

Abstract

BAZEMORE, JR., MICHAEL GLEN. Wellsprings of Heresy: Monks, Myth and Making Manichaeans in Orléans and Aquitaine. (Under the direction of Dr. Julie Mell.)

The execution of a number of clerics at Orléans in 1022 is viewed as a watershed moment in the history of heresy in the West. Five documents bear witness to the events, and each presents problems for historians. The accounts of Adémar of Chabannes and Paul of St Père de Chartres have received more attention than others, since they hint at the presence of dualist heretics in France, whom some historians have sought to link to the dualist Bogomils of Bulgaria and the Byzantine Empire. Though the consensus on the origins of heretics in France has shifted to emphasize local conditions in the emergence of heresy, recent document discoveries have revived the debate. Most prominent of these is the so-called “Letter of Héribert” describing seemingly dualist heretics in Périgord. Previously believed to be a twelfth century document, it has recently been discovered in an eleventh-century version. This thesis argues that the “Letter” describes not dualist heretics, but conscientious Christians taking responsibility for their own salvation. It further contends that this group can be identified as the “Manichaeans” whom Adémar of Chabannes describes as appearing in Aquitaine in 1018, and that when he applied the same label to the heretics of Orléans, he was not truly describing the latter group. The similarities between the doctrines adduced to the heretics and those of the Bogomils are considered, and it is argued that these are due to the influence of Orthodox monks on their Western brethren. Finally, it considers the implications of this for the study of eleventh-century heresy.

Wellsprings of Heresy: Monks, Myth and
Making Manichaeans in Orléans
and Aquitaine

by
Michael Glen Bazemore, Jr.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

History

Raleigh, North Carolina

2009

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Edith Sylla

Dr. Brett Whalen

Dr. Julie Mell
Chair of Advisory Committee

Dedication

To Laura,

She calls me her knight in shining armor;

She bestows upon me alone her charms.

Did ever a knight have such a prize

As the completion I find in her eyes

And the safe harbor of her arms?

Biography

Michael G. Bazemore, Jr., was born in Goldsboro, North Carolina, but spent most of his life in Newport News, Virginia where his historical interests were stoked by many able teachers. After starting as a History major, switching to a double major in History and Philosophy, he earned his Bachelor's degree in Philosophy from Christopher Newport University in 1993, writing about the intersections of Eastern philosophy and combat. Following a fourteen-year hiatus including a stab at graduate school and trying out various careers, Bazemore at last embarked on the serious study of History in the graduate program at North Carolina State University. When he's not engrossed in the history of medieval Europe, and when the waters are warm, Bazemore moonlights as a SCUBA instructor and can frequently be found swimming with his wife and the sharks on the numerous wrecks of the North Carolina Coast. In the fall of 2009, Bazemore will begin doctoral studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Education

2009	North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina Master of Arts Degree in History Major Field: Medieval Europe Minor Field: History of Science Thesis: "Wellsprings of Heresy: Monks, Myth and Making Manichaeans in Orléans and Aquitaine" Advisor: Julie Mell
1993	Christopher Newport University

Newport News, Virginia

Bachelor of Arts Degree

Major: Philosophy

Minor: History

Thesis: "Combat Without Violence: Yogas of Action in India, China and Japan.

Advisor: Dr. George Teschner

Publications/ Papers

- 2009 "The Adoptionism of Felix and the Beginnings of 'Medieval' Heresy"
HGSA Graduate Students Conference, North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina
- "Beware Greeks Bearing News: The Influence of Orthodox Monks on the
Reporting of Heresy in Western Europe" International Medieval Congress,
University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom

Awards

- 2009 Awarded Medieval and Early Modern Studies Graduate Recruitment Award,
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- Travel grant, North Carolina State University
- 2008 Inducted Phi Alpha Theta

Acknowledgements

There are more people who deserve my gratitude than I can ever hope to acknowledge. Whatever is accomplished with this document, it is the result of help and encouragement I have received over the course of my life. To my teachers and friends Tom Garner and Bruce Field, who made history interesting to a callow high-school student a quarter-century ago; to Dr. Raymond Jirran, who saw some sort of potential in a 15 year-old student taking his Western Civ course at Thomas Nelson Community College; to Dr. Mario Mazzarella, part of the perfect storm that aroused an initial interest in medieval history; to Dr. Alan Friedlander, who deserved more than he got from me—many thanks.

My journey through North Carolina State University has been a joyful one, mostly due to the efforts of the fine people in the history department. The fine instructors I had throughout my time here kept me on my toes. You know who you are and so do I. Norene Miller kept me up-to-date on paperwork and is in so many ways a guiding light for students. Steven Vincent, then the Director of Graduate Studies, encouraged me to apply when I was thinking of taking another path. I owe him more than I think either of us realize. Of course, there are the members of my committee to thank: Edith Sylla, whose help with Latin made my translations better, who always had the right question, and whose counsel and conversation I have valued immensely; Brett Whalen, who has the heaviest burden of all since he has to deal with me for several more years when I start working with him at UNC;

and, of course, Julie Mell, who has guided me through this since the beginning, and whose insight and advice have been invaluable. My heartfelt thanks to each of you.

Lest I forget, there are numerous fellow students, some of whom have contributed in by their comments and thoughts and still others who have contributed by sharing food, drink, baseball and bowling. You are too numerous to name and these thanks are inadequate, but thank you one and all.

No one should attempt such an undertaking without the love and support of family and I have been fortunate to have an abundance of both from mine. My mother-in-law, Kaye Reves, has been a steadfast supporter. My brother Steve came screaming into my life when I was thirteen and makes it a better and more interesting life by his mere existence. Watching him grow up has been one of my great privileges. Keep at it, kiddo. You'll get there, but you'll always be my baby brother. My parents, Patricia and Michael senior, on whose 39th wedding anniversary I will defend this thesis, taught me more than anyone else ever will, especially about how to succeed and how to be a good person. Dad got me started on this path more than thirty years ago through more walks and bike rides on the battlefields at Yorktown than I can recall and, equally important, taught me when to pass, when to shoot and when to drive. Mom taught me much about reading, writing, reason and wit and by nurturing my interests in comic books, cartoons and science fiction showed me that genius is not always in the obvious places. Both showed me, through their efforts and their achievements, that great achievement is possible through applied effort. I continue to learn

so much from them and try every day to live up to their example. On my very best days I succeed.

