

STEPHEN WESSLEY, *The composition of Georgius' Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum Hereticum*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 48, (1978), pp. 55-61.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato dalla Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](https://heyjoe.fbk.eu) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](https://heyjoe.fbk.eu) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale. Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



THE COMPOSITION OF GEORGIUS'
*DISPUTATIO INTER CATHOLICUM
ET PATERINUM HERETICUM*

BY

STEPHEN WESSLEY

Because many thirteenth-century antiheretical tracts are related to one another through borrowed passages, the accuracy of their descriptions of heretical beliefs may be questioned. One such antiheretical tract, Georgius' *Disputatio*¹ must be treated with caution when used as evidence for Bagnolese Cathar tenets². According to an Italian historian, Ilarino da Milano, the *Disputatio* (composed shortly before 1250)³

¹ The antiheretical tract "Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum hereticum" has been edited by Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand in *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* 5 (Paris, 1717), cols. 1703-54 and in part by Ilarino da Milano in "Fr. Gregorio O.P., vescovo di Fano, e la 'Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum hereticum'", *Aevum* 14 (1940) 125-40, and Ludovico Muratori, *Antiquitates italicæ mediæ ævi* 12 (Arezzo, 1778) cols. 557-9. Prior to 1947 this antiheretical tract was wrongly ascribed to a Gregory; see Antoine Dondaine, "Le manuel de l'inquisiteur (1230-1330)", *Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum* 17 (1947) 174-80 for a correct identification of the author. About antiheretical tracts in general see Walter Wakefield, *The Treatise Against Heretics of James Capelli* (Columbia University, 1951) [an unpublished dissertation] and "Notes on Some Antiheretical Writings of the Thirteenth Century", *Franciscan Studies* 27 (1967) 285-321.

² Georg Schmitz-Valckenberg seriously weakened his study of Moneta of Cremona in *Grundlehren katharischen Sekten des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, Paderborn, and Vienna, 1971) by not properly evaluating the evidence in Moneta of Cremona's "Adversus Catharos et Valdenses"; see Robert Lerner's review "Georg Schmitz-Valckenberg, *Grundlehren katharischer Sekten des 13. Jahrhunderts: Eine theologische Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von 'Adversus Catharos et Valdenses' des Moneta von Cremona*", *Speculum* 48 (1973) 404-6.

³ Clues for a more precise date can be found in Georgius' mention of a warring pope, and the practice of mutilating a heretic's tongue. This particular penalty had been established in Frederick II's Sicilian Constitution of 1224, but was not a usual punishment of the Inquisition.

was written to refute Bagnolese Cathars⁴, but the main evidence supporting his proposal is found only in the passage about the wicked steward⁵. This crucial section presents the Bagnolese Cathar version of man's origin and requirements for salvation. According to this Cathar tale, because of deception the wicked steward⁶, that is, the devil, had been driven from heaven along with his accomplices. In his new domain the devil was able to begin the work of the creation of the world by separating land from water and even fashioning human bodies, but was unable to create souls. In Bagnolese scripture the devil overcame this obstacle when he lured two angels from heaven and imprisoned them in human flesh, thereby forming Adam and Eve⁷. Through the transmigration of these spirits and those of other sinful angels trapped in various human bodies, it was believed men were brought into existence throughout the history of the Old Testament. No spirit, however, was able to be released and enter heaven. Only after the lifetime of the prophet Simeon did they hold that salvation was possible, and

⁴ Ilarino da Milano, "Fr. Gregorio O.P.", 114-25. This sect was one of the three divisions of the Italian Cathar church; the Albanenses, Concorezzenses, and Bagnolenses were formed by successive waves of Bogomil influences from the East. These divisions reflected differences in belief and espoused respectively, absolute dualism, mitigated dualism, and a compromise between mitigated and absolute dualism.

The Bagnolenses were also known as Scлавini and Caloianni after their connection with the Bosnian Bogomils and the name of their first bishop. The appellation Bagnolenses, taken from the town of their second bishop, Orto of Bagnolo (1185-1200), became their most common name in the thirteenth century.

⁵ Ibid., 132-5.

⁶ Cf. Luke, 16, 1-8.

