, as one having been sent by Him. And so his disciples gloried in the fact that in their master the promise of Christ concerning the Holy Spirit had been fulfilled. From these disciples, moreover, he chose twelve, whom he considered apostles, so that he might conform to the model of Christ, who chose for Himself twelve of His disciples to be apostles. And his imitators choose the same number to this day, since from their elect they choose twelve whom they call masters, and a thirteenth is chosen as their leader; moreover, they have 72 bishops who are ordained by the masters, and presbyters and deacons, who are ordained by the bishops, and these are called the elect among them. However, those who have not attained to such perfection that they can be called "elect", are called "listeners". Moreover, they are sent to all those who seem attracted to their error, either where it has been planted and has increased, or where it is not yet planted.16

---

16 Ibid., I, pp. 19-20:

Manicheus autem iste, ut nunc pauca de illo loquar, a persia oriundus erat et primo quidem manes dicebatur; postea uero a discipulis sui manicheus appellatus est, ne insanus uideretur et dictus manes a mania, quod est insanie nomen. Sic autem insanus erat ut diceret se esse spiritum sanctum et se missum fuisse a christo in mundum, sicut promiserat cum ascensurus esset in celum. Ideoque et christi se apostolum dicebat quasi missum
At first glance, it might seem that Eckbert has lifted a whole section from the *De haeresibus* to describe the contemporary Cathar hierarchy:  

Ab ipso. Inde et discipuli eius ex hoc gloriabantur quod in magistro ipsorum completa fuisse promissio christi de spiritu paraclito. Ex numero discipulorum suorum duodecim elegit quos quasi apostolos suos habebat, ut in hoc haberet formam christi, qui ex discipulis suis duodecim sibi elegit apostolos. Quem numerum imitatores eius et hodierna die observant, qui ex electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros et tertium decimum principem ipsorum, episcopos autem septuagintados qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros ac diaconos qui ab episcopis ordinantur et hi electi inter eos uocantur. Quic uero non ad tantam perfectionem peruerunt ut electi possint dici auditores uocantur. Mittuntur autem ex omnibus qui idonei uidentur ad eorum errorem, vel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, vel ubi non est seminandum.

The resemblance between Mani's name in Greek and the Greek word for "mad" was noted and exploited widely by Christian polemicists such as Augustine and appears in anti-Manichaean texts in Latin, Greek, and Coptic. See C.H. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985): 104; and Müller, *The De Haeresibus*, pp. 161-62.

17 Eckbert drew from the following two passages; see Müller, *The De Haeresibus*, pp. 84, 94:

Manichei a quodam Persa exstiterunt qui vocabatur Manes; quamvis et ipsum, cum eius insana doctrina coepisset in Graecia praeidicari, Manichaenum discipuli eius appellare maluerunt devitantes nomen insaniae. Unde quidam eorum quasi doc- tiores et eo ipso mendaciores, geminata littera, Mannicheum vocant, quasi manna fundentem.
indeed, that is what Milan Loos assumed.\textsuperscript{18} Such an assumption is wrong, however; Eckbert believed he was outlining the Cathars' origins, not the sect as it existed in his time.

Another passage which could easily lead one to conclude that Eckbert was applying to the Cathars what Augustine had written of the Manichaeans is Eckbert's statement that Mani chose twelve disciples, to conform to the model of Christ, and that "his imitators choose the same number to this

\textbf{Also:}

\begin{quote}
Promissionem Domini Iesu Christi de Paraclito Spiritu Sancto in suo haeresiarcha Manichaeo dicunt esse completam. Unde se in suis litteris Iesu Christi apostolum dicit, eo quod Iesus Christus se missurum esse promiserit, atque in illo miserit Spiritum Sanctum. Propter quod etiam ipse Manichaeus duodecim discipulos habuit ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichaei hodieque custodient. Nam ex Electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros, et tertium decimum principem ipsorum; episcopos autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos. Iam ceteri tantummodo Electi vocantur. Sed mittuntur etiam ipsi qui videntur idonei ad hunc errorem vel ubi est sustentandum et augendum, vel ubi non est etiam seminandum.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages (Prague: Academia, for the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1974): 116.
Although here Eckbert appeared to be referring to contemporary Cathars, he was quoting Augustine, who wrote in the De haeresibus that "Manichaeus also had twelve disciples in imitation of the twelve Apostles, which number the Manichaeans keep this number even today."  

Furthermore, it might be argued that Eckbert wrote "imitatores" because he was referring to contemporary Cathars, but this word could have been applied as easily to the "followers" or "imitators" of Mani, and I believe that it was in this sense that Eckbert used the word. This meaning would fit with his purpose of describing the Cathars' origins. When Eckbert described the Cathars of his own day, nowhere did he refer to Cathar masters, bishops, presbyters or deacons, nor did he mention groups of twelve disciples. He did not use the words "electi" and "auditores" by which Augustine regularly designated the Manichaeans.  

---

19 Sermones, I, p. 19: "Quem numerum imitatores eius et hodierna die observant, . . . ."

20 De haeresibus, 46; Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 94: "Propter quod etiam ipse Manichaeus duodecim discipulos habuit ad instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichaei hodieque custodiunt."

21 According to Augustine, the Manichaeans contained the two "orders" of "electi" and "auditores"; the latter were responsible for helping the elect maintain a life which would bring
the Cathar organization which emerges in the sermons is very different from that of the Manichaeans as described in Augustine's work. The "perfect" and "doctors" to whom Eckbert referred appear to have been the possessors of certain secret doctrines accessible only to those who had undergone a baptism with fire and the Holy Spirit. Eckbert also used the term "archcathar" to designate the presiding official at this baptism, but this may well be a term of opprobrium and not a title actually used by the Cathars. The "archcathar" may well have been no harm to the particles of Light trapped within nature. The hearers were not required to live as austerely as the elect. See De haeresibus, 46; Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 86; Contra Faustum, XXX.5-6; CSEL, 25, pp. 752, 755; and De moribus ecclesiae catholicae, XXXV.80; PL 32, col. 1344C. Augustine's description of this relationship between the "electi" and "auditores" is confirmed in Manichaean literature; see, for example, the Fragmenta Tebestina, II.2 in PL, suppl. 2.

22 Sermones, IX, pp. 161-63. Eckbert's description of this baptism is as follows:

Conuenientibus uobis in unum in aliquo obscura penetrati, primum hoc diligen-
tissime procuratur, ne forte per aliquam fenestram aut per ostium quisquam eorum qui foris sunt, uisu uel auditu, percipiat quod intus geritur . . . Locantur luminaria copiose in prietibus cunctis, statur per ordinem in circuitu cum reuerencia magna quoniam sancta res agitur que tamen magis complaciet diabolo quam deo. Statuitur in medio infelix ille qui baptizandus, siue katharizandus est, et assistit ei archicatharus, tenens in manu libellum deputatum ad hoc officium. Quem imponens uertici eius, dicit bene-
served as the equivalent of a Catholic bishop, guiding a group of Cathar congregations, but this is not clear. How these perfect, doctors, and archcathars fit into the hierarchy of each community is uncertain; perhaps one person could hold all three titles. In any case, Eckbert provided no further information on the Cathar hierarchy, and while his description of Cathar baptism reflects the presence of an ecclesiastical organization among them, it was very loosely structured.

Because the Cathars did, in fact, profess some of the same doctrines as had the Manichaeans, we must look carefully at each for any sign of Augustine's influence. First, both sets of heretics rejected marriage. Upon reading Eckbert and Augustine, it becomes clear that the reasons for the Cathar condemnation of marriage were different than those of the Manichaeans; thus, Eckbert refuted doctrines which did not appear in Augustine's writings but did exist among contemporary Cathars in Italy. Consequently,

\[ \text{dictiones que pocius maledictiones uocande sunt, orantibus ceteris qui circumstant et faciunt filium gehenne, non regni dei, sic-que perficitur ille baptismus. Dicitur autem hic baptismus fieri in igne propter ignem luminum que in circuitu ardent.} \]
although Eckbert had read about the Manichaean rejection of marriage in Augustine, he did not incorporate any of this material into his defense of this institution.

In his refutation of the Cathar condemnation of marriage, Eckbert revealed different motives at work among them, and identified three different views concerning marriage. Some Cathars seem to have condemned marriage due to an emphasis on asceticism which fit in with the reform movements then active in Europe; others, however, based their rejection of marriage on a secret teaching whose source was probably Bogomilism. In his list of Cathar errors in the opening sermon, Eckbert wrote that the Cathars

reject and condemn marriage, to the point that they promise nothing other than eternal damnation to those who remain married until the end of their lives. However, some of them say that they approve of marriage between virgins but say that these are not able to be saved, unless before their lives end they separate from one another, and so in this way they also prohibit marriage.23

23 Ibid., I, pp. 9-10:

Et quidem uere hi sunt ad quos pertinet hic sermo quoniam nuptias reprobant et condempnant ita quod non aliu quam eternam damnationem promittunt eis qui in coniugali uita permanent usque in finem. Approbare quidem se dicunt quidam ex eis illorum coniugium qui uirgines conueniunt sed nec illos saluari posse
In the fifth sermon, Eckbert described another Cathar position on marriage which represented a modification of allowing virgins to marry:

To this again I return to what you say, that the married who come together as virgins ought to produce only one child. From where do you derive this?24

As shown in the previous chapter, the refusal to marry was part of the movement for religious reform in eleventh- and twelfth-century Europe, although some heretics allowed marriage provided there was no sexual intercourse or production of children.25 For example, the people questioned at Monteforte in 1028 professed that although they

\[ \text{dicunt, nisi ante finem uite sue abinuicem seperentur ac pro hoc tale quoque coniu­gium prohibent.} \]

24 Ibid., V, p. 98:

Ad hoc iterum redeo quod dicitis, unam tantum prolem debere generare coniuges qui uirgines conuenerunt. Vnde hoc habetis?

allowed some of their members to marry, these treated their wives as mothers or sisters. In 1114 near Soissons, there were heretics who condemned marriage and the production of offspring.

In roughly the first half of his fifth sermon, Eckbert was clearly addressing those Cathars who allowed marriage, provided the partners remained celibate. His arguments reveal that his opponents approved of marriage itself— that was not the issue; rather, Eckbert's purpose was to defend the legitimacy of marital intercourse. Citing Mark 10:9, he maintained that not only were man and wife permitted to stay together until they died, but they were commanded to do so. Christ stated that only

---


28 Sermones, V, p. 65:

Vos autem abinuicem separandos esse urum et mulierem dicitis et aliter eos non posse saluari et ipse contra ait, "Quod deus coniunxit, homo non separat." Uirim et mulierem coniungit deus, qui secundum instituciones diuinarum legum coram ecclesia ineunt fedus coniugale et tales per hominem separandi non sunt.
on the grounds of unchastity could a man divorce his wife.²⁹ Eckbert also turned for support to Paul, who urged spouses not to separate, even if one was an unbeliever. Rather, the marriage should remain intact, since the Christian would sanctify the heathen partner.³⁰ Moreover, Eckbert responded to two texts which the Cathars may have used to support their view; since Eckbert used the word "perhaps" when presenting them,³¹ it is difficult to know whether he actually heard these verses quoted or whether he attributed them to the Cathars to advance his argument. First was Paul's admonition that "It is a good thing for a man to have nothing to do with women."³² According to Eckbert, the Cathars interpreted these words to mean that it was always evil for a man to touch a woman. Eckbert

²⁹ Matt. 5:32; Sermones, V, p. 66:

Vnam autem separationis causam qua potest uir, si uult, ab uxore discere et rumpere uinculum coniugale quo alligatus est ei determinauit dominus quando, post respon-sionem supra memoratam, ita subiunxit dicens, "Dico autem uobis quia quicunque dimiserit uxorem suam nisi ob fornicationem et aliam duxerit, mechatur."