Any shortcomings in this work are exclusively my own.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	ix
Chapter One: Heresy in the Air	1
Contemporary Accounts of the Orléanais Heresy	5
The Letter of Héribert	9
The Heresies and the Historians	10
The Structure of This Work	20
Chapter Two: In Those Times	24
John of Ripoll and André of Fleury	24
Ralph Glaber	28
Paul of St. Père de Chartres	32
Adémar of Chabannes	36
“Héribert”	42
Chapter Three: Common Threads	47
Politics and Heresy	48
“Manichaeans” in Aquitaine and Orléans	52
The Peace of God and the Cult of Saints	57
Millennialism	60
Chapter Four: Questions of Influence	65
Orthodox Influences	65
Italy	73
Intersections	78
Heresy at Orléans and Beyond	83
Bibliography	89

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparison of accounts of the 1022 heresy at Orléans	41
Table 2: Comparison of accounts of heresy from 1018, 1022 and the "Letter of Héribert" ...	46
Table 3: "Manichaeans" of 1018 and the "Letter of Héribert"	66

Chapter One: Heresy in the Air

Heresy was in the air throughout France during the first half of the eleventh century. On the Feast of the Innocents in 1022 a number of persons associated with the Church of the Holy Cross at Orléans were, at the order of King Robert II, burned as heretics. There were, based on the various reports of the incident, between ten and fourteen of them, and whether all of them were clergy is muddled by the sources available, but it seems certain that at least ten of them were. What is certain is that their leaders were close to the king, their unmasking an embarrassment in Orléans, where two bishops contested the episcopate and served as proxies in a struggle between the king of France and the count of Blois. It was the first execution for heresy in the West since the fourth century. The incident at Orléans would not be the only such event in the early eleventh century, but since it seems to mark a shift in both the emergence of heretical groups and in the tactics used in dealing with them, it is the best known.

At about the same time a monk, writing perhaps from the abbey of St.-Germain d'Auxerre, sounded the alarm. I imagine this monk, named Héribert, sitting in the candlelit darkness of the scriptorium, thick smoke rising from a shrinking candle, scribbling feverishly on the parchment, intent that his clarion call to Christians at the four points of the compass issue forth and be heard. "A new heresy is incited in the world," he wrote, "springing in the

present time from pseudo apostles.”¹ Perhaps in his struggle he identified with the patron and namesake of the monastery, who had battled the Pelagian heresy almost six centuries earlier. Indeed, had he been schooled in the life of his patron, and in the tenets of Pelagianism, the heretics he saw rising from Périgord might have seemed familiar.

They do not eat meat, nor do they drink wine, except for a small bit every third day. They genuflect one hundred times. Not only will they receive no money, but even distribute property according to what seems fit. But this sect is exceedingly perverse, hidden and deceiving[...] They say alms are for nothing, because there should be no possessions whence they come. The Mass leads to nothing, nor should communion be seen as anything other than pieces of blessed bread. They assert that ecclesiastical chant is vain and invented for the approval of men.²

These radicals included laymen who had given up their property, as well as men and women of religious vocation, and were accused of recruiting others to torture them to death as well as being credited with the ability to perform wonders.³ Discounting the accusations of murder and miracles, we can easily see their aim. Like the Pelagian heretics of old, these were believers taking charge of their salvation; the Church did not approve.

¹ Guy Lobrichon, “Latin Texts of the ‘Letter’ of Heribert” in Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press: 1992), 347-350. *Nova heresis horta est in mundo, incipiens hoc tempore a psOdo apostolis.*

² Ibid., 347-348. *Carnem non comedunt, uinum non bibunt, nisi per modicum tertio die. Centies genua flectunt, pecuniam non solum non recipient, sed et habitam prout uidetur decenter dispertiunt. Sed est illorum secta valde perversa, occultaque ac decipiens... Elemosinam dicunt nihil esse, quia nec unde fieri posit debere possideri. Missam pro nichilo ducunt, nec communionem debere percipi nisi solummodo fragmenta panis benedicti. Canticum ecclesiasticum vanum esse asserunt, ac pro fauore hominum inuentum.*

³ Ibid., 348. *In hac itaque seductione quamplurimos iam nom solum laicos propria omnia relinquentes, sed etiam clericos, presbyteros, monachos et monachas pertraxerunt. Itaque sunt mersi ut uelint inuenire qui eos crucient et morti tradant. Faciunt enim multa signa.*

The Burgundian monk Rodolphus Glaber, who would also chronicle the events of Orléans, wrote of two heretics, one in the county of Châlons named Leutard, the other an Italian named Vilgard who flourished briefly at the end of the tenth century, as well as of an unnamed heresy that emerged from Sardinia and was eliminated, all of which he saw as according “with the prophecy of St John, who said that the Devil would be freed after a thousand years.”⁴ Adémar of Chabannes, another of the chroniclers of the Orléans affair, wrote about a group of heretics who had troubled authorities in Aquitaine in 1018 and whom, like the group at Orléans, he labeled “Manichaeans.”

These movements have been the subject of a long-running scholarly dispute concerning their origins, one which will be addressed in this work. Some historians, following Adémar of Chabannes’ accounts of heresy, have seen his descriptions as support for the notion that they had been influenced by the Bogomils, a dualist sect originating in Bulgaria, and which spread to the Byzantine Empire eventually either influencing or inspiring the Cathar heresy in the West during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁵ Others have concentrated on local conditions as the source of dissent, frequently denying that these movements were heretical at all.⁶ These historians see the groups either as harbingers of the late-eleventh-century Gregorian reforms or, most especially in Orléans, as victims of political

⁴ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories*, edited and translated by John France (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 89-93. Hereinafter in the text I will use the conventional English name Ralph Glaber.

⁵ The classic example is Sir Steven Runciman, in *Medieval Manichee: A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1947). Such a position has been more recently advanced by Claire Taylor in *Heresy in Medieval France*.

⁶ See “The Heresies and the Historians” below.

intrigue. The political argument has been effectively advanced by R.I. Moore, who has concluded that persecution of heretics was an outgrowth of the institution-building process, especially in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁷ Secular and episcopal authorities during this time were engaged in consolidating and centralizing power, which had the net effect of placing certain groups outside the pale of orthodox political or religious belief. The process by which these authorities came to identify perceived threats to order is the genesis of Moore's "persecuting society." The unmasking and execution of heretics at Orléans in 1022, contextualized as part of a power struggle between King Robert II of France and Count Odo of Blois⁸, is seen as an early manifestation of this consolidation and as a precedent for later action against outsider groups.

This thesis will argue that both positions are inadequate to explain the accounts and events of Orléans. It will show that evidence for the presence of eastern dualism and its influence on early-eleventh-century heresy is confused because the sources are confused. Adémar is quick to identify the heretics of 1018 and Orléans as "Manichaeans." Yet his account of Orléans offers little insight into what makes the heretics Manichaeans; the only facts he presents are the names of key figures, the location, and the date. By calling them

⁷ R. I. Moore, *Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe c.950-c.1250* 2nd ed. (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 8, 14-15.

⁸ According to Thomas Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orléans 800-1200* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 267, this is truly an instance of the personal becoming political. Robert the Pious had married Odo's stepmother, Bertha of Burgundy. He later repudiated this marriage and married Constance, leading to a bitter rift between the two, which played out in the battle between two contenders for the bishopric of Orléans. Head points to this as the root of the feud between them. Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1180* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 192, points to a later political conflict over Odo's inheritance of Meaux and Troyes in 1021.

“Manichaeans” Adémar employs a shorthand, referring the reader to the beliefs of the 1018 group. I shall argue in this thesis that taking Adémar’s account of the 1022 heresy as evidence of dualism is a mistake. Adémar’s account has little of use to tell us about that event, which at its core was a political dispute. Further, I will argue that the heretics Adémar claimed were running rampant throughout Aquitaine in 1018 and those described in the “Letter of Héribert” are the same group, which can be seen by their reported beliefs and the identification of Périgord as the origin of both the group described by Héribert and of the heresiarch of Orléans according to Adémar. Both accounts described pious individuals who rejected certain elements of religious practice in their quest for more authentic religious experience. In taking charge of their own salvation, these groups presented an unacceptable challenge to ecclesiastical authority. This thesis also takes issue with those who, following Bautier and Moore, might argue that the events of Orléans were a purely political matter. Clearly politics played a large role. However, it is just as clear that those accused espoused some position that gave their accusers a weapon to use against them.