⁷ According to the inquisitor Anselm of Alessandria's treatise, the Bagnolese Cathars specified that two types of sinful angels had left heaven; some through conspiracy with the devil and these will never be saved, others through abduction and these, who afterwards were infused in such bodies as Adam and Eve, would find salvation. See Antoine Dondaine, "La hiérarchie cathare en Italie, II. Le 'Tractatus de hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.", Arch. fratr. Praedicatorum 20 (1950) 313.

That the Bagnolenses believed in both the creation and sinfulness of mens' souls before the foundation of the world was stressed additionally by the inquisitor Rainier Sacconi, whose account is particularly valuable because he was a former Cathar. See Antoine Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIII^e siècle: Le 'Liber de duobus principiis'*, suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare (Rome, 1939), p. 77 and François Šanjek, "Raynerius Sacconi O.P., 'Summa de Catharis'", Arch. fratr. Praedicatorum 44 (1974) 59.

this was announced in the "Nunc dimittis" ⁸. Subsequently, if a good man did penance and followed the way of a paterine, according to these Cathars, his spirit would be saved. Failing this, the soul had to remain in the world when the body died, and through metempsychosis enter another human body just being born. Bagnolese Cathars opined that souls existed prior to the establishment of the world, that is all mens' spirits were actually angels ⁹.

This passage is the same as one found in the so-called *Summa of Peter Martyr* (1235-1238). The editor of this *Summa*, Thomas Kaepeli, suggested that both tracts drew from a common source ¹⁰. Because Bagnolese Cathars are assumed to have been the object of Georgius' refutation on the basis of one passage, which was probably borrowed from another source, it is important to analyze further the composition of the *Disputatio* to estimate its overall reliability.

Two manuscript families of the *Disputatio* are extant, and Ilarino da Milano named them "Italian" and "French" ¹¹. The Italian group seems to be the older and the original text, while the French group has additional material such as a chapter on the eucharist, and at least one French version, the text edited by Martène and Durand, has a section on predestination appended after the body of the *Disputatio* ¹². Walter Wakefield has demonstrated the close relationship between the chapter on the eucharist ¹³ in the French version of the *Dispu-*

⁸ Luke, 2, 25-38.

⁹ This creation myth is found in Ilarino da Milano's edition of the "Disputatio", "Fr. Gregorio, O.P.", 132-5, and was listed by the author of the "Disputatio" in *ibid.*, 127-30 with other Cathar doctrines.

¹⁰ Thomas Kaepeli, "Une somme contre les hérétiques de s. Pierre Martyr (?)", *Arch. fratr. Praedicatorum* 17 (1947) 325, no. 38.

¹¹ Antoine Dondaine, "Le manuel de l'inquisiteur (1230-1330)", *Arch. fratr. praedicatorum* 17 (1947) 176, no. 19, argued against pressing the classification of "Italian" and "French" versions. A primitive text does exist and also a later text as found in the Martène and Durand edition. Italian manuscripts sometimes correspond to the Martène and Durand text, however, and manuscripts foreign to Italy, according to Dondaine, sometimes follow the primitive text.

¹² The rule-of-thumb is that the more elaborate rendition of the subject is the later example. One copy of the "Disputatio" states that it was written for the instruction of preachers, and that, to increase their effectiveness, material against the Cathars was added to the original "Disputatio".

¹³ Walter Wakefield, "Notes on Some Antiheretical Writings of the Thirteenth Century", *Franciscan Studies* 27 (1967) 298; for the text that Wakefield quotes here from Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses*, ed. T. Ricchinus (Rome, 1743) the cited page number should be corrected to read 301.

tatio and a corresponding section on the eucharist in Moneta of Cremona's *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses* (c. 1241). Other scholars have seen a link between the section on predestination attached to the Martène and Durand text and a corresponding text in Moneta's *Adversus Catharos*. But neither of the sections corresponding to Moneta's *Adversus Catharos* is part of the original *Disputatio*, that is, of the primitive Italian text, and, consequently, Arno Borst's statement, based on the findings of Charles Schmidt and Charles Molinier, that the *Disputatio* had no connection with Moneta's text has not been refuted¹⁴. The *Disputatio*, according to Borst, was arranged neither in the pattern of the *Adversus Catharos* nor was dependent on it. I wish to point out here, however, a previously unnoticed relationship between the original version of the *Disputatio* and the *Adversus Catharos*. Both tracts, written about the same time, have a very similar section on the veneration of the cross¹⁵. This similarity¹⁶, explained most plausibly through the use of a common source, is set forth below. And this relationship be-

¹⁴ Arno Borst, *Die Katharer, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica*, 12 (Stuttgart, 1953), p. 17, no. 13.