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 67-68. 1 Cor. 7:10-15.

³¹ Ibid., p. 70: "Illud mihi forte obicitis, o katare . . .", and p. 71: "Ad illud item fortasse confugies quod idem apostolus ait . . . ."

³² 1 Cor. 7:1
considered this view illogical; if true, it would mean that a man could never even look at a woman:

If you admit that it is evil to touch a woman for the reason that it is good not to touch a woman, admit also that it is evil to look at a woman and since it is good not to look at a woman, and if you admit that it is evil to look at a woman, rip out your eyes that you might never see a woman. Hypocrite, a man may touch his wife, since anyone may have a wife, according to the words of the apostle. and since it is permitted it is not bad.33

Thus, while Eckbert agreed that it was better not to marry or even to touch a woman, as more expedient to salvation, he maintained that it was no sin to marry and touch one's own wife.34

---

33 *Sermones*, V, p. 71:

Si concedis quod malum est tangere mulierem pro eo quod bonum est mulierem non tangere, concede etiam quia malum est mulierem uidere pro eo quod bonum est mulierem non uidere et si concedis quoniam malum est mulierem uidere, erue oculos tuos ut nunquam uideos mulierem. Hypocrita, licitum est homini tangere mulierem suam quia licitum est ut unusquisque habeat suam, secundum uerba eiusdem apostoli et quia licitum est, malum non est.

Eckbert did not cite the scripture in which Paul approved of marriage but no doubt had in mind 1 Cor. 7:28: "If, however, you do marry, there is nothing wrong in it", or perhaps 1 Cor. 7:36: "But if a man has a partner in celibacy and feels that he is not behaving properly towards her, . . . he may do as he pleases; there is nothing wrong in it; let them marry."

34 Ibid.: "Bonum autem magis homini est et magis expediens ad salutem mulierem omnino nec habere nec tangere."
Among the texts cited by the Cathars in defense of their rejection of marriage was 1 Cor. 7:29: "The time we live in will not last long. While its lasts, married men should be as if they had no wives." Eckbert argued that in this verse Paul only advised against marital intercourse—he did not command it.35 Otherwise, how could he have written that a man and his wife should not refuse one another except for a time, and then to come together again?36 Moreover, the Cathars might argue that if marital relations were legitimate, Paul would not have had to sanction it with the words, ""All this I say by way of concession, not command."37 Eckbert countered by pointing out that the word ""indulgentiam"" [concession] in this verse

35 Ibid., p. 72: "Et ego dico quod si hoc facere possunt bonum est illis, non tamen hoc quisquam sensatus eis precipit, sed suadet."

36 Ibid., pp. 72-73:

Si autem opus coniugale ad damnationem esset omnibus coniugatis, nequaquam apostolus dixisset, "Vxori uir debitum reddat, similiter autem et uxor uiro. Mulier sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed uir. Similiter autem et uir sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed mulier. Nolite fraudare inuicem nisi forte ex consensu ad tempus ut uacetis orationi et iterum reuertimini in idipsum, ut non temptet uos sathanas propter incontinentiam uestram." (1 Cor. 7:3-6)

37 Ibid., pp. 73-74; 1 Cor. 7:6.
actually

signifies the absolution by which the penalty for a sin is relaxed, not this name of "indulgence" [uenie] which has been attached to it. It also signifies the concession by which lesser good works are conceded to those who are not able to do greater works, and accordingly the term "indulgence" does not apply to it.\(^\text{38}\)

According to Eckbert, while marital intercourse intended only to gratify passion is sin, it is a lesser sin, preferable to the greater sin which marriage prevents--fornication.\(^\text{39}\) However, marital intercourse is not sinful when performed to produce children, its proper purpose.\(^\text{40}\)

\(^{38}\) Ibid., p. 74:

Nam significat absolutionem qua peccatori debita pena relaxatur et secundum hoc "uenie" nomen ei adaptatur. Significat et concessionem qua minora conceduntur bona his qui exequì maiora non possunt et secundum hoc non ad eam pertinat nomen "uenie."

\(^{39}\) Protection against fornication was one of the goods of marriage cited by twelfth-century theologians. It was one of the three objects of marriage, according to Anselm of Laon, Liber Pancrisis; see Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, col. 2141 as cited in Mackin, The Marital Sacrament, p. 302.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., pp. 75:

Coniugalis concubitus qui sit simpliciter intentione generande ac deo educande pro-lis per se peccatum non est quia, ut pecca-tum non sit, defendunt nuptialia bona que sunt spes prolis et fides et sacramentum et est de minoribus bonis que indulgentiam habent que concessio dicitur.
In the second half of the fifth sermon, however, Eckbert's argument was directed at another group of Cathars, whose rejection of marriage was based on a secret teaching of Bogomil origin. Here, Eckbert was clearly working from first-hand information; moreover, no similar teaching on marriage appears in Augustine's anti-Manichaeans writings, nor do any of Eckbert's scriptural arguments against it. Eckbert began this section by claiming that

I know one of your whisperings, having heard one of your secret teachings which is fundamental to your heresy concerning marriage. Moreover, it became known to me through several men who left your company and recovered from your lies through the word of God and the ministry of his servant [Eckbert?] For you say that the fruit which

Eckbert's attitude toward marital intercourse seems to correspond to that of most medieval theologians, for whom marital intercourse was a problem in their attempts to justify marriage as one of the sacraments. In general, twelfth-century writers on marriage followed Augustine's view that concupiscence is present in marital intercourse, but that offspring is one of the good results of marriage. (See De bono coniugali, 24; PL 40, col. 394) Thus, marital intercourse was often called a venial sin, if a sin at all. Alain de Lille, for example, acknowledged that "marriage cannot be consummated without intercourse. But this is not always a sin. For by means of the sacrament intercourse can be kept to venial sinfulness, or to no sin at all ...." (Contra haereticos libri IV, I,64 in PL 210, col. 360; translation from Mackin, The Marital Sacrament, p. 305.) Peter Abelard maintained that marriage prevented intercourse from being sinful. See his Epitome theologiae Christianae, PL 178, col. 1745; discussion in Mackin, The Marital Sacrament, pp. 303-04.
God forbade the first man to eat in paradise was none other than the woman which He had created. You say that God ordered Adam not to become one with her and he came to her against the order of God not to eat of the forbidden tree. From this you argue that the entire human race, which was produced by them, was born from fornication, and that no one can be saved unless he has been cleansed through the prayers and holy deeds of those among you who are called perfect. Therefore, this is the reason you condemn marriage, and you say that all who are married and perform the conjugal act are fornicators and are partaking in the same disobedience through which Adam fell, unless they separate from one another and join you and are cleansed by you.41

Having described this secret Cathar doctrine,

Eckbert proceeded in the remainder of this sermon to

41 Ibid., pp. 77-78:

Scio unum ex susurriis uestrís, noui uerbum occulte sapientie uestre quod est fundamentum heresis uestre quam de coniugio habetis. Innotuit autem mihi per quosdam uiros qui exierunt de societate uestra et resipuerunt a uerbis mendacii per uerbum dei et per ministerium serui eius. Dicitis enim quod fructus ille de quo precepit deus primo homini in paradiso ne gustaret ex eo, nichil aliud fuit nisi mulier quam creauerat. De ipsa dicitis ade precepit dominus ut non commiseretur ei et commixtus est ei contra preceptum dei quod erat gustare de uetito ligno. Ex hoc ergo probatis omne genus humanum quod de eis propagatum est natum esse ex fornicatione et neminem posse saluari nisi purgatus fuerit per orationes et sanctificationes eorum, qui inter uos perfecti uocantur. Nec ergo causa est pro qua soletis culpare coniugium et dicitis quod omnes qui in coniugio sunt et coniugale opus exercent fornicantur et rei sunt eiusmodem per quam cecidit adam et idcirco omnes dampnantur, nisi discedant abinuicem et uobis iungantur et purgentur per uos.
attack it on two fronts: first, as plainly contrary to Scripture, and second, as illogical. The issue was no longer whether marital intercourse was allowed, but whether or not God had prohibited all marriage as fornication. This notion was not reformist in origin; it was not compatible with the ascetical ideals of those Western heretics who condemned marriage. Their objections to marriage were grounded in their emphasis on celibacy, not on any allegorical identification of the forbidden fruit with Eve. That view can be traced to the Bogomils of Bulgaria, from whom it went to Italy, and, probably, to the Rhineland. 42

42 This allegorical explanation of Genesis 2:1-7 appears among the Cathars of Italy during the latter half of the twelfth century. For example, the one-time Cathar bishop Bonacursus, in his description of Cathar belief given to the clergy of Milan between 1176 and 1190, reported that "the union of Adam and Eve was, in their words, the forbidden fruit." See the edition in Fearn, Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung, pp. 30-31, taken from the Vita hereticorum in PL 204, col. 776 and the discussion by P. Ilarino da Milano, "La 'Manifestatio Heresis Catarorum Quam Fecit Bonacursus'" Aevum, 12 (1938): 281-333.

Moreover, based on thirteenth-century sources, it is known that the Lombard Cathars were closely attached to various Bogomil churches in the Byzantine Empire, including that of Bulgaria. See Antoine Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare," Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 19 (1949): 309-11.

Finally, among the Byzantine Bogomils of the twelfth century there is a similar explanation of the human fall from grace. In the Bogomil treatise Interrogatio Joannis, written during the eleventh century and brought from Bulgaria to Italy by 1200, the human race is defiled by the union of Satan (not
It is clear that Eckbert learned about the Cathars' views of marriage primarily from first-hand sources, but did he also rely on Augustine's description of the Manichaean view of marriage? In the first half of this sermon, I have found no evidence that Eckbert employed any of Augustine's arguments against the Manichaean rejection of marriage, although there are instances where he might well have done so.

It is apparent, first, that the Manichaean rejection of marriage was based on their complicated cosmogony, which divided all matter into particles of light, or goodness, and particles of darkness, or evil. According to Augustine, whose view is confirmed by Manichaean documents, Mani had taught Adam and Eve. The theme, however, coincides with that of Eckbert's version: human sin was actually the result of illicit intercourse, not the eating from a forbidden tree. See Jordan Ivanov, ed., *Livres et légendes Bogomiles* (Sofia, 1925; rpt. Paris: G.-P. Maisonneuve et Larose, 1925): 96.

I believe that from the Bogomils of Bulgaria, this doctrine moved to the Cathars of Italy, underwent editing designed to remove the overtly dualist elements in the story (such as Satan as the creator of the material world) and then moved on to the Rhineland. See Chap. III, pp. 557-63.

Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings are no longer as important as they once were in reconstructing the history of Manichaeism in the Late Roman Empire. Since 1900, the corpus of Manichaean writing has grown enormously, with important manuscript finds in Latin, Chinese, Coptic, and Greek. Scholars have intensively re-examined Augustine's testimony in the light of this
that before the world existed, there were two co-eternal and distinct realms, one of light and one of darkness. At some point, however, the powers of darkness invaded the kingdom of light, and a battle between the two forces resulted. Although the forces of light were victorious, led by the archangel Michael, some of the powers (or "archons") of darkness managed to ingest some particles of light. The supreme leader of the kingdom of light, the "Father of Greatness", then formulated a plan to rescue the divine material trapped within these archons. This elaborate scheme involved the creation of the world and of mankind. According to Manichaean belief, the body of the first human, Adam, was created by the powers of light and belonged partly to that realm, since his soul retained particles of light; however, his body was composed of defiled elements of darkness and thus belonged to that realm, creating a battle between the two powers for control of Adam and all of his descendants. Therefore, for the Manichaean, life new primary material and have discovered that he remains a remarkably reliable and accurate source for the teachings and practices of the Manichaeans. See, for example, John P. Maher, "Saint Augustine and Manichean Cosmogony," Augustinian Studies, 10 (1979): 91-101, who concluded that Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony was based on a Latin translation of writings attributed to Mani in Coptic.
was a constant struggle to free particles of light from his own body and from all creation, so that they might return to their rightful realm of existence.44

Based on this view of the universe and of human origins, of which only the main outlines have been described, the Manicheans taught that the creation of offspring must be avoided at all costs, since this would perpetuate the bondage of the soul (or light) to the evil substance of the body.45 Thus,


45 The Manichaean "Seal of the Breast" prohibited intercourse; see De moribus manicheorum, XVIII.65, col. 1372-73; Lieu, Manichaeism in the
the Manicheans objected not to marriage itself, but to the production of children which would follow from marital intercourse. Moreover, this abstention from marriage extended only to the Manichaean "elect" and was not required of their "believers". Augustine argued in the De moribus manichaeorum that the Manicheans allowed marriage among their "credentes" only for the gratification of their passion. Augustine also accused the Manicheans of making whores of their wives: "But there is no marriage where it is arranged that there is no

Later Roman Empire, pp. 20-21; Decret, L'Afrique Manichéenne, pp. 139-43; and Henri-Charles Puech, Sur le Manchéisme et autres essais (Paris, 1979): 67. The ascetical requirements for the Manichaean "Elect" were contained in the "Five Commandments" and the "Three Seals" and included fasting, prayer, and almsgiving, prohibition against killing, eating flesh, and a vow of poverty. See C.R. Allberry, A Manichaean Psalm-Book (Stuttgart, 1938): 33, and De moribus manicheorum, VII.10 and IX.18, col. 1349 and 1353.

46 De moribus II.18; PL 32, col. 1373A:

. . . quandoquidem auditores vestri, quorum apud vos secundus est gradus, dicere atque habere non prohibeat ur uxor es. Quae cum magna voce et magna indignatione dixeritis, ego vos lenius interrogabo ad hunc modum: nonne vos estis qui filios gignere, eo quod animae ligentur in carne, gravius putatis esse peccatum, quam ipsum concubitum? . . . Ex quo illud sequitur, ut non liberorum procreandorum causa, sed satiandae libidinis habere conjugem censeatis.
mother; therefore there is no wife."*47

Eckbert also maintained that a marriage without the purpose of producing children was sinful. Since we know that he was familiar with the *De moribus manichaeorum* (he placed passages from it in his appendix), Eckbert could have buttressed his own argument by drawing on Augustine. A comparison of the appropriate passages in Latin, however, indicates that he did not. Augustine:

Nuptiae autem, ut ipsae nuptiales tabulae clamant, liberorum procreandorum causa, marem feminamque conjungunt: quisquis ergo procreare liberos quam concumbere gravius dicit esse peccatum, prohibet utique nuptias; et non jam uxorem, sed meretricem feminam facit, quae donatis sibi certis rebus, viro ad explendam ejus libidinem jungitur. Si enim uxor est, matrimonium est. Non autem matrimonium est ubi datur opera ne sit mater: non igitur uxor.*48

Eckbert:

Ille uero coniugalis concubitus qui sit non cum intentione generande prolis sed tantum causa explende libidinis per se quidem peccatum est sed ueniale, quia pro cetera bona coniugii excusatur et habet indulgentiam que permissio dicitur, quoniam permittitur hoc malum ut evitetur malus malum, id est, fornicatio.*49

Another of Augustine’s defenses of marriage

---


49 *Sermones*, V, pp. 76-77.
which also appears in the Sermones is Paul's exhortation against divorce, even if one partner is heathen and the other Christian: "For the heathen husband now belongs to God through his Christian wife, and the heathen wife through her Christian husband."\(^{50}\) In the De moribus ecclesiae catholicae, Augustine quoted this verse and then asked: "Why do you obstinately persist in opposition to such truth? Why do you try to darken the light of the scriptures with vain shadows?"\(^{51}\)

Eckbert also quoted 1 Cor. 7:14, but added a different commentary:

> In the time of the primitive church, it frequently happened that a husband was a believer and his wife an unbeliever, and by contrast that the husband was an unbeliever and the wife a believer and the apostle persuaded such not to separate, which he would not have done, if he had

\(^{50}\) 1 Cor. 7:14 (NEB)


Quandoquidem hac castitate coniugii, et ex se inuicem ipsos qui conjuncti sunt, si alter eorum fuerit infidelis, et eam quae inde nascitur prolem sanctificari dixit: 'Sanctificatus est enim,' inquit, 'uir infidelis in muliere fideli, et sanctificata est mulier infidelis per uirum fidelem: alioquin filii uestri immundi essent; nunc autem sancti sunt.' Quid obstrepitis pertinacia tantae ueriati? Quid lucem scripturarum uanis umbris obnubilare conamini?
known that both members of such a marriage would have perished.\textsuperscript{52}

Further evidence for Eckbert's independence from Augustine in his defense of marriage is that none of the Manichaean reasons for forbidding it are reproduced in the \textit{Sermones}. As shown above, the Manichaean reasons for forbidding marriage were far more concerned to prevent procreation than marriage itself. While they allowed marriage among their "auditores", those a rank below the "electi",\textsuperscript{53} they prohibited the procreation of children, since this would perpetuate the bondage of the soul to the flesh. In the \textit{De haeresibus}, Augustine wrote that the Manichaean avoid conception and birth to prevent the divine substance, which has entered into them through food, from being bound by chains of flesh in their offspring. For this is the way, indeed, they believe that souls come into all flesh . . . Hence, without doubt, they condemn marriage and forbid it as much as in their power, since they forbid the propagation of offspring,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Sermones}, V, p. 68:
\begin{quote}
In tempore primitiue ecclesie, frequenter hoc accidit ut uir esset fidelis et mulier infidelis et contra ut uir esset infidelis et mulier fidelis et suadebat apostolus ut etiam tales abinuicem non discederent quod utique non fecisset, si sciret utroque simul in tali coniugio perituros.
\end{quote}
\item \textit{De moribus manichaeorum}, II.18; PL 32, col. 1373A.
\end{itemize}
the reason for marriage.\footnote{De haeresibus, 46; Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 92-95 (I have followed the English translation of Müller):}

The Cathars, on the other hand, prohibited intercourse itself as an unclean act, not because it led to procreation. Whether they based this belief on a desire for asceticism, as some did, or on an allegorical interpretation of Scripture, as did others, the Cathars did not condemn the bearing of children—at least Eckbert did not know of such a teaching. In fact, Eckbert mentioned the practice among some Cathars of allowing virgins who married to produce one child, after which they should separate.\footnote{Sermones, V, p. 98:}

\begin{quote}

Et si utuntur coniugibus, conceptum tamen generationemque devitent ne divina substantia, quae in eos per alimenta ingrediatur, vinculis carnis ligetur in prole. Sic quippe in omnem carmen, id est, per escas et potus venire animas credunt. Unde nuptias sine dubitatione condemnant et, quantum in ipsis est, prohibent, quando generare prohibent, propter quod coniugia coplanda sunt.
\end{quote}

Moreover, nowhere in the Sermones did...
he record the belief that the divine substance of the soul was entrapped in flesh through procreation, although he was certainly aware that it had been taught by the Manichaeans.56

The Manichaeans and Cathars also shared the refusal to eat meat. Eckbert reported that

those who have perfectly entered their sect forbid all flesh, not for the reason for which monks and others living spiritual lives abstain from it, but rather because they say that all flesh is born from intercourse, and for this reason they consider it unclean.57

56 It should be noted, however, that a doctrine somewhat similar to this appears among some Cathars of the thirteenth century, according to Rainerius Sacconi, one-time Cathar bishop and inquisitor of Lombardy from 1254 to 1259. In the Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno, Rainerius maintained that the following was one of the peculiar doctrines of the Cathars of "Belesmanza"; translation from Walter Wakefield and Austin Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969): 338, from A. Dondaine, Un Traité néo­manichéen, pp. 64-78:

Also, that the devil with his angels ascended into heaven and there, after doing battle with the archangel Michael and the angels of the good God, carried off a third part of the creatures created by God. These he implants daily in human bodies and in those of lower animals, and also transfers them from one body to another until such time as all shall be brought back to heaven.

57 Sermones, I, p. 10:

Carnem omnem uitant qui perfecte sectam illorum ingressi sunt, non ea causa qua monachi aut alii spiritualiter uiuentes ab ea abstinent sed idcirco uitantum esse esum carnis dicunt quia de concubitu nata
In secret, however, the Cathars said they refused to eat flesh because, "all flesh was made by the Devil, and for this reason they do not taste any meat even under the greatest necessity." 58 Later in the first sermon, Eckbert declared that

The doctrines of Manichaeus and his followers are opposed to the very foundation of the Christian faith, as I will now demonstrate. For we believe and confess that there is only one god, who made heaven and earth and all the things which are in them, and this is the foundation of our faith. But those [the Manichaeans] teach that there are two creators, a good one and another, evil one, namely god and a certain monstrous prince of darkness, whom I do now know how we can more correctly refer to, except as the devil. 59

In the seventh sermon, concerning the Cathar view of

sit omnis caro et ex hoc immundam esse arbitrantur.

58 Ibid., pp. 10-11: "Et hanc rationem quidem manifestius dicunt sed in occulti suis quod peius est dicunt, uidelicet omnem carnem facturam esse diaboli ideoque nec in summis necessitatibus eam ullatenus gustant."