Contemporary Accounts of the Orléanais Heresy

There are five more or less contemporary accounts of the events at Orléans in 1022. I will provide a brief overview of them here—one which will be expanded on in the second chapter of this work—followed by an exploration of the historiography of this event. The earliest of these accounts is a letter written by a monk named John of Ripoll to abbot Oliba of Cuxa in early 1023. His account presents an image of clergy who denied the power of the

consecrated priesthood to baptize and to absolve sins, who abstained from meat and denied the sacred rites of marriage.⁹ John's letter is presented as a warning to his bishop to be on the lookout for such heretics and to guard against their arrival.

Next chronologically, written around 1027, is the account of Adémar of Chabannes, who wrote about the events of Orléans in the second and third versions of his *Chronicon*.¹⁰ It was Adémar who charged that the heretics were Manichaeans, linking them to the dualist sect that had so troubled Augustine in the fourth century. His account is sensational. Eschewing any discussion of doctrine, he claimed that the heretics participated in full-fledged diabolical orgies, and that any child produced by such intercourse was murdered and reduced to a powder. This powder, Adémar claimed, converted those who touched it into Manichaeans. Members were also accused of communing personally with the devil, who appeared to them as an Ethiopian and as an angel of light.¹¹ Adémar's account also seems to link the heretics at Orléans with the "Manichaeans" that appeared in Aquitaine in 1018.¹² All of the accounts but Adémar's were or may have been based on eyewitness testimony.

The accounts written by André of Fleury and Ralph Glaber were written at roughly the same time, with André's account likely written in the mid 1030s. André was an

⁹ John of Ripoll, *Johannes monachus ad Olibam* in *Vie du Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury- Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Floriacensis Monasterii* trans. and ed. by Richard-Henri Bautier, (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989), 180-183.

¹⁰ See Richard Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Adémar of Chabannes 989-1034* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), Chapters Six, Seven, and Ten for the story of the three versions labeled *Alpha*, *Beta* and *Gamma*. In his account of Orléans, the *Beta* version is an expansion on *Alpha*. *Gamma* marks only a few changes; see Chapter Four below.

¹¹ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 129, ed. by R. Landes and G. Pon (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1999), 180.

¹² *Ibid.*, 180. See page 170 for the notice of 1018.

eyewitness to the affair and wrote of them first in his *Vita Gauzlini*.¹³ Gauzlin was an active participant in the trial in his dual role as abbot of Fleury and archbishop of Bourges. His account shares several details with John of Ripoll's and it is important to note that of the accounts to be examined these are the only two that can be reliably said to contain eyewitness testimony to the proceedings. John and André, then, can show us some of the contours of what the "heretics" preached. Gauzlin's presence at the proceedings, and André's account of it, also provide a window into the political nature of the events.

Sometime between 1036 and 1041, Ralph Glaber wrote of the affair in his *Quinque Libri Historiarum* while he was a monk at the monastery of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre.¹⁴ Like John and André, he attempts to detail the group's beliefs, but his account is racier than the more sober accounts of Fleury. Like Adémar, he accuses the group of sexual license and claims the heresy was brought to Orléans from abroad. He does not, however, tie the group to Périgord, claiming rather that it was brought from Italy by a woman. The account shows some of his concerns about chiliastic matters, and it seems the imputed Italian origin of the heresy may be an attempt to link it to outbreaks of heretical behavior in Italy in 970 and 1028. Glaber was not an eyewitness to the affair at Orléans, though it has been suggested

¹³ André of Fleury, *Vie du Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury- Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Floriacensis Monasterii* trans. and ed. by Richard-Henri Bautier, (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989), 97-103.

¹⁴ Glaber, *Historiarum* 139-143

that he may have learned of the event from the bishop Odolric, who was at the center of the controversy and whom Glaber met in 1034.¹⁵

Paul of St. Père de Chartres wrote the latest account that might have involved some eyewitness testimony, though he wrote it nearly sixty years after the event. His version includes the infiltration of the group by a Norman nobleman named Aréfast, with the assistance of Evrard of Chartres and the duke of Normandy.¹⁶ Paul's tale is by far the longest and strangest, incorporating the more salacious elements present in Adémar's version and adding details that would lead one to believe that the group in Orléans was a Gnostic illuminist sect, one whose members claimed to possess secret knowledge imparted to them directly by the Holy Spirit. It is interesting to note that many of the illuminist characteristics resemble more closely those of a group of heretics executed in Monte forte, Italy in the year 1028 than the beliefs of the heretics described by John of Ripoll and André of Fleury.¹⁷ This account is the most overtly political of the five. As we shall see, Aréfast was a key figure in the political intrigues between the count of Blois, the duke of Normandy, and the king of France.

¹⁵ Arthur Siegel, *Heresy, Reform and Regional Power in Italy: A Re-evaluation of the Montforte Sect*, unpublished dissertation, (University of Delaware, 2003), 67. For their having met, Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum*, 203.

¹⁶ Paul of St. Père de Chartres, "The Narrative of Paul, a Monk of Chartres," in Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, eds., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991) 76-81. The account comes from "De rebus quas dedit Arefastus monachus Santo Petro" *Vetus Aganon*, ed. Benjamin-Edmé-Charles Guérard in *Capitulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres* (Collection des Cartulaires de France, ser. 1. 2 vols. Paris: 1840), 108-115. The account in Wakefield and Evans (*WEH*) is only of the heresy, while the account "De rebus" contains more information, though most of it is about the heresy.

¹⁷ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 86-89 for an account of the Monteforte group.

The Letter of Héribert

As we have seen this document, written by a monk calling himself Héribert, “the least of all monks” speaks of a heresy arising from Périgord.¹⁸ Located in a manuscript originating in the abbey of Saint-Germain d’Auxerre, it has been dated by paleographic analysis to the beginning of the eleventh century.¹⁹ Prior to 1990, however, this letter was only known from twelfth-century manuscripts. Before that time, the charges leveled above and others to come were widely seen as referring to early vestiges of the Cathar movement, the evidence of Bogomil evangelists infiltrating from the Byzantine Empire. If we knew only the twelfth-century version of the “Letter of Héribert”, we would be on solid ground in promoting it as evidence of dualist heresy in western Europe. There is abundant twelfth-century evidence of dualism, found in the writings of authors such as Eckbert of Schonau, who wrote a series of sermons between 1163 and 1167 providing detailed information on the Cathar heretics.²⁰ There is also the report of a Cathar council held at Saint-Felix de Caraman in 1167, detailing the visit of the Cathar “pope” from the east, Nicetas, in which France was divided into bishoprics by the heretics gathered there.²¹ Set among these and other works, the letter would merely be one more witness to the emerging Cathar phenomenon.

¹⁸ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 348. *monachorum omnium minimus*

¹⁹ Lobrichon, “The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre,” *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, ed. Richard Landes and Thomas Head, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992), 84.

²⁰ The first of these sermons speaking of their errors can be found in R. I. Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1997; reprint Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 89-94.