¹⁵ Wakefield, "Notes", 297, listed a shortened version of the "Disputatio" attributed to a Frater Torso. This tract, *Summa Fratris Torsonis de hereticis et spetialiter de erroribus paterinorum et de Pauperibus Lugdunensium*, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms. Cod. Vindob. 512, fols. 108^v-118^v, has been studied in a photocopy. A smaller *catena* of the same biblical texts used by Georgius in his discussion of the veneration of the cross is found on fol. 114^r. For a description of the *Summa* of Fr. Torso see Hermann Haupt, "Waldensia", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 10 (1889) 313-16, and for its relationship to the tract of the Anonymous of Passau see Alexander Patschovsky, *Der Passauer Anonymus, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica* 22 (Stuttgart, 1968), p. 104.

Another work dependent on the "Disputatio" is "Omnia puncta principalia et auctoritates extracte de disputatione inter Christianum Romanum et patarenum Bosnensem", Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, ms. Marc. Lat. II 64 (3000), fols. 295^v-308^r. The chapter on the veneration of the cross is found on fols. 304^v-305^r. This polemic has been edited by Franjo Rački, in "Prilozi za povjest bosanskih Patarena", *Starine, Jugoslovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti* 1 (1869) 109-38; for "De cruce" see 130-1.

¹⁶ The identical phrases in each tract are due mainly to similar *catenae* of scriptural passages. Such *catenae* seem to be the basis of all antiheretical tracts. Certain of the earlier *summae* against heretics were only chapter titles and lists of appropriate biblical verses. Some of the work of the later polemicists, such as James Capelli, retained these verses in their original sequences and were simply filled in with additional commentary according to Walter Wakefield and Austin Evans, eds., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York, 1969), pp. 296-7.

tween the original text of the *Disputatio* and the *Adversus Catharos* thus again confirms scholarly doubts about the *Disputatio*'s reliability as an independent source.

Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses*

... *Crux Christi ejus ignominia fuit*, sicut enim in cruce habuit inopiam, et molestiam, ita etiam ignominiam; et tamen sicut illius inopia, teste apostolo 2. Corinth. 8. v. 9. divites facti sumus, ita etiam *ejus ignominia nostra gloria est*, sive honor, et sicut sua mors nostra vita est 1. Petri 2. v. 24. « *Qui peccata nostra ipse pertulit in corpore suo super lignum; ut peccatis mortui, justitiae vivamus* »; Et sicut ejus livor nostra sanitas, ibid. « *Cujus livore sanati estis* », sic ejus ignominia sumus glorificati. Vis videre quod dico? Dicit apostolus ad Galat. 6. v. 14. « *Mihi autem absit gloriari, nisi in cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, per quem mihi mundus crucifixus est, et ego mundo ». Dixi, quod ejus ignominia fuit crux, hoc autem dixi quantum ad infideles et haereticos quorum opinione ignominia, et stultitia fuit crucifigi; sed quantum ad fideles habentes oculos illuminatos, ipsa crux gloria, et sapientia, et virtus fuit. 1. Cor. 1. v. 18. « *Verbum enim crucis pereuntibus quidem stultitia est: iis autem, qui salvi fiunt, id est nobis, Dei virtus est* »; et iterum v. 27. « *Quia quod stultum est Dei, sapientius est homi-*

Georgius, *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum hereticum*

Concedimus enim quod *crux fuit ignominiosa Christi*, sed illius ignominia est nostra gloria, sicut dicit apostolus Petrus 1. capite 9. in fine. « *Qui peccata nostra ipse pertulit in corpore suo super lignum, ut peccatis mortui, justitiae vivamus, cuius livore sanati sumus* ». Sicut ergo livore illius sanati sic ergo sumus ignominia glorificati. « *Nos autem* », sicut ait apostolus ad Galathas capite ultimo, « *absit gloriari nisi in cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi* ». Bene autem diximus ignominiam crucis quantum ad infideles et haereticos et illos qui pereunt et ignominia et stultitia fuit crucifigi. Sed quantum ad catholicos gloria et sapientia et virtus Dei est: unde apostolus ad Corinthios 1. capite 7. « *Verbum crucis pereuntibus quidem stultitia est, hiis autem qui salvi fiunt id est nobis virtus Dei est* ». Et iterum benedictus apostolus in fine illius capituli, « *Quia quod stultum est Dei sapientius est hominibus et quod infirmum est Dei fortius est hominibus* ». Crux enim Dei quae infirmum et stultum faciebat apparere Deum, fortior est hominibus quia salus est totius mundi et victoria diaboli, quod omnes homines fortitudina