59 Ibid., p. 19-20:

Manichei doctrina et sequantium eius christianae fidei in ipsa radice sua se opponit sicut nunc demonstrabo. Credimus enim et confitemur unum solum esse deum qui fecit celum et terram et omnia quae in eis sunt et hec est radix fidei nostre. Illi uero duos creatores esse docent, unum bonum et alterum malum, uidelicet deum et quendam immanem principem tenebrarum quem nescio quomodo rectius uocare possimus nisi diabolum.
creation, Eckbert wrote that "the Prince of your error, Mani, forbade the eating of flesh because, he said, all flesh had been created by the Devil . . ."60 Despite Eckbert's mistaken conviction that Mani was the source of this Cathar belief in two creators, such a belief did exist among them, and Eckbert's description of it came primarily from his own knowledge of certain secret Cathar teachings, not from Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings.61

First, as shown above, Eckbert included this belief in the devil as creator of the world among the secret teachings of the Cathars. Thus, it is very unlikely that he was reporting what he had heard others say about them, since he had gained access to these secret teachings through former members of the sect. Eckbert's contacts enabled him to describe the Cathar baptism in "fire and the Holy

60 Ibid., VII, p. 1: "Scimus autem quia princeps erroris uestri, manes, talem habebat uitandarum carnium racionem . . ."

61 It must be granted that certain features of Eckbert's account of Cathar dualism smack of Augustine. For example, his description of the devil as a "monstrous prince of darkness" [immanem principem tenebrarum] is reminiscent of Augustine's report that the five elements in the Manichaean realm of darkness "generated their own princes to the people of darkness . . ." [Quinque enim elementa quae generunt principes proprios genti tribuunt tenebrarum] Müller, The De Haeresibus, pp. 87-88.
Spirit" in some detail, as well as the reasons for the condemnation of marriage by the Cathar "perfect." He knew about the docetism of the Cathars from an informant who had left their ranks, and so we can be confident that regarding Cathar dualism, Eckbert had reliable sources from the inside.

Second, the ancient Manichaeans did not teach that the devil created the material world, nor did Augustine attribute such a belief to them. The Manichaean extant literature attributes to Mani the teaching that the visible universe was created by the "Primal Man", or "Living Spirit", a being representing one of the three characteristics of the "Father of Greatness", who reigned over the primordial kingdom of light. After the battle

---

63 Ibid., V, pp. 77-78.
64 Ibid., I, p. 14: "Nec intactum preteribo quod audiui a quodam uiro fideli qui, agnita eorum perfidia et secretis quibusdam turpitudinibus eorum, de societate ipsorum exiuit. Nam in domino salvatore ita eos errare affirmabat ut dicerent eum nec uere natum ex uirgine nec uere humanam carnem habuisse sed simulatam carnis speciem nec ex mortuis eum resurrexisse sed mortem et resurrectionem simulasse.

65 See the account in Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire, pp. 14-15, and Widengren, Mani and Manichaeism, pp. 27-28. This teaching is recorded in the Kephalaia, a record of the doctrines and revelations of Mani, parts of which survive in a
between the realms of light and darkness had been won by this "primal man", "from the bodies of the demons they slew, the Living Spirit created eight earths and from their excoriated skin, ten heavens." However, the problem of rescuing the light particles swallowed by evil archons remained, and toward this end an elaborate scheme was concocted to free the trapped particles. The male archons were forced to ejaculate the particles of light within them, which fell to earth as seeds and eventually produced all animal and plant life. Thus, although the forces of darkness were utilized in the creation of the world, in Manichaean tradition the creative act was performed by the powers of light.

It is true that in the De haeresibus, Augustine wrote that the Manichaens "assert that all flesh is the work, not of God, but of an evil mind, [malae mentis] which emanating from the opposite principle,

---


66 Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire, p. 14.

67 Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire, p. 15; see Augustine's description in Contra Faustum, XXI.12; CSEL 25, p. 583.
is coeternal with God."\(^{68}\) However, he did not call this creative force the devil, nor did he even call it a "god", but a "nature" or "substance". For example, Augustine wrote that Mani

invented two principles, different from and opposed to each other, both eternal and co-eternal, that is, they have always been, and, following other ancient heretics, he believed that there were two natures and substances, namely, a good and an evil one.\(^{69}\)

Moreover, it appears that the Manichaeanstemselves referred to these opposing powers not as "gods" but as "substances". In a direct quotation from the Manichaean work *Epistula Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti*, attributed to Mani himself, Augustine used "substantiae" to describe the two opposing and eternal forces of creation: "Indeed, he said these two substances were in the beginning separated from one another and indeed, God the Father, perpetual in his holy origin, ruled the

\(^{68}\) Müller, *The De Haeresibus*, p. 96: "Omnem carnem non Dei, sed malae mentis perhibent esse opificium, quae a contrario principio Deo coaeterna est."

\(^{69}\) 46; Müller, *The De Haeresibus*, p. 84:

*Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque aeterna et coaeterna, hoc est semper fuisse, composuit; duasque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios antiquos haereticos, opinatus est.*
kingdom of light . . ."70 In fact, as pointed out by John Coyle, the renowned Manichaean Elect Faustus denied Augustine's charge that the Manichaeans believed in two "gods" and claimed that they never called the principle of evil a god.71

Based on the passages presented above, it could be argued that Eckbert attributed the Manichaean view of flesh to the Cathars, simply turning Augustine's phrase "evil mind" into the more familiar "Devil." Still, besides the fact that this information appears to have come from Cathar informants, this doctrine was also being taught elsewhere in Europe. The Bogomils within the Byzantine Empire and the Cathars in Lombardy taught that the Devil created the material world. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is good evidence that Bogomil doctrines moved into Lombardy and then on to the Rhineland during the mid-twelfth century.72

70 Contra epistulam quam vocant fundamenti, XIII; CSEL 25 (1891): p. 209: "'Haec quippe,' inquit, 'in exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae, et luminis quidem imperium tenebat deus pater in sua sancta stirpe perpetuus . . ."

71 Contra Faustum, XXI.1: "Vnus deus est, an duo? Plane unus. Quomodo ergo uos duos adseritis? Nunquam in nostris quidem adsertionibus duo rum deorum auditum est nomen . . ."; Coyle, The De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae, p. 331.

72 See Chap. III, pp. ?
In a statement made to the clergy of Milan sometime between 1176 and 1190, Bonacursus, a former Cathar, claimed that they "put forward another error, which is that all things that have been made—in the air, in the sea, and on the earth, such as men and animate and inanimate things—were made by the devil." Bonacursus added that the Cathars considered anyone who ate meat, eggs, or cheese, or "anything of an animal nature" to be damned. Furthermore, the De heresi catharorum, written between about 1200 and 1214 but recounting events from the mid-eleventh century, reported that the mitigated dualists among the Lombard Cathars believed that Satan's creation of the world was described in Genesis.

73 Fears, Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung, p. 30: "Alium errorem inducunt, scilicet omnia quae facta sunt in aere, in mari et in terra, facta esse a diabolo, sicut homines, animata et inanimata."

74 Ibid., p. 31: "Si quis manducaverit carnem, vel ova, seu caseum, vel aliquid bestialis naturae, quod damnationem sibi manducat."

75 Those who believed that Satan was God's creation, rather than a being co-eternal and equal in power to God.

76 Antoine Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie, I: Le 'De heresi catharorum', Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 19 (1949): 310:

Et dicunt quod iste lucifer est ille deus qui dicitur in genesi creasse celum et terram et illa opera per VI dies fecisse. Et dicunt quod lucifer ille formavit de
It appears that the source of this view of creation among the Cathars may well have been the Byzantine Bogomils, for Euthymius Zigabenus, an Orthodox monk writing in Constantinople between 1100 and 1118, reported that they believed Satan to be the creator of the visible world.77 Also, the Byzantine Bogomils refused to eat meat or eggs; although Zigabenus did not explain why, at least part of the reason must have been their dualistic view of creation.78

Moreover, a comparison of the reasons for which the Manichaeans and Cathars abstained from eating meat further supports Eckbert's independence from Augustine on this point. As previously noted, according to Eckbert, in public the Cathars refused to eat meat because as the product of sexual intercourse, they considered it unclean. In secret, however, they abstained because they believed it had

limo terre formam ade and in illa forma vi suffocavit illum bonum angelum secun-


been created by the devil.\textsuperscript{79}

However, the Manichaean prohibition against meat, which extended only to their "elect" and did not include their "believers", was designed to prevent particles of light from being trapped in flesh, and thus to facilitate the return of these particles to the kingdom of light.\textsuperscript{80} In Contra Faustum, Augustine wrote that the Manicheans refused to eat meat because of its being mixed with "the race of darkness", and being held captive by the darkness.\textsuperscript{81}

Elsewhere, Augustine provided a more detailed explanation of the reasons why the Manichaeans abstained from meat:

Since the member of God has been mixed

\textsuperscript{79} Sermones, I, pp. 10-11.

\textsuperscript{80} See the discussion in Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire, pp. 19-21, 77-79, who notes: "The Elect are the earthly agents for the release of the captive Light. This is achieved through their digestive systems as they refine the Light Particles in the food which they eat and release them through their belches." (p. 21) See also Decret, L'Afrique Manichéenne, pp. 134-38.

\textsuperscript{81} VI.8; CSEL 25 (1891):

Si secundum errorem uestrum propter commixtionem gentis tenebrarum non carnes, sed ipse deus uester inmundus est in ea parte, quam uelut debellandis et captuandis hostibus absorbendam et inquinandam misit et miscuit, deinde propter ipsam commixtionem etiam quicquid aliud manducatis, inmundum est.
with the substance of evil, that it might restrain it [the substance of evil] and suppress it from the greatest rage . . . the world is made of both natures mixed together, that is the good and the evil. However, as that divine part of things is being cleansed daily from every part of the world, and is restored to its own kingdom, but, breathing out through the earth and stretching out toward the sky, it enters plants, since they are fastened to the earth by their roots, and in this way, it gives fertility and strength to all grasses and trees. From these animals get their food which, if they have sexual intercourse, bind that divine member in the flesh . . . When the soul [of an animal] has left the flesh, however, what is left is utterly filthy, and the soul of those who eat flesh is defiled.82

Later, in the De haeresibus, Augustine gave a more concise (and more lucid) account of this belief:

Yet they do not eat meat either, on the grounds that the divine substance has fled from the dead or slain bodies, and what

82 De moribus manichaeorum, XV.36-37, col. 1361B-D:

Quoniam, inquit, membrum Dei malorum substantiae commixtum est, ut eam refrenaret, atque a summo furore comprimeret (sic enim dicitis) de commixta utrque natura, id est boni et mali, mundus est fabricatus. Pars autem illa divina ex omni parte mundi quotidiane purgatur, et in sua regna resumitur: sed haec per terram exhalanda, et ad coelum tendens, incurrit in stirpes, quoniam radi-cibus terrae affiguntur, atque ita omnes herbas, et arbusta omnia fecundat et vegetat. Hinc animalia cibum capiunt, quae si concumbunt, ligant in carne divinum illud membrum . . . Quocirca, cum anima etiam carnem deseruerit, nimias sordes reliquas fieri, et ideo eorum qui vescuntur carnis, animam coinquinari.
little remains there is of such quality and quantity that it does not merit being purified in the stomachs of the Elect. They do not even eat eggs, claiming that they too die when they are broken, and it is not fitting to feed on any dead bodies; only that portion of flesh can live which is picked up by flour to prevent its death. Moreover, they do not use milk for food although it is drawn or milked from the live body of an animal, not with the conviction that there is nothing of the divine substance intermingled with it, but because error itself is inconsistent.\(^\text{83}\)

Had Eckbert been inclined to embellish his account of the Cathars by borrowing freely from Augustine, he surely would have done so here, for he included in his appendix the passage quoted above from the De haeresibus. But nowhere in the sixth sermon did Eckbert mention this Manichaean desire to free particles of light from their prisons of flesh. Rather, he wrote that the Cathars refused to eat meat because "all flesh is born from intercourse

\(^{83}\) Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 90-92:

\[
\text{Nec vescuntur tamen carnibus tamquam de mortuis vel occisis fugerit divina substantia, tantumque ac tale inde remanerit quod iam dignum non sit in Electorum ventre purgari. Nec ova saltem sumunt quasi et ipsa cum franguntur exspirent, nec oporteat ullis mortuis corporibus vesci, et hoc solum vivat ex carne quod farina, ne moriatur, excipiatur. Sed nec alimonia lactis utuntur, quamvis de corpore animantis vivente mulgeatur sive sugatur; non quia putant divinae substantiae nihil ibi esse permixtum, sed quia sibi error ipse non constat.}
\]
and thus is unclean and pollutes the one eating it." In Eckbert's eyes, although the Cathars' abstinence made them appear holy and chaste, they were really hypocrites and liars.