²¹ A brief document describing the council can be found in Edward Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), 121-123. Malcolm Lambert *The Cathars*

The re-dating of this document presents a challenge to those who have accepted the earlier interpretation of it, for while there is a consensus concerning the presence of dualist heretics in the twelfth century, there is no such accord when it comes to the eleventh. While chroniclers in early eleventh-century France noted an increase in heresy, historians are deeply divided over what those accounts describe. Héribert's letter is now squarely in the middle of this debate. What, then, does his letter describe? It will be argued that Héribert's letter is not evidence of Bogomil dualism, but of another, less pernicious, sort of influence from the East. Further, these believers were not seeking to destroy the church; they were in the vanguard of coming movements, taking responsibility for their own salvation and, by forsaking money and property, and embracing older norms of monastic life. Furthermore, the "heretics" described by Héribert will be identified as the "Manichaeans" Adémar described plaguing Aquitaine in 1018, and as the group he conflates with the clerks of Orléans.

The Heresies and the Historians

It is the charge of Manichaeism in early instances of heresy that has so excited the imaginations of subsequent historians, leading some to conclude that heretics who appeared in the West from 970 forward were influenced by Bogomil missionaries. I will refer to this position as the "missionary thesis." Though the missionary thesis is the current minority position, we will examine it briefly before exploring the dominant position and the later

(Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 45-59 has an account of Nicetas's mission and the council, along with notes on the historiography of the event.

response to it. According to the missionary thesis this first wave of conversions began shortly before the turn of the millennium and ended in the middle of the eleventh century with the disruption of travel routes through Italy by the Norman wars and with the emergence of the movement known as the Gregorian reform, which channeled much of the zeal that may have led to heresy. Dualist heresy then re-emerged in the early twelfth century with a wave of charismatic preachers culminating in the Cathar heresy, which was first reported in 1143.

One of the most impassioned advocates of the missionary thesis was Sir Steven Runciman. In his classic *The Medieval Manichee* (1947), he argues not only for continuity between Bogomil dualists and Western heretics, but also for the continuity of those same Bogomils with the ancient Gnostic dualist tradition that is as old as Christianity itself. Faced with the problem of reconciling the existence of evil with that of an omnipotent and benevolent Creator, dualists asserted that this world was not the creation of the God of the New Testament, the God of love and mercy. It was, rather, the creation of his enemy, who masqueraded as God in the Old Testament, and who had trapped sparks of the divine in gross material bodies.²²

A brief aside is required to examine the term “Manichee,” or Manichaeism, as it has been used in writing about medieval heresy. Manichaeism was one of Runciman’s Christian dualisms, one which had been practiced for fourteen years by the future Saint Augustine.²³ Mani, the self-proclaimed Apostle of Christ, founded a religion with the characteristic

²² Runciman, *Medieval Manichee*, 6.

²³ Ibid., 12. Runciman argues that early writers like St. Ephraim were right when they grouped Mani with other Christian heretics.

practices of dualism, but with an exceedingly complex cosmology. This faith was a major competitor of Christianity in the third century.²⁴ When Augustine turned to Christianity, his former faith would be the target of much of his vitriol, so much so that the term Manichaeism came to be, in the minds of medieval churchmen, synonymous with dualism, and a call for authorities to take action.²⁵ The use of the term “Manichaeism” to describe heretics like those Adémar of Chabannes described from 1018 and 1022, coupled with their apparently dualist practice, led to the old consensus that Western heresy was largely the product of the evangelical activities of Bogomil missionaries. Opponents of this consensus would argue that when a medieval chronicler employed the term, he did so because it was “one of the most infamous names in the constellation of medieval churchmen” on the strength of Augustine’s condemnation of it.²⁶

The missionary thesis was first challenged by the Italian historian of religion Raffaello Morghen. In his book *Medioevo cristiano* (1951) and again in the essay “Problèmes sur l’origine de l’hérésie au moyen-âge” (1968), he argued that the heresies of the tenth and eleventh centuries were not influenced by either Manichaeism or by Bogomil dualism.²⁷ He claimed that scholars advancing the missionary thesis have been guilty of credulously accepting polemic as fact. Those labeled as heretics were most often reformers

²⁴ There is a thumbnail sketch of Manichaeism in Runciman, *Medieval Manicheism*, 12-15.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

²⁶ Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992; reprint, Barnes & Noble Books, 1998), 20.

²⁷ Raffaello Morghen, “Problèmes sur l’origine de l’hérésie au moyen-âge in *Hérésies et sociétés dans l’Europe pré-industrielle 11^e-18^e siècles*, ed. Jacques LeGoff (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1968), 121

seeking a more authentic religious experience by attempting to recapture the spirit of the early Church, their movements a reaction to purely local conditions arising from the renewal of economic life and the rebirth of city life around the turn of the millennium.²⁸ That heresies in Western Europe arose at the same time Bogomilism was peaking in Bulgaria and Byzantium is not conclusive; “it is a matter of a simultaneity that does not imply dependence.”²⁹

Morghen’s position was almost immediately challenged by Antoine Dondaine, Dominican priest and historian of medieval religion. His “L’Origine de L’Hérésie Médiévale: A Propos d’un Livre Récent” (1952) was a direct response to Morghen’s *Medioveo cristiano*. Dondaine charges that in rejecting the missionary thesis, Morghen had ignored clear evidence that the Western heretics were proselytized by Bogomils: the heretics were extreme ascetics, ethical dualists, opposed to the Church, and exhibited the hierarchy of hearers and initiates characteristic of Bogomilism.³⁰ He proclaims that “almost all the traits of Bogomilism, in every case those which are essential to characterize the movement, are found in the West around the first half of the eleventh century.”³¹ Accounts by Western chroniclers of missionaries from other regions of France or, especially from Italy, provide further evidence of Bogomil infiltration in the West.³²

²⁸ Ibid., 123-129

²⁹ Ibid., 126. *il s’agit une simultanéité qui n’implique pas de dépendance.*

³⁰ Antoine Dondaine, “L’Origine de L’Hérésie Médiévale: A Propos d’un Livre Récent,” *Estratto da Revista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, Anno 6 (April 1952): 48.

³¹ Ibid., 62-62. *presque tous les traits du Bogomilisme, en tout cas ceux qui sont essentiels pour caractériser le mouvement, se retrouvent en Occident dès la première moitié du XI^e siècle.*

³² Ibid. 63-64.

As we have noted earlier, modern scholars have by and large accepted Morghen's thesis. Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans pursue a similar track in *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (1969). While admitting that groups like the heretics at Orléans may have been dualist, they assert that it was entirely conceivable that such dualism could be inherently Western.³³ Malcolm Lambert, in *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (1992), sees not a dualist heresy at Orléans, but a Gnostic one.³⁴ Eleventh-century heresies were not imported by Bogomil missionaries, but arose from other cultural currents: the Peace of God in Aquitaine, political instability, and eschatological fervor surrounding the millennial celebrations of Christ's birth and crucifixion.³⁵

Richard Landes, a well-known scholar of chiliastic movements, has explored the theme of millennial expectation and its influence on eleventh-century heresy. In his essay "The Birth of Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon" (2000), he argues that the Peace of God and heresies arising in the early eleventh century were both products of millennial enthusiasm.³⁶ Landes's argument also answers another key question: why, after a silence of nearly six centuries, did heresy appear at just this time?³⁷ He also maintains that heretical movements represented a kind of radicalism that was one likely result of the popular passions aroused by the Peace of God, which attempted to bring the populace and the clergy together

³³ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 19.

