

---

H-France Review Vol. 17 (October 2017), No. 175

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

Response by John H. Arnold, University of Cambridge and Peter Biller, University of York.

H-France has invited us to respond to Mark Gregory Pegg's review of the *Heresy and Inquisition in France, 1200-1300* sourcebook.<sup>[1]</sup> We are grateful for the various positive things that Professor Pegg says *inter alia*, and we recognise the point he makes about the problems involved in deciding on how to translate the names of southern French people (i.e. should they be translated into modern English, modern French, or the Occitan/Provençal/Catalan original). However, we continue to feel that, in the context of a pedagogic sourcebook, the best tactic is that which helps anglophone students locate references in other existing scholarship.

We are confident that with regard to a variety of issues that Professor Pegg raises, readers can make up their own minds by reading the translations, the *Cathars in Question* collection, and the various publications by those involved. In other words, we do not propose to revisit the argument overall in this response. Our views are set out quite extensively elsewhere, as are those of Professor Pegg, Professor R. I. Moore, and others.

There are four things arising from Professor Pegg's review that we did however want to address. First, the introduction to *Heresy and Inquisition in France* is necessarily quite brief (given the length of the book) and, we had hoped, "neutral" in tone. That is, whilst it is true that it does not spell out in great detail the views of Pegg, Moore or others, it quite clearly indicates their scholarship, and the scholarship of others, and does not seek to editorialize for our interpretation. We did this precisely given that there is extensive debate available elsewhere, and (ironically) because we wanted to make it a book useable for teaching by those – Pegg included – who do not hold the same interpretation as us. But we would emphasize that the disputants are clearly flagged, and we do not think most readers will find these to be "throwaway sentences."

Second, beginning with the charter of St Félix was of course a deliberate choice, precisely because it poses key questions of interpretation. (It does not appear in part VIII, as Pegg suggests it should, because the sourcebook is not arranged chronologically, but via different genres of document). As we note in the sourcebook, *contra* to Pegg's rhetoric in the review and elsewhere, a seventeenth-century copy of a thirteenth-century *vidimus* of a twelfth-century charter is not an unusual thing in itself. We would therefore suggest that pointing out a transmission along those lines does not magically render a document "compromised." At the same time, it is of course open to critique--although that critique should bear in mind the really very strong conclusions made in favour of its authenticity by experts from the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in a volume dedicated to it published in 2001.<sup>[2]</sup> What it appears to contain is obviously important, and its presence in a book of translations will thus allow people to form their own judgment.

Third, Professor Pegg suggests that the guileless reader may be misled by the presence of words such as "Cathar" and "perfect" in "all" the introductions to inquisition documents in our volume of translations. In fact, because previous modern historians have made free use of these words, we were at pains to make the reader aware of this. The first reference, on p. 2, is to "heretics often called 'Cathars'." The reader will in fact find only sparing use of the danger words in the document introductions, and a sprinkling of quotation marks around some of them: semantic care which in fact owes much to Mark Pegg. (In parentheses, Peter Biller notes that Mark Pegg is right to point out that Biller used 'perfect' freely in a 1994 article, but wrong to state that Biller claimed to find the term in the texts he was citing; it was moreover common usage by historians in the field at that point, including Robert Moore, Malcolm Barber and Malcolm Lambert).

With regard to "perfect," one of our translations (no. 40) comes from Bernard Gui and emphasizes that the primary meaning of the word for that inquisitor--and perhaps for others--was something like "fully-fledged"; pushing us all, that is, away from interpretations which imagined "perfection" in some spiritual sense. Overall, we would like to emphasize the literalism of our translations. "Hereticus" is translated as "heretic" (never "Cathar" or "perfect"), and "Valdensis" as "Waldensian." Since these are what occur nearly all the time, this is what the reader will pick up--accurately--as ordinary usage in inquisition texts and records. "Catharus" (translated as "Cathar") occurs very rarely, in a handful of early theological treatises--so the reader will pick up its rarity, its generic location, and its absence from trial records.

Finally, if readers turn to the essays in A. Sennis, ed., *Cathars in Question* (Boydell and Brewer: York, 2016), they can decide for themselves whether we "misrepresent" the scholarship and interpretations of Professor Moore and Professor Pegg; and the existence of the sourcebook may help students and scholars similarly develop their own views. (In parentheses, John Arnold would like to emphasize one point only: that in his chapter in *Cathars in Question* he did not intend to impute any "unsavoury political views" to Moore or Pegg. Indeed, the point he makes in the concluding section of his essay is that all disputants in this debate are, as far as he can tell, on the Left politically).

## NOTES

[1] Corrigenda to the sourcebook can be found at <https://www.york.ac.uk/res/doat/bibliographies/handiinfrance.html>.

[2] M. Zerner, ed., *L'histoire de Catharisme en discussion: Le 'concile' de St Félix* (Centre d'Études Médiévales: Nice, 2001).

John H. Arnold  
University of Cambridge  
jha33@cam.ac.uk

Peter Biller  
University of York  
pete.biller@york.ac.uk

Copyright © 2017 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Review* nor republication of any amount in print form

will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on *H-France Review* are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172