Still, Augustine and Eckbert did employ some of the same scriptural texts in their defense of eating meat, and these merit closer examination for evidence of Augustinian influence on the Sermones. For example, Augustine noted that the Manichaeans justified their abstinence from meat by citing Romans 14:21, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine." He admitted that this was true, as long as one carefully considered the reasons for abstention. Paul encouraged it because weaker Christians might be scandalized by the eating of meat offered to idols. Augustine explained, "For at the time the apostle was writing, much meat which had been offered to idols was being sold in the market." He also claimed that the Manichaeans

84 Sermones, VI, p. 102: "Racio uestra est quare edende non sint carnes, quia de coitu nascitur omnis caro et ideo immunda est et coquinat manducantem."

85 Ibid.: "Hoc in ypocrisi loquimini, quia in hoc casti et sancti coram hominibus uultis apparere sed est mendax hec uestra doctrina."

86 De moribus manichaeorum, XIV.31; PL 32, col. 1358B: "Eo enim tempore, quo haec scribebat Apostolus, multa immolatitia caro in macello vendebatur."
overlooked the last part of the same verse: "Nor anything whereby thy brother stumbles or is offended or is made weak." To further illustrate his point, Augustine quoted the rest of Romans 14 and Romans 15:1-3 and reminded the Manichaean's of Christ's words in Matthew 15:11: "A man is not defiled by what goes into his mouth, but by what comes out of it." Although Christ thus declared all foods clean, Paul urged believers to abstain from meat if it should offend those weaker in the faith than themselves.

According to Eckbert, the Cathars may have also used Romans 14:21 to defend their rejection of meat.

87 Ibid.: At enim ait Apostolus, "Bonum est, fratres, non manducare carnem, neque bibere vinum." Quasi vero quisquam nostrum id bonum neget: sed aut eo fine quem superius commemoravi, secundum quem dicitur, "Et carnis curam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis": aut eis quos rursus idem Paulus ostendit; id est, aut refrenandae gulae causa, quae his rebus solet rabidius immoderatiusque raptari; aut ne frater offendatur, aut ab infirmis idolio communicetur.

88 Ibid., col. 1358D-1359C.

89 Ibid., col. 1358C: "Non quod intrat in os uestrum, uos coquinat, sed quod exit"; tamen propter hos infirmiores, ne offenderentur, ab his rebus abstinere debant. Neque hoc suspicione colligitur, sed in ipsis Apostoli Epistolis manifeste inventitur.
Like Augustine, he agreed that abstention from meat "is good for man. Why is it good? Because he who abstains from the eating of flesh and the drinking of wine is farther from that sin which is brought about through the desire of the gullet than he who uses them." 90

This raises the issue of whether the Cathars refused wine as well as meat, as did the Manichaeans. Nowhere did Eckbert state that the Cathars avoided wine, and in his opening list of Cathar errors, he mentioned only their abstention from meat. 91 He did, however, point out that Christ himself drank wine with his disciples, 92 and did not exclude wine from his citations of Romans 14:21, citing the entire verse instead. The best explanation is that Eckbert did not know whether or not the contemporary Cathars of Lombardy or Southern France prohibited the drinking of wine, nor any indication that the Cathars of the thirteenth century rejected wine.

90 *Sermones*, VI, pp. 110-11:

Et ego idipsum concedo quidem, quoniam hoc homini bonum est. Quare bonum? Quia qui abstinet ab esu carnium et potu uini longius est ab eo peccato quod contrahitur per concupiscenciam gule quam qui utitur istis.

91 I have found no evidence that the contemporary Cathars of Lombardy or Southern France prohibited the drinking of wine, nor any indication that the Cathars of the thirteenth century rejected wine.

92 *Sermones*, VI, p. 112: "Nam et salvator bibit de genimine uitis cum discipulis suis et tamen nunquam peccauit."
the Cathars prohibited the drinking of wine; while not directly accusing them of it, he assumed for purposes of refutation that they did abstain from wine.

Using an analogy not found in Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings, Eckbert argued that while it is good not to eat meat, it is no sin to do so:

We know that it is good to keep silence, and it is very highly regarded by spiritual men, since he who keeps silent is farther from the sin of the tongue than he who speaks. For "He who does not sin in word, he is a perfect man." If therefore it is good to keep silent, it is evil to speak. Does this not necessarily follow? Not at all. For these two things are both true, namely that it is good to keep silent and it is good to speak. And thus when it is said "Do not eat meat" and when it is said, "Do not drink wine", it is as though it were an precaution, but not a virtue, and it does not follow that because of this it is evil to eat meat and drink wine . . .93

93 Ibid., pp. 112-13:

Scimus quoniam bonum est silencium et multum a spiritibus uiiris commendatur, quoniam qui silet longius est a peccato lingue quam qui loquitur. Nam "Qui non peccat in uerbo, hic perfectus est uir." Si ergo bonum est silere, malum est loqui. Nuncuid hoc necessario sequitur? Nequaquam. Quoniam simul hec duo uera sunt, uidelicet bonum est silere et bonum est loqui. Itaque cum dicatur non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum, cum dicatur bonum quasi cautum, non quasi uirtus, non oportet ut ob hoc dicatur malum esse comedere carnes et bibere uinum, quia in hoc continuo intelligeretur quod esset uicium et peccatum.
Moreover, Eckbert, like Augustine, utilized both Romans 14:21 and Matthew 15:11 in his attack on the Cathars' abstinence from meat, but I do not believe Augustine was his source in either case. A comparison of the actual scriptural texts in both the De moribus manichaeorum and the Sermones suggests that Eckbert was working independently of Augustine. Augustine's rendering of Romans 14:21 is as follows: "Bonum est, fratres, non manducare carnem, neque bibere vinum."\(^94\) Eckbert's text is different, and agrees with the Vulgate\(^95\): "Bonum est homini non manducare carnem et non bibere uinum."\(^96\) Again, Eckbert's rendering of Matthew 15:11 departs from that of Augustine and is almost identical to the Vulgate. Augustine: "Non quod intrat in os uestrum, uos coinquinat, sed quod exit."\(^97\) Eckbert: "Non quod intrat in os coinquinat hominem sed quod procedit de ore hoc coinquinat hominem."\(^98\) Vulgate: "non quod intrat in os, coinquinat hominem, sed quod

\(^94\) XIV.31, col. 1358C.


\(^96\) Sermones, VI, p. 111.

\(^97\) De moribus manichaeorum, XIV.31, col. 1358C.

\(^98\) Sermones, VI, p. 107.
procedit ex ore, hoc coinquinat hominem!" Granted, the Augustinian text which Eckbert possessed may have been different from that which has come down to us, but the fact that in several places Eckbert's text agrees with the Vulgate against Augustine indicates that his scriptural commentary was not based on the anti-Manichaean works.

We should also carefully compare the Latin of Augustine's commentary on Romans 14:21 with that of Eckbert on I Cor. 10:25, since both were seeking to justify the eating of meat by placing Paul's words in the context of circumstances within the early church. Here would have been a chance for Eckbert to augment his attack on the Cathars by using the anti-Manichaean works. Augustine wrote:

Eo enim tempore, quo scribeyat Apostolus, multa immolatitia caro in macello vendebatur. Et quia vino etiam libabatur diis Gentium, multi fratres infirmiores, qui etiam rebus his venalibus utebantur, penitus a carnibus se et vino cohibere maluerunt, quam vel nescientes incidere in eam quam putabant cum idolis communicationem. Propter hos autem etiam ii qui firmiores erant, et haec majori fide contemnenda judicarunt, scientes nihil immundum esse nisi per malam conscientiam, tenentesque illam Domini sententiam. "Non quod intrat in os uestrum, uos coinquinat, sed quod exit."99

Eckbert's explanation of I Cor. 10:25 is as follows:

99 De moribus manichaeorum, XIV.31, col. 1358B-C.

In my opinion, the passages above are not similar enough to support the argument that Eckbert even paraphrased Augustine. It is more likely that both Manichaeans and Cathars independently used Romans 14:21 in defense of their abstention from meat. Moreover, the fact that Eckbert, like Augustine, sought to downplay Paul's seeming prohibition of meat by explaining its immediate cause is not at all surprising and does not in itself suggest that Eckbert borrowed the argument from Augustine.

Another technique used by both Augustine and Eckbert to refute their opponents' abstinence from meat was to contrast it with Christian asceticism in

100 *Sermones*, VI, pp. 108-09.
an attempt to expose its weaknesses. In the De moribus manichaeorum, Augustine approved of Manichaean abstinence "if therefore there is the desire to be frugal and to restrain the appetite in which we are attracted and captivated by such eating and drinking, I listen and approve, but this is not the case."\textsuperscript{101}

According to Augustine, the Manichaeanists were like a man who dines sumptuously on various exotic vegetables and drink, while abstaining from meat and wine and praising himself because of it. On the other hand, and here Augustine clearly meant Christian practice, it is better to eat only a little cabbage and quench one's thirst with two or three swallows of wine, in order to curtail hunger.\textsuperscript{102} Augustine also explained that Christians

\textsuperscript{101} XIII.28, col. 1357B: "Si ergo parcimoniae gratia et coercendae libidinis, qua escis talibus et potu delectamur et capimur, audio et probo: sed non ita est."

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., XIII.29, col. 1357C:

Nam quaero a vobis, si quis existat, quod fieri potest, ita homo parcus et frugi, ut appetitum ventris et gutturis moderans, non epuletur bis per unum diem; et huic coenanti oluscula cum exiguo lardo apponatur, eodem lardo uncta atque condita, quantum comprimendae fami sat est; sitimque irriget propter diligentiam valetudinis, duabus aut tribus vini meracis potionibus, isque illi victus sit quotidianus: alius vero ex alia parte nihil gustans carnium, nihil vini, exquisitas
abstain from flesh and wine for three reasons:

To check indulgence, which with these foods frequently happens, and drunkenness, which frequently is the result of drinking wine. To protect the weak, because of those foods and drink which are sacrificed to idols. And for that reason which is most highly commendable, because of love, lest the weakness of those more feeble should be offended by the continence of these.\(^\text{103}\)

Eckbert also attempted to expose Cathar abstinence by contrasting it to Christian practice. Refusing food is useful in order to avoid gluttony, and whatever is eaten beyond necessity is indeed sin, he argued. While those monks and others who abstain from meat are honorable, their action does not make eating meat and drinking wine evil. A man

et peregrinas fruges multis ferculis variatas et largo pipere aspersas nona hora libenter assumat, noctis etiam principio talia coenaturus . . . et bibat non quantum sitit, sed quantum libet . . . quem tandem horum duorum, quod ad cibandum potandumque attinet, abstinentius vitam ducere judicatis? Non opinor usque adeo vos esse caecos, quin illum de parco lardo et vino, huic gurgiti praeferatis.