³⁴ Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 16.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 20-21.

³⁶ Richard Landes, "The Birth of Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon," *Journal of Religious History* 24 (February 2000), 42-43.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 29. Like most historians of medieval heresy, Landes ignores heresies such as the Adoptionist controversy in eighth-century Spain and other, smaller disputes that took place between the fourth and eleventh centuries.

against petty nobility capriciously exercising the power of the ban, which they had usurped from legal authorities. Peace oaths, taken in councils attended by lay and cleric alike, were sworn upon the relics of the saints, in the presence of God and Man. The enthusiasm engendered by the Peace not only manifested in religious expressions labeled heretical, but also in the spread of relic cults, a phenomenon that will need to be considered as we examine Adémar's account in detail.³⁸

R.I. Moore has taken an unequivocal stand on the origins of early eleventh-century heresy. He resolutely rejects the notion that these movements were the product of Bogomil evangelization, and even questions whether many of these "heresies" were in fact heretical at their core.³⁹ He further asserts that ecclesiastics were wont to throw the label "heretic" at anyone who bucked their authority, so that their judgments, in the absence of other corroborating evidence, must be seen as suspect.⁴⁰ In this, he follows R.H. Bautier, who notes that the beginning of the eleventh century was a time of great ferment, with bold thinkers who at times "gave themselves over in unheard-of audacity, resuscitating old heresies, notably those of the Pelagians."⁴¹ For both, the question of outside influence is off the table.

³⁸ Idem, "La vie apostolique en l'an mil: paix de Dieu, culte des reliques et communautés hérétiques," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 46 (May-June 1991), 575.

³⁹ R.I. Moore, *Origins of European Dissent* 2nd ed. (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985; reprint, Buffalo, N.Y.: University of Toronto Press), 165.

⁴⁰ R.I. Moore, "The Birth of Popular Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon?," *Journal of Religious History* 24 (February, 2001), 22. In this essay, Moore argues against Landes's position that eleventh-century heresies were related to millennial concerns, which is interesting but not terribly relevant to this discussion.

⁴¹ Robert-Henri Bautier, "L'hérésie d'Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XI^e siècle: documents et hypothèses," reprinted in *Recherches sur l'histoire de la France médiévale: Des Mérovingiens aux premiers*

There is, however, a new scholarly trend advancing the missionary thesis based on new sources that have recently surfaced: the “Letter of Héribert,” which we will examine in detail, and the sermons of Adémar of Chabannes, which will play a tangential role in our investigation later. The “Letter of Héribert” has long been known from a mid-twelfth-century version and was believed to describe the beginnings of the Cathar presence in France in the 1160s.⁴² In the early 1990s, French scholar Guy Lobrichon discovered an eleventh-century version of the letter in a codex from the monastery of Saint-Germain d’Auxerre. Whether this is the original document cannot be determined, but the earlier date of it, confirmed by paleographic analysis and its placement in the codex, throws the earlier consensus about it into turmoil. When the document was known only from the twelfth century, it was seen as a further piece of evidence of Catharism’s emergence in Aquitaine. Practices described in the letter were readily accepted as showing Bogomil influence because this influence was widely understood to have been a factor in Catharism’s rise. So while it is widely agreed that dualism was a potent force in the twelfth century, there is no such consensus concerning the eleventh. Interpretations of the “Letter of Héribert” since the discovery of the earlier version have attempted to address the matter.

Capétiens, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier (Brookfield, Vt.: Gower Publishing Company, 1991), 88. *Certains se sont livrés à des hardiesses inouïes, ressuscitant les vieilles heresies, notamment celles des pélagiennes.*

⁴² Moore, *Origins*, 183; Runciman, *Medieval Manichee*, 119; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 138. Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 2nd ed., 30, mentions that one sees hints of the accusation of Manichaeism in Héribert’s letter. In *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 36-38, he addresses the current debate finding in the heretics a “stress on flight from the world, a will to purity, a positive repugnance for the material and for human flesh and its desires” along with “a radical pessimism about the natural order” but no dualism.

Lobrichon has taken a literary approach to the “Letter,” his analysis suggesting that Héribert was not directly attacking a real heretical movement. He argues that the author is presenting Cluniac ideology through the document, “but as if in a photographic negative,” and that his real targets may have been the bishops and secular powers attempting to erode the exemptions from their authority gained by Cluniac houses, like the monastery of Saint-Germain where the “Letter” was found.⁴³ Héribert sounds the warning not only against these authorities, but against reactionaries within the Church who attacked innovations in Church services like ecclesiastical chant.⁴⁴ Finally, he warns against those adopting for themselves the mantle of monks, attempting to live the apostolic life and, in so doing, upsetting the social order.⁴⁵ For his part, Lobrichon finds little new in the “new” heresy described by Héribert, arguing that the heretical practices attributed to the group were commonplace accusations aimed at heretics since the early years of Christianity.⁴⁶

The “Letter” has provided fresh material for current proponents of the missionary thesis. Bernard Hamilton, a scholar of the Bogomils and long-time proponent of the missionary thesis, while admitting that the position exemplified by Bautier and Moore is the “new orthodoxy,” argues that the “Letter” puts dualism solidly back in play.⁴⁷ Hamilton believes that heretical movements in the eleventh century were Christian dualists and most

⁴³ Guy Lobrichon, “Chiaroscuro”, 94.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 95-96.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 96-98.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 88.

⁴⁷ Bernard Hamilton, “Bogomil Influences on Western Heresy,” in *Heresy and the Persecuting Society: Essays on the work of R.I. Moore*, ed., Michael Frassetto *Studies in the History of Christian Traditions* 129 (Boston: Brill, 2006), 94, 97.

likely influenced by the Bogomils.⁴⁸ He takes issue with historians who assume that, when medieval chroniclers used the term “Manichaeism,” they were engaging in hyperbole. His contention is that these chroniclers viewed heresy as an illness and thought that the key to successful treatment was correct diagnosis.⁴⁹ To those who have maintained that the lack of evidence of Bogomil infiltration must obviate the argument that they influenced Western heresy, Hamilton counters that there were numerous visits to Western monasteries by Orthodox monks and that many of these monks might have been closet Bogomils, as was the pattern in the Byzantine Empire.⁵⁰

Michael Frassetto finds additional evidence for dualism in the autograph manuscripts of sermons written by Adémar of Chabannes.⁵¹ In “The Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes and the Letter of Heribert: New Sources Concerning the Origins of Medieval Heresy,” (1999) he argued that the foundations of the anti-Bogomil argument are shaky and that these new documents throw it further into doubt.⁵² He declares that these sources show the presence of dualist heretics in the early eleventh century.⁵³ He argues that the sermons of Adémar of Chabannes, in particular, show that the heretics were engaged in doctrinal denials (of the

⁴⁸ Ibid., 94-95.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 95. The theme is addressed in detail in R.I. Moore, “Heresy as Disease,” in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th-13th C.)* ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst. Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain May 13-16, 1973 (Louvain, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1976) 1-11.