nibus: et quod infirmum est Dei, fortius est hominibus»; crux enim Dei, quae infirmum et stultum facit apparere Dominum nostrum est salus totius mundi, et victoria diaboli, quod omnes homines sapientia, et fortitudine sua facere non possunt; unde eodem cap. v. 23. dicitur; «Nos autem praedicamus Christum crucifixum: Judaeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stultitiam (v. 24.) Ipsi autem vocatis Judaeis, atque Graecis, Christum Dei virtutem, et Dei sapientiam». Et ideo crucis signaculum non erubescimus, sed nostrae fronti imprimimus dicentes cum Paulo ad Roman. 1. v. 16. «Non enim erubesco evangelium» idest mortem Christi, et crucem ejus evangelizare, et frontibus etiam imprimere. «Virtus enim Dei est in salutem omni credenti»: propter quod et David in spiritu hoc praevidens futurum ait Psal. 4. v. 7. «Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui Domine»; vultus Dei Patris dicitur filius, quia in eo videtur voluntas ejus, et amor ad nos; lumen ipsius dicitur crux, quia fides crucis Christi illuminat credentes in eum.

Item Ap. 7. v. 2. et 3. angelus ascendens ab ortu solis clamat quatuor angelis. «Nolite nocere terrae et mari, neque arboribus, quoadusque signemus servos Dei nostri in frontibus eorum».

Item cap. 9. v. 4. «Et praeceptum est locustis, ne laederent foenum terrae, neque omne viride, neque omnem arborem: nisi tantum homines qui non habent signum Dei in frontibus suis».

Item Matth. 24. v. 30. «Tunc», idest in die judicii, «parebit signum

et sapientia facere non possunt, unde dicitur in eodem capite, «Nos autem praedicamus Christum crucifixum, Judaeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stultitiam, nobis autem electis Dei vocatis Christum Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam». Signaculum autem crucis tamquam imaginem regis nostri characterem imperatoris, vexillum fidei armaturam Dei frontibus nostris imprimimus sicut dicitur a David, «Signatum est super lumen vultus tui Domine». Et in Apocalypsi capite 6. «Quoadusque signemus servos Dei nostri in frontibus eorum». Et iterum capite 8. in medio, «Et praeceptum est eis ne laederent foenum terrae, neque omne viride, nec omnem arborem, nisi tantum homines qui non habent signum Dei in frontibus suis». Et in evangelio de die judicii dicit Dominus, Mattheus capite 24. «Tunc apparebit signum filii hominis in coelo», quia crux Christi in judicio apparebit ad terrorem crucifixorum, quia tunc videbunt in quem pupugerunt, et ad humilitatem et gloriam electorum; quia exemplo magistri, qui semetipsum exinanivit, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. Nos ipsi gratias referentes humiliabimur et gloriabimur in cruce tamquam vexillo salutis nostrae.

(Georgius, *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum hereticum*, Milan. Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS. S. 27 Sup., fol. 63r. This text from the «Italian» tradition differs only slightly from the corresponding text of the «French» ms. tradition printed by Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus*, 5, cols. 1747-8; it is taken from MS. S. 27 Sup. of the

filii hominis in coelo». *Apparebit autem ad terrorem crucifixorum, qui tunc videbunt, quem pupugerunt. Item ad gloriam bonorum, et humilitatem, qui exemplo illius qui semetipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens, factus obediens Patri usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis; humiliabuntur ei gratias agentes, et gloriantur in cruce, tanquam in vexillo salutis nostrae* (Moneta of Cremona, *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses*, ed. T. Ricchini, p. 461.)

Ambrosiana simply because Ilarinda Milano's partial edition does not include this section).