\(^{103}\) Ibid., XV.35, col. 1360C:

Apparet igitur, ut opinor, quo fine a carnibus et a vino sit abstinendum. Is finis est triplex. Ad comprimendam delectationem, quae in his maxime cibis haberis solet, atque in tali potu usque ad ebrietatem pervenire. Ad tuendum infirmitatem, propter illa quae sacrificantur atque libantur. Et quod maxime commendandum est, propter charitatem, ne imbecilliorum ab his continentium offendatur infirmitas.
can partake of them temperately, as did Christ and his disciples. However, a comparison of this passage with that from the *De moribus manichaeorum* cited above provides no evidence that Eckbert utilized Augustine on this point.

There is also the issue of whether Eckbert could have drawn upon Augustine in his description of Cathar baptism. Scholars have debated whether the Manichaeans practiced some form of baptism; it is clear that they rejected baptism with water. Augustine wrote that "They allege that baptism in water grants no salvation to anyone, and do not believe that they have to baptize any of those whom they deceive." Although this passage seems to

104 *Sermones*, VI, p. 111-12:

Suauia enim sunt hec ad gustandum et faci.e prouocant concupiscenciam gule, ut supra quam oporteat delectetur in his qui gustat ea quod quidem peccatum est. Item, idcirco bonum est ut per abstineniam istorum corpus affligatur et per afflictionem corporis maior a domino merces acquiratur. Et he quidem sunt cause quibus monachi et fideles uiri penitentes ab illis se abstinent . . . quia possibile est ita temperate hominem istis uti ut non peccat. Nam et saluator bibit de genimine uitis cum discipulis suis et tamen nunquam peccavit.

105 *De haeresibus*, 46; Müller, *The De Haeresibus*, p. 175: "Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre, nec quemquam eorum quos decipiunt baptizandum putant."
rule out any form of Manichaean baptism, it has been suggested that they did employ baptism to mark the passage of a follower from "believer" to "elect", although Augustine left no description of it. Thus, even if the ancient Manichaeans practiced some form of baptism, Eckbert could hardly have known of it. Eckbert had learned about the Cathar baptism by "fire" first-hand, from a former member of the sect. Moreover, its main features corresponded closely to the Cathar "consolamentum", which was later described in detail by thirteenth-century sources, both Catholic and Cathar.

---


107 *Sermones*, IX, p. 161: "Hinc est quod eos quos assumitis in societatem catharie uestre, sicut audiui de quodam qui expertus fuerat secreta uestra, tali modo rebaptizatis."

108 For an example of a Cathar description of the *consolamentum*, see the Provençal version dating from about 1280, but believed by scholars to reflect much earlier Catharist practice. Léon
Eckbert also placed in his account of early Cathar history passages concerning the Manichaean denial of Christ's humanity, since he believed the Cathars were following their predecessors in espousing these doctrines. Probably drawing on the De haeresibus, Eckbert noted that

This is also clearly to be read among the errors of Manicheus and his disciples, that they said the Son of God never truly received a human body from the virgin, but had only the appearance of a human body, and that he never truly suffered, or died, or rose from the dead, but that in all these acts he so deceived the human senses that everything said about His humanity seemed true to men but that, nevertheless, none of these acts were true.  

Clédat, éd., Le Nouveau Testament traduit au XIIe siècle en langue provençale, suivi d'un rituel cathare (Paris: Mm. Lumière, 1887): 470-82. English translation and discussion in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 438-94. The main features of this baptism—the laying on of hands, the Lord's Prayer, and the placing of the gospel on the supplicant's head—are also found in Catholic descriptions of the consolamentum; see, for example, that of Rainer Sacconi, written in 1250, James Fearns, ed., Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung, pp. 31-32, from Antoine Dondaine, Un Traité néo-manichéen du XIIe siècle, pp. 65-66; and the work of the Franciscan friar James Capelli (ca. 1241), edited by Dino Bazzocchi, La Eresia catara: Saggio storico filosofico con in appendice "Disputationes nonnullae adversus haereticos", codice inedito de secolo XIII della biblioteca Malatestiana di Cesena (Bologna, 1919): cxviii-cxxxix.; English translation and discussion by Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 301-03.

109 Sermones, I, pp. 21-22:

Hoc quoque manifeste inter errores manichaei et discipulorum eius legitur quod dicebant filium dei nunquam uere humanum
Moreover, Eckbert was convinced that Mani was the source of the Cathars' docetism:

For they who know you well say that you deny the humanity of the saviour . . . But it is not surprising to me that you are the mad disciples of a mad master. For the prince of your error, Mani, taught that our saviour appeared in human form in such a way that, indeed, he seemed to be a man and was not truly a man and that he was not truly born from a virgin, nor truly suffered, nor truly died, nor truly rose from the dead.  

This mistaken belief of Eckbert, however, should not cause us to summarily discount as plagiarism his

\[
\text{corpus suscepisse in uirgine sed simili-tudinem tantum humani corporis habuisse et nunquam uere passum aut mortuum fuisse aut resurrexisse, sed tantum in his omni-bus eum fefellerisse humanos sensus, ita ut hominibus uera uiderentur cuncta que dicuntur de humanitate eius et quod nulla tamen ueritas fuisset in omnibus illis.}
\]

Cf. Müller, The De Haeresibus, p. 94:

Christum autem fuisse affirmant . . . nec fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam spe-ciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur.

\[110\] Sermones, XIII, p. 337:

Nam qui bene uos noscunt salvatoris hu-manitatem negare uos dicunt. . . Non est autem incredibile mihi insani ma-gistri insanos esse discipulos. Nam princeps erroris uestri, manes, salua-torem nostrum ita in humanitate appa-ruisse docebat ut uideretur quidem esse homo et non esset uere homo et quod nec uere natus fuisse de uirgine nec uere passus nec uere mortuus nec uere a morte suscitatus . . .
report of docetism among the Cathars. There are good reasons for believing that some of them were docetists. First, Eckbert claimed a first-hand source for this information. He wrote that he had learned of this doctrine

from a certain faithful man who, having recognized their [the Cathars'] falsehood and disgraceful secrets, left their society. For he affirmed that they err so greatly regarding the Lord Saviour, that they say he was not truly born from a virgin, did not truly have human flesh, but the appearance of flesh, and did not rise from the dead, but only seemed to die and rise again.\textsuperscript{111}

Moreover, docetism was present among the Cathars of Lombardy and Southern France during roughly the same period in which Eckbert was writing. Bonacursus told the clergy of Milan (between 1176 and 1190) that "concerning Christ they say that he did not have a living body, that He did not eat, drink, or do anything else as men do, but

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., I, p. 14:

Nec intactum preteribo quod audiui a quodam uiro fidelii qui, agnita eorum perfidia et secretis quibusdam turpitudinibus eorum, de societate ipsorum exiuit. Nam in domino salutare ita eos errare affirmabat, ut dicere eum nec uere natum ex uirgine nec uere humanam carnem habuisse sed simulatam carnis speciem nec ex mortuis eum resurrexisse sed mortem et resurrectionem simulasse.
that it only seemed that he did." Likewise, docetism is attributed to one sect of the Lombard Cathars by the De Heresi de Catharorum:

The Sclavini believe that in the time of grace the Son of God (who is Jesus Christ), John the Evangelist, and Mary were three angels appearing in the flesh. And they say that Christ did not really put on flesh, nor did He eat or drink, nor was He crucified, died, or buried, and that everything He did as man was only in appearance, not actuality, and only seemed to be real.

In his Historia Albigensis (written ca. 1218), the French Cistercian and crusader Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernay reported that the Cathars of Southern France say that Christ did not really take on the flesh, that he did not eat or drink, nor was he crucified nor did he die, nor was he buried, and all things that He did according to human nature were not truly done but only in appearance.

---

112 Fearns, Ketzer und Ketzerbekämpfung, p. 31: "de Christo dicunt, quod non habuit animatum corpus, non manducavit, neque bibit, sed nec aliqua secundum hominem fecit, sed videbatur ita."

113 Dondaine, "Le hiérarchie cathare en Italie," p. 311:

Sclavini tempore gratie credunt quod filius dei, scilicet Ihesus christus, et Johannes evangelista et maria fuerunt tres angeli apparentes in carne. Et dicunt quod christus non in veritate carnem suscepit, nec comedit, nec bibit, nec crucifixus, nec mortuus, nec sepultus est, et omnia que secundum humanitatem fecit, non erant in veritate set in apparencia, quia sic videbatur.

Eckbert's report of docetism becomes more credible when we recall that there were reports of docetism in Western Europe in both the eleventh and twelfth centuries. These attestations, if accurate, could reflect the influence of Bogomilism, as Dondaine maintained.\textsuperscript{115} Most scholars, however, believe that they probably arose independently of dualistic influences and that the anti-materialistic nature inherent in Christianity can produce such a denial of Christ's humanity at any given time.\textsuperscript{116} Examples include the heretics encountered in about 1022 at Orleans\textsuperscript{117} and those reported near Soissons in 1114.\textsuperscript{118}

There is no evidence that Eckbert relied on


\textsuperscript{116} See, for example, Jeffrey Russell, Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965): 188-229, and "Interpretations of the origins of medieval heresy," Medieval Studies, 25 (1963): ; see also the discussion in Wakefield and Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 6-23.


\textsuperscript{118} Labande, ed., Guibert de Nogent, p. 428.
Augustine for his refutation of Cathar docetism. In his defense of Christ's humanity, Eckbert did not reproduce Augustine's anti-Manichaean arguments, but offered a different exposition of the Gospel texts. For example, Eckbert cited Luke 24:39-40 as proof of the risen Christ's true humanity: "'See my hands and feet, that I am; touch and see, since a spirit does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have.' And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet." If Christ himself testified that He had a true body, how can the Cathars claim that He did not, asked Eckbert. "If you doubt that from the womb of the Virgin He assumed his body, run, wretched ones, to the gospel of Luke in which can be read the words of the angel to Mary, who spoke in this way: 'Behold, you will conceive and bear a

119 For Manichaean docetism, see Lieu, Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire, pp. 126-27; H. Polotsky, "Manichäismus," Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Supplementband 6, pp. 268-70; Allberry, Manichaean Psalm-Book, p. 54. For Augustine's description of the Manichaean view of Christ, see Contra Faustum, XX.2 and XXXII.7, CSEL, 25, pp. 536, 766; De Natura Boni, 44; CSEL, 25/1, p. 881.

120 Sermones, XIII, p. 339-40: "Ipse uerum corpus et animam se habuisse testatus est et qua temeritate uos dicitis neutrum in ipso fuisse et magis in hoc credendum arbitramini fallaci manicheo quam ueraci deo?"
son."

Eckbert stressed the importance of the phrase "concipies un utero" as proving that Christ was physically born. He also noted that the angel told Joseph that Mary had conceived by the Holy Spirit. The phrase "in ea natum est" clearly showed that Christ had a real body, according to Eckbert.