⁵⁰ Hamilton, “Bogomil Influences,” 96.

⁵¹ He and Daniel Callahan of the University of Delaware are said to be working on a monograph about Adémar’s sermons. I look forward to it.

⁵² Michael Frassetto, “The Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes and the Letter of Heribert: New Sources Concerning the Origins of Medieval Heresy,” *Révue Bénédictine* 109 (1999): 325.

⁵³ Ibid., 327.

Eucharist, of the Cross, etc.) characteristic of dualists.⁵⁴ These are presented as clear evidence of Bogomil influence.⁵⁵

Claire Taylor, who studied under Hamilton, has provided the most comprehensive re-statement of the missionary thesis, taking Frassetto's work and the "Letter" into account, in her book *Heresy in Medieval France Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (2005). While arguing for Bogomil influence, she accepts some conclusions of those arguing against that same influence. The heresy itself was imported, but social conditions made Western Europe, particularly Aquitaine, fertile ground for heresy especially, following the failure of the Peace of God movement to live up to expectations of a sacral alliance between the clergy and laity against rapacious petty nobles.⁵⁶ She has made much of the increased interaction between Catholic and Orthodox monks in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, suggesting that this was a possible vector for Bogomilism.⁵⁷ Details within the "Letter of Héribert," such as the unique doxology employed by the heretics, she argues, must have come from Bogomil missionaries.⁵⁸

Moore maintains that the "Letter" is an important piece of evidence for medieval proto-communist movements. At the core of such movements lay "the principled repudiation

⁵⁴ Ibid., 333.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 337.

⁵⁶ Claire Taylor, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (Rochester, N.Y.: The Boydell Press, 2009), 32.

⁵⁷ Idem, "The Letter of Heribert of Perigord as a source for dualist heresy in the society of early eleventh-century Aquitaine," *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000), 333. She is following the work of Hamilton, who detailed these interactions in "*Oriental Lumen et Magistra Latinas: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900-1100)*" in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)* (London: Valiorum Reprints, 1979), V, 184

⁵⁸ Taylor, *Heresy*, 94.

of private property and/or exclusive pair bonding between men and women which has so often been an element of radical and social enthusiastic movements.”⁵⁹ He asserts that it was such movements, spreading among pious laymen and clerics which, ironically, created an environment where private property could flourish.⁶⁰ Movements rejecting property and marriage were a protest against the increasing similarity between secular and ecclesiastical hierarchies. Second sons of nobles, who had little hope of inheriting from their fathers, were gaining incomes from the Church that they could not gain otherwise. In turn these same families benefited by keeping these incomes out of the hands of their rivals.⁶¹ Groups embracing poverty, such as that detailed in the “Letter of Héribert,” were a refuge for those disenchanted with the parallel system of patronage within the Church. When properly controlled, they served as a relief valve. They provided a place for these dissenters, while allowing the hierarchy to maintain its ways. Properly countenanced and controlled, they could serve as visible faces of reform; uncontrolled, they could foment heresy.⁶²

The Structure of This Work

It is the primary contention of this thesis that historians who argue for dualist influence in the cases of Orléans and the “Letter of Héribert” are mistaken. Those accepting the diagnosis of “Manichaeans” are following Adémar of Chabannes and Paul of Chartres.

⁵⁹ R.I. Moore, “Property, Marriage, and the Eleventh- Century Revolution: A Context for Early Medieval Communism,” in *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1998), 179.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 180.

⁶¹ Ibid., 193.

⁶² Ibid., 202.

They rarely address John of Ripoll, André of Fleury, or Ralph Glaber. Five accounts, then, describe the affair at Orléans, and all but one are, or purport to be, based on, eyewitness testimony. There are also considerations of time and distance to be kept in mind. A quick assessment of their reliability based on these three factors places John of Ripoll and André of Fleury at the fore, followed by Ralph Glaber. One receives from these three accounts the impression of a group who, if they are heretics, err on the side of a general anti-clericalism or suspicion of the established church. The basis of their denials may be as much political as theological.

Next in order of reliability is Paul of St. Père de Chartres, with Adémar of Chabannes providing the least reliable witness. These two accounts are the ones that receive the most attention in the study of eleventh-century heresy. Their accounts are the ones most readily that lend themselves to a dualist interpretation, and I believe we are in peril if we take them at face value, new evidence notwithstanding. We will explore Adémar's use of the term "Manichaeism" describing the 1022. It will argue that Adémar's interests in the cult of relics and the Peace of God fatally compromise his account of the group. I will follow Moore and R.H. Bautier in taking the position that Paul is not to be trusted, and that he is an apologist for the winning side in the matter.

The Letter of Héribert will be shown as a document that can easily be applied to groups of pious individuals taking responsibility for their own salvation. To explain the more baroque elements of the letter, those most redolent of dualism, I will argue that we

should not look for Bogomil missionary activity on Orléans or in Périgord. We should instead examine the numerous documented contacts between Orthodox and Catholic monks in the tenth and eleventh centuries. It appears more likely that their accounts of heretics back home colored the chronicles of French heretics. These efforts rest at the core of and significantly determine the shape and content of this work.

Finally, this thesis will argue that there were no Manichaeans in Orléans. Following Bautier, it will be shown that in labeling the Orléans group “Manichaean,” Adémar was merely applying without consideration the characteristics of the Aquitainian “heretics” of 1018.⁶³ I will further argue that the latter group, in turn, should be identified with the group described in the “Letter of Héribert.” In the process, I will search for alternate sources for Héribert, Adémar, and Paul, which I believe can be teased out of some of these accounts. I will also consider the implications of this for the study of other accounts of eleventh-century heresy as we consider their origins and relations to the wider political realm.

Chapter Two will analyze and compare the different accounts of heresy, providing a detailed examination of the five witnesses to the events at Orléans, the Letter of Héribert, and Adémar’s account of the “Manichaeans” of Aquitaine in 1018. Following this, I will explore the themes and connections of the texts, in an attempt to place them all in a correct context. In the Chapter Four, all of this material will be woven together, in an attempt to make sense of what was happening at Orléans and in Aquitaine at this time. I will take stock of the preceding work and attempt to ground it in Moore’s persecuting society thesis, to see if it fits

⁶³ Bautier, “L’hérésie,” 72.

with the idea that persecution was an integral part of the building of power structures in this time. That the events unfolding in December of 1022 held political implications is unquestioned, but whether the group at Orléans was a victim of persecution or merely of political convenience is not.

By investigating these questions it seems possible to compose a more nuanced story of these movements and suggest a framework for explaining other “heretical” movements in the eleventh-century west. The heretics executed at Orléans in 1022 were the first so punished since the execution of Priscillian of Avila in 383, and though he had been accused of Manichaeism in a time when this was a reasonable charge, he was executed for witchcraft.⁶⁴ There was no charge of witchcraft to serve as a fig leaf for the execution of the Orléanais “heretics” and no Martin of Tours to ride to their rescue. Heresy was a sufficient charge to send them to the flames. Whatever the truth of the charges of heresy in this case, it set the tone for dealing with heresy and other religious crimes and as such needs to be properly understood. Once this incident is viewed in its own light, we can then examine subsequent movements in theirs, freed from the preconceptions that have dogged study of the topic.