By contrast, Augustine's rebuttals of Manichaean docetism are not nearly so straightforward. In Contra Faustum, which contains Augustine's fullest treatment of Manichaean docetism, Augustine took up the Manichaean belief that Christ was generated from the earth through the power of the Holy Spirit, and that the "suffering Jesus" [Jesus patibilis] represented that portion of

121 Ibid., p. 341: "Si dubitas eum de virginis utero corpus assumpsisse, curre, miser, ad evangeliun luce in quo leguntur uerba angeli ad mariam loquentis hoc modo, 'Ecce, concipies in utero et paries filium.'"

122 Ibid.: "In utero,' inquit, 'concipies,' ut intelligas de ipsa carne uirginalis uteri et non aliunde eum carmem assumpsisse."

123 Ibid.:
Christ which was of the visible world, and which was crucified and mingled with it. Thus, the fruits of trees were said by Manichaeans to be symbols of this suffering Jesus.\textsuperscript{124} According to Augustine, such a position meant that Faustus

\begin{quote}
is forced to say either that Christ was crucified without a body—nothing more absurd and demented could be said—or or that he was crucified in appearance rather than in reality—again, what is more wicked than such inpiety?\textsuperscript{125}
\end{quote}

Eckbert encountered no such ideas among the Cathars, and fashioned no such arguments in his work. Rather, he presented what he considered the irrefutable and clear evidence of Scripture that Christ was truly human. According to Eckbert, a reading of John 19:34-37 made very clear that He was

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{124} Contra Faustum, XX.11; CSEL, 25, p. 549:
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Sed ut de conceptu iam taceam, partum ipsum deinde respicite. Concipientem de spiritu sancto dicitis terram gignere patibilem Iesum, quem tamen ita contaminatum omni ex ligno pendere perhibetis in frugibus et pomis, ut innumerabilibus animalibus animalium uscentium carnibus amplius contaminetur, ex ea sola parte purgandus, cui fames uestra subuenerit.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., p. 551:
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
Unde cogimini aut sine corpore dicere crucifixum—quo absurdius et dementius dici nihil potest—aut in phantasmate potius quam in ueritate eiusmod fuisse crucifici—qua rursus inpietate quid peius est?
\end{flushright}
born in the flesh, and left no doubt that He actually suffered and died:

Although you should be able to understand, if you possess any sanity, from the previously adduced testimonies that Christ was born with real flesh, it is also very clear from many testimonies of Scripture that he truly suffered and died in real flesh, and now it will suffice to introduce one from these many, from the gospel of John, who at the end of the Lord's passion said, "One of the soldiers pierced his side with a lance and immediately blood and water flowed out, and he who saw bears testimony and his testimony is true. . . " Note what he said, that "blood and water flowed out" and that he testifies that he saw this and that he affirms emphatically that he knows this to be true, so that there can be no doubt that there was in Christ the true substance of flesh.  

Eckbert added, "For if his body had been a phantom, as your Mani lyingly asserted, the lance could no more have pierced his body than blood and water

\[126 \text{Sermones, XIII, pp. 342-43:} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{Cum uera carne natum fuisse christum ex predictis testimoniis, si quid sane mentis habes, intelligere pots et in uera carne eum fuisse passum et mortuum, ex multis scripture testimoniiis evidentissimum est et nunc unum pro multis inductum sufficiat, ex iohannis euangello qui in fine passionis dominice ita ait, 'Vnus militum lancea latus eius aperuit et continuo exiuit sanguis et aqua et qui uidit testimonium perhibuit et uerum est testimonium eius . . . Attende quid ait, quia 'exiuit sanguis et aqua' et quod hoc se uidisse testatur et scire se rei eteritatem dicere diligenter affirmat, ut nullo modo dubitetur eteritatem carnee substantie in christo fuisse.}
\end{align*}
Moreover, in instances where Eckbert and Augustine used the same verse to defend Christ's humanity, their purpose was quite different. For example, Eckbert asserted that the risen Christ's invitation to Thomas to touch his wounds (Luke 24:39) clearly proved that he physically rose from the dead in the same flesh in which he had died. Augustine cited the same text in his attack on Manichaean docetism in *Contra Faustum*, but as part of a secondary argument. Faustus had claimed that Paul at first believed Jesus was descended from David and afterwards changed his mind, shown in 2 Cor. 5:16: "From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view; even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer." Augustine replied by citing 2 Tim. 2:8: "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, born of David's line." Although Faustus maintained that this verse and 2 Cor. 5:16 were contradictory,

127 Ibid., pp. 343-44: "Nam si fantasticum habuisset corpus . . . ut mentitus est uester manicheus, non magis de corpore eius lancea confixo quam de uento percusso potuisset profluere sanguis et aqua."

128 Ibid., p. 344: "Quod uero in eadem carne in qua natus est et passus etiam resurrexit, ex uerbis que supra induxi patet, que post resurrectionem suam dixit ostendens discipulis suis manus suas et pedes et ex eis que dixit thome dubitanti."
Augustine explained that what Paul meant by "flesh" in writing to the Corinthians was not the body, but the corruption of the body.\textsuperscript{129} It was in this context that he quoted Luke 24:39:

\begin{quote}
For by flesh the apostle here means not the substance of our bodies, in which sense the Lord used the word, when, after His resurrection, He said, 'Handle me, and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have,' but the corruption and mortality of flesh, which will then not be in us, as now it is not in Christ.\textsuperscript{130}
\end{quote}

Augustine's refutation of Manichaean docetism was far more complicated than Eckbert's rebuttal of Cathar docetism and involved much more than a literal interpretation of certain gospel passages. There is no evidence that Eckbert borrowed any of Augustine's arguments on this point.

Thus, Eckbert's report of docetism among the Cathars was genuine. He claimed to have heard of it first-hand, and the presence of docetism among the Rhineland Cathars is not at all surprising, given the reports of it among the Cathars of Southern

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Contra Faustum}, XI.7; CSEL, 25, p. 232.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.:
France and Lombardy during the twelfth century. Still, Eckbert mistakenly assumed that this doctrine originated with Mani and drew on the *De haeresibus* to support this claim. Yet, he did not buttress his account of Cathar docetism with material from Augustine, nor did he utilize Augustine in his refutation of this belief.

To summarize the conclusions of this chapter, there are several doctrines which the Manichaeans and Cathars shared: condemnation of marriage, abstinence from meat, a belief in two creative powers, and a docetic view of Christ. In these instances, one might expect to find that Eckbert supplemented his account of the Cathars by reaching to the familiar pages of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. Little evidence of this has been found, however, and the reasons for this are clear upon a close reading of the *Sermones*.

First, for all of those doctrines mentioned above, Eckbert claimed a first-hand source; he was not reporting rumors about the Cathars for which he had consulted books of heresiology; rather, he was recounting what individual heretics and former heretics had told him, including some of their secret doctrines. Thus, in most cases Eckbert had no need to call upon Augustine, or any other source,
to make his work appear more concrete; it was already grounded firmly in his own knowledge of the Cathars.

Second, even in those instances in which Augustine would have been of most help to Eckbert, he did not incorporate the anti-Manichaean writings into his work. For example, while Eckbert attributed Cathar docetism to Mani, in an obvious attempt to discredit contemporary heretics by linking them to more familiar ones from the past, he did not borrow from Augustine's description of Manichaean docetism. Even in his brief defense of Christ's humanity, Eckbert did not draw upon Augustine for help. Again, although according to Eckbert the Cathar belief that the devil created the world derived from Mani, he did not utilize anything which Augustine had written about Manichaean cosmology.

The result of this study clearly shows that a re-evaluation of the Sermones as a primary source for twelfth-century Catharism is necessary. It is no longer permissible to dismiss them, based upon a study of the first sermon, as a compendium of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. Rather, Eckbert's sermons should be regarded as the first thorough and systematic attempt to describe and
refute Catharism in the medieval West. As such, they should be carefully consulted by those addressing the basic questions of when and where Catharism first appeared in the medieval West, how it was influenced by Bogomilism, and how it interacted with the already existing movements for reform. In particular, Eckbert lends support to the view that Catharism in the West first appeared in 1143 near Cologne, for there is no doubt that he was combating the same two traditions of dissent about which Everinus had written to Bernard of Clairvaux. Moreover, between 1143 and 1163 the two heretical groups described by Everinus had become a single heresy, albeit with many sub-divisions, and the *Sermones* reflect the complicated relationship formed between the indigenous reform movement in the Rhineland and the dualism which had moved from the Bogomils of the Byzantine Empire into that region. The answers which Eckbert provided here might be applied to the study of how and why, in Lombardy and Southern France, the reformists seem to have been quickly overcome by dualists. Such was not the case in the Rhineland, where the two traditions remained distinct as late as 1163, although the process of forming an alliance had already begun. Furthermore, the degree to which Eckbert was able to separate and
identify these divisions within the Cathar community was remarkable and attests to his considerable first-hand knowledge.

Finally, although Eckbert was not immune from the medieval assumption that Manichaeism had survived in some form into contemporary times, he did construct a sophisticated description of the relationship between the Manichaeans and contemporary heresy. Eckbert had gained enough knowledge of Catharism to avoid simply projecting the Manichaeans of Augustine's time into the twelfth century. While maintaining the connection between the two heresies, he clearly distinguished between them, recognizing that changes in doctrine and organization had taken place since Augustine's time. It is true that he made mistakes—he believed that the dualist view of creation by the Cathar "perfecti" was derived from Mani, and that the Cathars celebrated the "Bema" feast of the Manichaeans—but these should not lead us to reject Eckbert's valuable testimony as unreliable. If one approaches the Sermones cautiously, weighing each piece of information presented, the effort will be rewarded.
Chapter V - Textual Tradition of the *Sermones*

The *Sermones contra Kataros* are extant in three manuscripts, none of which is complete. The earliest, (copy A) which is not dated but was probably composed in the thirteenth century, is contained in manuscript 482 of the *Codices Palatini Latini* of the Biblioteca Vaticana, ff. 67v-139r of ff. 1r-192r. This manuscript contains originally independent texts dating from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries which have been bound together. Copy A of Eckbert's sermons reveals evidence of having been copied primarily by three hands, all of which display features corresponding to the Early Gothic period, indicating a date of composition during the first half of the thirteenth century, although up to eight different hands worked on the entire copy. That Copy A was composed before 1317 is indicated by the following postscript: "Anno domini MCCCXVII in chathedra sancti petri audita

---

1 I am indebted to Dr. James J. John of Cornell University and Dr. Leonard Boyle of the Biblioteca Vaticana for studying portions of the manuscript and offering suggestions as the identity of the script and date and place of composition.
sunt in nocte tonitrua magna et uisa sunt fulgura."
Although this notation could have been added to the
text well after 1317, a composition date for Copy A
in the first half of the thirteenth century is also
suggested by a comment on the title page, which
mistakenly states that Eckbert (ca. 1129-1184) lived
during the reigns of Emperor Frederick II (1212-
1250) and King Louis IX of France (1226-1270),
rather than those of Frederick Barbarossa (1152-
1190) and Louis VII (1137-1180): "Eckbertus
presbyter Monachus Schonaugiensis contra Catharos.
Uixit sub Frederico II Imperatus et Ludouico IX
Gallia Regis."
Measuring 23 1/2 cm. X 34 1/2 cm, Copy A
contains enlarged and sometimes decorated letters
marking the division of the text into sermons, as
well as marking major divisions within each sermon,
though these are utilized almost exclusively in the
first sermon. On verso folios there are titles
corresponding to each sermon, added in another hand
at some time after composition. Additions to the
text are inserted in the right or lower margins.
Corrections in spelling and syntax are made
interlinearly. In the middle of ff. 20r and 20v,
the text is obscured by a circular mark
approximately 5 cm. in diameter, evidence of the

The *incipit* and *explicit* of A are as follows:

*Incipit*: "Illustrissimo rectori pontificalis cathedre in colonia domino regenoldo, frater ekebertus sconaugiensis cenobii monachus, hoc munusculum ex meditacionibus suis."

*Explicit*: "... ad laudem et honorem iesu christi dei et domini nostri cui est gloria et potestas in celo et in terra permanens in secular seculorum. Amen."

The location of composition was most probably in Germany, and Cologne is suggested by the postcript of 1317 which reported a great thunderstorm near the cathedral of St. Peter.

The texts comprising manuscript Palatina Latina no. 482 seem to have been collected at random sometime after 1508, which represents the latest composition date listed among its texts. Folios 1r-43r contain texts dating from the twelfth century; folios 43v-66v date from the eleventh or
twelfth centuries; 67v-147v date from the thirteenth century; folios 148r-192r date from the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Its contents, not including the Sermones contra Kataros, are as follows.

ff. 1v-6v: "De diueris officiis." From De officio missae or Micrologus de ecclesiastici observationibus (ca. 1088-1099); (selections from books I-XXIII), edited in PL 151, col. 977ff. Inc.: "De introitu admissam." ff. 6v-14r: "Micrologus de dominicis observationibus." Micrologus de ecclesiastici observationibus, (selections from books XXX-LXII), PL 151, col. 1003-22. Inc.: "Ab adventu domini usque ad natuiitatem eius: te deum laudamus . . ." For discussion of authorship and date, see PL 151, col. 973-78.


mox christianissimus . . ."


ff. 61r-64r: "Scriptum Theodorici Paterbrunnensis 'De oratione dominica'". De Orat.ine Dominica,
(ca. 1079) edited in PL 147 (1853), col. 331-40.


ff. 66r-66v: "Responsoria in honorem ss. Valerii, M. Magdalenae et Cornelii centurions ..." Inc.: "A progenie in progeniem fecit misericordiam dominus qui eduxit habraham de ur chaldeorum".

ff. 67r: "Adnotationes de incendiis Paterbrunnensibus annis 1000 et 1058, de translatione et depositione reliquiarum a. 1068, et de pecunia expensa pro 'aureo scrinio sancti Libroii'." Inc: "Anno dominice incarnationis MLVIII indictione XI Regina autem quarum Heinrici primo Ordinationis uero ... epistoli vii."


ff. 186v-187r: "Ordo Regum" Inc: "Karolus pippini filius cum iam principatum maior domus xii annos . . ."

ff. 187r-188r: "Qualiter Arrius orione Alexandrie episcopi divino iudicio dampnatus sit . . ."


The most significant feature of Copy A is the omission of the appendix, containing excerpts from three of Augustine's anti-Manichaean works, which Eckbert stated he had attached to the sermons:

For I have summarily and briefly collected from three of the works which were written by the blessed Augustine about the Manichaeans, namely from that which is entitled "Against the Manichaeans" and from that entitled "Concerning the Practices of the Manichaeans" and from the book "Concerning Heresies", and I have chosen to attach this collection to the end of this work.2

Despite the fact that the earliest printed edition of the Sermones (described below) includes this appendix, I have based my edition on Manuscript A, on the basis that as the earliest tradition it is more likely to be the most accurate.

A second copy (B) of the Sermones dates from the sixteenth century, indicated by its humanistic and cursive hands. Measuring 21 x 26 cm. in octavo,

2 Sermones, I, pp. 23-24:
Nam que de manicheis a beato augustino con-
scripta sunt summam et breuiter collegi
ex tribus libris eius, uidelicet ex eo qui
inscribitur contra manicheos et ex eo qui
intitulatur de moribus manicheorum et ex
libro de heresibus et eandem collectionem
in fine libri huius annectere dispono . . ."
its origin is unknown, and it is contained in manuscript 4576 of the *Codices Vaticani Latini*, ff. 1v - 110r of 1v - 115r, although it was at one time part of manuscript 482 with Copy A, according to Roth.3

The *incipit* and *explicit* of B are as follows:

**Incipit:** "Illustrissimo rectori pontificis cathedrae in colonia domino Regenoldo frater Eckebertus Sconaugiensis . . . ."

**Excipit:** "intendi ista scribendo ad laudem et honorem Jesu scripsi dei domini nostri, cui est gloria et potestas in caelo et in terram permanens in secula seculorum. Amen."

The remaining works in Palatina Vaticana no. 4576 are as follows:

**ff. 110r-114r:** "Assertionem definitionis apostolicae sedis de Henrici Anglie."

**ff. 114v-115r:** "Regis matrimonio adversus Academiarum quarundam definitionem contrarium Alberti Pighii ad Christianam lectorem praefatio."

B is clearly a copy of Manuscript A and does not depart significantly from the text of A. It does not include the appendix of Augustine's anti-Manichaean works. Moreover, in those places where the text of A is now obscured, B makes no notation, indicating that B was copied before these marks were formed. The slight differences between the texts primarily involve spelling and grammar, and only

3 Roth, *Die Visionen*, p. 217.
rarely does B change a phrase or word in A. An example is the following passage from the twelfth sermon, in defense of the doctrine of the Real Presence. A: "Nostra fides hec est et, sicut aiunt, uos omnino renuitis credere quod ab aliquo sacerdote, siue bono siue malo, possit ulla consecratione fieri corpus domini et quod ab aliquo homine sumi possit ad communicandum." B replaces "ad communicandum" with "ad manducandum."

B adds a phrase to clarify A in a few instances. Typical is the following passage from the sixth sermon, in defense of eating meat. A: "Sacerdotes quoque populi israelis et omnes qui de genere sacerdotum erant, carnes legalium hostiarum in loco sancto manducare iussi sunt." The last part of the passage in B reads "manducare a domino iussi sunt."


^ Sermones. XII, p. 296.

^5 Sermones, VI, p. 105.
It is clear that this printed edition was based on a manuscript tradition other than that of A-B. Although the texts of C and A generally correspond very closely, at the beginning of the printed edition C inserts a brief biographical statement on Eckbert of Schönau and a list of his other works, taken from Johannes Trithemius' *Catalogus illustrium virorum Germaniae*, published in 1495. Thereafter, C follows A very closely, from the beginning of the prologue in A to the last section of the fifth sermon, in defense of marriage.

The major departure between A and C is the inclusion of the appendix of Augustine's work in C, which also indicates that C was not based on A-B. It is possible that the appendix could have been separated from A after it served as the basis of the printed edition in 1530, but it is the departure between the two versions in the fifth sermon (discussed below) which provides conclusive evidence that this was not the case. Since it cannot be determined whether C was working from a textual

---


tradition earlier than A, I have based my critical edition on A and have listed C as the variant.

The texts also depart at the point at which Eckbert cites a passage from a work attributed to John Chrysostom, which he claimed the Cathars used to support of their denial of marriage. The text of A explains the proper sense in which the passage from Chrysostom should be understood, and lists a series of patristic writers who commended marriage: Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine, Hilary, Jerome, and Bede. Moreover, A explains the seeming contradiction of Chrysostom's view with these fathers as a matter of differences in audience and custom, Chrysostom writing about the Greek Church rather than the Latin Church.

C, however, does not just list a string of Church fathers for support, but quotes from works of Augustine and Jerome. Moreover, C explains the contradiction between Chrysostom and the other

---

8 *Sermones*, V, pp. 94-95: "Scio autem quoniam uerba iohannis crisostomi nobis opponitis quibus dixit quod 'secundum coniugium honesta fornicacio sit.'"

C is as follows, p. 40:

Scio autem quoniam et in hac parte nobis contraitis et obijcitis nobis quaedam uerba Iohannis Chrysostomi, quae in expositione Matthaei scribit dicens: "Secundam quidem uxorem accipere, secundum consilium apostoli est, secundum ueritatis rationem, uere fornicatio est."
Church fathers by explaining that because Chrysostom was a doctor of the Greeks, his words do not carry the authority of the Western Fathers on issues such as marriage. This rather long break in the texts of A and C indicates that C was not based on A but another tradition. Although it is possible that here C represents an earlier and more reliable tradition, (perhaps the more critical attitude toward Chrysostom in C is evidence of this), this does not warrant choosing C as the basis for a critical edition.

Of the four printed editions of the Sermones which have appeared since 1530, all have been based ultimately on C: Magna bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, primo guidem a Margarino de la Bigne . . . collecta et tertio in lucem edita (Universitate Coloniae Agrippinae theologorum ac professorum, 1618), vol. 12, pt. 1, col. 897ff; Marguerin de La Bigne, Maxima Bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum (Lugduni: Anissonios, 1677), vol. 23, pp. 600ff; Galland, Veterum Patrum Bibliotheca (1781), vol. 14, pp. 447ff; and J.-P. Migne, Patrologia Latina (Paris: 1855; rep. Brepols, 1976)
The conclusion that C provided the basis of these four later editions is based on a comparison of them with C, although the editors of the *Patrologia* acknowledged that their text derived from Galland's edition.

Moreover, a third manuscript of the *Sermones*, (D) containing the eleventh sermon in the series of fourteen, is in the Stiftesbibliothek of Wurzen, East Germany, manuscript no. 235, ff. 1v-47r, measuring 22 1/2 X 35 cm. in octavo. It is briefly described in the *Archiv des Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 8 (1843): 715 as follows: "chart. s. XVI. 8. Sermo domini Hekkeberti Treverensis contra haeresim catharorum de sacerdoto." A summary of the sermon's content, in defense of the Catholic priesthood, is presented in ff. 1v-16r, in the same hand as the text of the sermon (ff. 16v-47r). The *incipit* and *explicit* of D are as follows:

*Incipit:* "Sermo domini Hekkeberti Treuerensio contra haeresim catharorum de sacerdotio . . ."

*Explicit:* "De vobis autem scio quod quidquid loquamur quantumcumque sit rationabile vos vestros garrietis errores, sicut vulgo dicitur, 'Ouem, ouem clamat

---

The introductory summary of D was completed in March, 1531; f. 16r states: "Datum in magno . . . anno MDXXXI, ix calen. Martii." As the summary and text appear to have been copied by the same hand and during the same period, a date of 1531 for the entire text of D seems likely. It is also probable that D worked from the printed edition of the Sermones published in Cologne in 1530. D does not depart significantly from the text of C, although often changing the juxtaposition of words and deleting words or brief phrases. An example is D's treatment of the following passage from C in defense of the church's claim to possess the apostolic tradition: "... ut silvester ut gregorius ut leo et quam plures alii eadem, inquam, fides usque in hodiernum diem in ea predicatur et tenetur adiuvante apud patrem illa domini nostri iesu christi interpellatione de qua ipse dixit ad petrum . . ." D edits this passage as follows: "... ut silvester, gregorius, leo et quam plures alii eadem, inquam, fides usque in hodiernum in ea predicatur et tenetur adiuvante apud patrem illa domini iesu christi interpellatione de qua ipse dixit ad petrum . . ."
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