⁶⁴ Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 12

Chapter Two: In Those Times

If we conceive of the events at Orléans of December 1022 as a pebble dropped into still waters, generating wider circles farther away from the event, then the two accounts connected to the monastery of Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, also known as Fleury, will be located close to the center. The account of John of Ripoll was the earliest. André of Fleury, though he wrote later than others, was present at the proceedings. Adémar of Chabannes wrote the second account of the events, about six years after their occurrence. The wave next passed Ralph Glaber, writing in Auxerre sometime between 1036 and 1041. Finally it swept past Paul of St. Père de Chartres some fifty years later. But the reliability of the accounts is not necessarily tied to the proximity of the chroniclers. As we will see in examining the accounts in detail, the ripples generated by the events at Orléans were affected by other pebbles dropped into the pond.

John of Ripoll and André of Fleury

The earliest account was written soon after the events, by John of Ripoll, and is right at the splashdown point. André of Fleury's version in the *Vita Gauzlini*, and its near duplicate in the *Miraculi Sancti Benedicti* were written almost two decades later, but they remain close to the center since they are based on not only André's likely witness, but that of abbot Gauzlin. Still, the account in the *Vita* and its twin in the *Miraculi* are likely based on the recollection of both André and of abbot Gauzlin, a participant in the proceedings and an important figure in the region's ecclesiastical politics, and it is possible that André himself might have witnessed the

proceedings.¹ By examining these accounts and the milieu of their production, what they say and what they do not say, we may gain a clearer understanding of the political dimensions of the event.

John of Ripoll was a monk of the community of Ripoll in Catalonia, which had deep connections to Fleury. No ordinary monk, John had been educated at Ripoll, become abbot of Saint-Cécile de Montserrat, and relinquished his position to return Ripoll and live the life of a simple monk.² John had come north on business for his abbot, Oliba- bringing to Gauzlin the news of the death of Oliba's brother, Count Bernard of Besalu. While at Fleury, John was witness to the events at Orléans, and reported them to his abbot within a few weeks of their occurrence.³ His is the first report of the heresy uncovered at Orléans. He describes the events as follows:

For King Robert made fourteen among the best clerics and the noblest laymen of that same city [Orléans] to be burned alive; who, odious to God and hated in heaven and Earth, they deny the grace of holy baptism and the consecration of the blood and body of the lord. Furthermore, after having committed the wickedness of vices, they denied it to be possible to have received pardon for sins. Truly indeed, with these assertions, they slander marriages. They abstained, as though from impure things, even from the foods which God created, that is from meat and fat.⁴

¹ Robert-Henri Bautier, "L'hérésie d'Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XI^e siècle: documents et hypothèses," reprinted in *Recherches sur l'histoire de la France médiévale: Des Mérovingiens aux premiers Capétiens*, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier (Brookfield, Vt.: Gower Publishing Company, 1991), 66.

² André of Fleury, *Vie du Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury- Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Floriacensis Monasterii* trans. and ed. by Richard-Henri Bautier, (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989), 92.

³ The letter is included in Bautier's bilingual edition *Vie du Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury- Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Floriacensis Monasterii* in Appendix III, 180-183.

⁴ John of Ripoll, "Letter to Oliba" in Bautier, ed, *Vita Gauzlini*, 180-182. *Nam fecit rex Robertus vivos ardere de melioribus clericis sive de nobilioribus laicis prope XIII ejusdem civitatis; qui Deo odibiles perosique celo et terre abnegando abnegandant sacri baptismi gratiam, dominici quoque corporis et sanguinis consecrationem. Cum hoc,*

The account continues with a warning for Oliba, that he must diligently watch for heretics like this, that they might not infect his region.

André's reports are more narrative in tone, but this reflects the tenor of the works in which we find them. His earlier version appears in the *Vita Gauzlini*, and was written in the mid-1030s. The second is found in the *Miracula Sancti Benedicti*, a work written by a string of monks at Fleury; André wrote his portion sometime after 1043.⁵ The differences are minor. In the *Vita* there is a brief introductory that links the account to the preceding material, but with slight exceptions the account proceeds word-for-word until the burning of the heretics. There, the *Vita* shows Gauzlin's staunch orthodox credentials, as if he felt the need to add distance to those who stood accused, by having him make a confession of faith in front of the council.⁶ In the *Miraculi*, André writes of a vision seen by a monk shortly after the events, wherein Benedict is seen to banish demons threatening Fleury, directly intervening to protect the monastery bearing his name and his relics.⁷

André provides more information about the heretics telling us that they were

ordained clerics, educated from youth in the holy religion, having been immersed in sacred letters as much as secular, others of them were priests, others deacons, others sub-deacons, the most vicious wolf under the skin of the sheep, carrying their own perdition,

post perpetrata scelera viciorum, vitabant posse recipi veniam peccatorum. Enim vero cum his assercionibus, nupciis detraebant; a cibis etiam quos Deus creavit, hoc est a carne et adipe, tamquam ab inmundiciis, se abstinebant.

⁵ *Les Miracles de Saint Benoit* (Paris: Chez Mme Ve Jules Renouard, 1858; reprint, 2006), xxi.

⁶ André of Fleury, *Vita Gauzlini*, 98-102.

⁷ Idem. *Les Miracles de Saint Benoit*, 247-248.

whose leader was Stephen with Lisois, the seedbed of the devil and the perdition of many.⁸

André also confirms certain characteristics of the group mentioned by John, that they deny the grace that comes with baptism and that they held there to be no pardon for mortal sin. They denied the Trinity and that Jesus had taken flesh and any special status for Mary. To this he adds that the heretics deny right of bishops to ordain, the laying-on of hands, and the existence of the Church.⁹ Worse still are their sexual mores, they “ought not make a marriage with a benediction, but each one took [another] just as he wanted.”¹⁰

The accounts also differ in other details. John of Ripoll informs us that there were fourteen people, laymen and clerics, accused of heresy. André tells us that they were clerics of different rank. Gauzlin plays a role in both accounts, as a member of the council that condemned them. In both accounts the heretics are justly burned. At the conclusion of the account in the *Vita Gauzlini*, the abbot offers an elaboration of orthodox faith. John of Ripoll and André of Fleury are linked in this study not only because they provide the most reliable witness to the events of December 1022, but also because they are linked through the monastery of Fleury which, as we shall see, was inextricably tied into the politics of Orléans that provided the backdrop to discovery of heretics. We shall also see that these accounts, indeed all of the accounts of the heresy, were written for different purposes.

⁸ Idem, *Vita Gauzlini*, 96-98. *clericalis ordinis, a puero in sancta religione educati, tam divinis quam secularibus imbuti litteris, horum alii presbiteri, alii diacones, alii subdiacones, pessimum suae perditiones lupum sub ovina pelle portantes, quorum princeps erat Stephanus cum Lisoio, seminarum diaboli et multorum perditio.*

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid. *nuptias cum benedictione non debere fieri, sed accipiat quisque qualitercumque voluerit.*

Ralph Glaber

Ralph Glaber's account appears in his *Historiarum Quinque Libri*, which he wrote over a period beginning before 1030 and ending in 1046. His description of the affair at Orléans, which is found in the third book, was likely written sometime between 1036 and 1041, while the Cluniac monk was resident at the monastery of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre.¹¹ His source for the affair is not made clear, but Arthur Siegel has suggested the possibility that Odolric, bishop of Orléans from 1021 to 1035, might have told him the story. The two met sometime in 1034, while both were returning from pilgrimage to Jerusalem.¹²

Glaber's account is a bit more detailed than those of John and André, and whether this reflects his source or his imagination is not able to be determined. "In the third year from the twentieth after the millennium," he begins, "an all too vigorous and impudent heresy was discovered in the city of Orléans." The heresy originated in Italy, whence it was brought by a woman who, "being possessed of the devil seduced whom she could, not just layfolk and fools but even many who passed as the most learned among the clergy." The implication of Glaber's text is that she not only proselytized in Orléans, but also along the route from Italy, and though she passed a time at Orléans, the heresy was spread there primarily through the efforts of two of her converts among the clergy, whom Glaber identifies as Herbert and Lisois. We are also told that the two heresiarchs are friends of the king, a position they enjoyed as long as their heretical

¹¹ John France, "Introduction," *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), xlv.

¹² Arthur Siegel, *Heresy, Reform and Regional Power in Eleventh-Century Italy: A Re-Evaluation of the Montforte Sect*, (PhD diss., University of Delaware, 2003), 67 .

inclinations remained secret.¹³ Their heresy was discovered when they tried to spread it beyond Orléans. According to Glaber's account, they tried to ensnare a priest of Rouen, by telling him "that the moment was at hand when all people would embrace their religion."¹⁴ This priest in turn informed Duke Richard II of Normandy of their perfidy and he approached King Robert with this information. Robert then went to Orléans, where he convened a council of clergy and devout laymen to learn the truth of the matter.

In the council, Herbert, whom Glaber identifies as the principal of the church school of Saint-Pierre-le-Puellier, and Lisois, a canon of the Church of the Holy Cross, freely confessed their beliefs. Glaber has them triumphantly state

We have long believed in this religion which you have only now discovered, but we have looked forward to the day when you and all the others, from whatever obedience or order, would come to this belief too; we still believe the day will come.¹⁵

They then revealed their beliefs to the assembled dignitaries.¹⁶ The heretics denied the Trinity. They claimed that the heavens and the Earth had always existed, that they had not been created. Their sexual mores are described as Epicurean in that "they did not believe carnality was a sin meriting avenging punishment."¹⁷ Good works counted for nothing.

Like the account in the *Vita Gauzlini*, Glaber follows this with an orthodox profession, attempting to refute the errors of the heretics. After a nod to Paul's warning in Corinthians

¹³ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum*, 139.

¹⁴ Ibid., France has chosen to translate *dogma* as "religion," but it has the flavor of the English "dogma" or "doctrine."

¹⁵ Ibid., 141. France has chosen to translate *secta* as "religion" in this case

¹⁶ Ibid., 139-141.

¹⁷ Ibid. 141.

11:19¹⁸ about the necessity of heresies in proving the faithful, he embarks less on a point-by-point refutation of the heretics than a discourse about creation and the Incarnation. John France, editor of the English version of the *Historiarum*, suggests that the material is “clearly a charge of dualism.” While Glaber makes no overt charges of dualism, he writes that God is the creator of all things, and that all things must admit Him their superior and asserting that “[t]his reasoning applies to **spiritual** as well as **corporeal** things.” John France, translator and editor of the *Historiarum* has seen this as a charge of dualism.¹⁹ The Latin for this text reads “*Pari quoque ratione sciendum est tam de re corpore quam incorporea*” which may be an even stronger suggestion of dualism in that the reasoning is applied “as much to matters of the body as to the incorporeal.”²⁰ The implication that France seems to have drawn from this is that the heretics have denied God’s involvement in matters of the flesh.

Further, Glaber asserts that Scripture and the miracles contained therein are testament to this truth. Miracles are provided as instructive vehicles, that man might use his reason to know the love and mercy of God.²¹ It was as an illustration of this love that Jesus was sent to man, clothed in flesh and co-eternal with the Father. Jesus was to show man, who with free will stands between the angels and the animals, the will of the Creator. Glaber, however, sees a failing in men that prevents him from doing God’s will.

But the greater part of men could not, or rather would not, believe
in and love it [Christ’s mission], although they ought to have been

¹⁸ For there must also be heresies: that they also, who are approved may be made manifest among you.

¹⁹ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum*, 143, emphasis added.

²⁰ Ibid, 142. Translation by the author.

²¹ Ibid., 145.

able to perceive in it all that was needful to their salvation; rather they remained rooted in diverse errors and as hostile to the truth as they are shown to be lacking in knowledge of Him. Here, undoubtedly, is the origin of all the heresies and perverse sects which exist all over the globe.²²

This might indicate that the root of the heresy is a Christological question and, coupled with the earlier statement about matters corporeal and incorporeal, suggest that the heresy was dualist. Whatever the case, in none of this does Glaber say the heretics explicitly deny these things. We are left to infer their teaching on these matters from the text. This issue will be explored in the next chapter.

Following this discourse, Glaber returns to the heretics in the here and now. Many attempts were made to return the heretics to their proper faith, all of which failed, so it was decided by all present that they be consigned to the flames.²³ Thirteen people, then, faced the fire without flinching, promising to all present that they would be delivered from the conflagration. Immediately upon entering the flames they screamed that the Devil had tricked them and repented of their heresy, but it was too late. They were instantly reduced to dust. Nor does the story end in Orléans. Glaber reports that members of the sect were found elsewhere and eliminated and that “the holy catholic faith has flourished more brilliantly everywhere on earth since the folly of these wicked madmen was rooted out.”²⁴

We see, then, that Glaber adds a significant amount of detail around the heresy to the accounts of André and John, though we learn little about the beliefs of the group. There is the

²² Ibid., 149.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid. 151.

denial of the Trinity we see in André's account. Glaber adds that the heretics deny that God created the world, arguing that it had always existed. In his refutation of this, we might infer that Glaber catches the scent of dualism, especially in his emphasis that God created things corporeal as well as spiritual. This notion may be tempered by the fact that in dualist systems the world is generally viewed as a creation, albeit of an evil deity. Glaber attempts to adduce an origin to the heresy, in the person of the Italian woman, and asserts that there was evangelization occurring. He is also the first to suggest that an outside agency was responsible for the heretics coming to light. Finally, he tells us that the thirteen condemned embraced the flames, but repented as they burned quickly to ash.

Paul of St. Père de Chartres

Paul of St. Père de Chartres, who wrote his account of the events at Orléans in about 1078, is the next witness in order of reliability. His story is the story of Aréfast, a Norman nobleman who joined the monastery of St. Père de Chartres in about 1028.²⁵ It is contained in the *Capitulaire de l'Abbaye de Chartres*, a document detailing the holdings and some of the history of the monastery. Before giving the account of the heresy at Orléans, Paul begins with a brief statement from Aréfast, dated by the editor of the *Capitulaire* to before 1028. In it, Aréfast donates his considerable holdings, except in cases where other peoples' interests constrain him,

²⁵ According to Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 108, Aréfast is listed as a monk in 1029 and 1033.

to the monastery.²⁶ It has been suggested that Paul wrote his account based on the recollection of an eyewitness, perhaps even Aréfast himself.

In 1022, according to the account, Aréfast was a nobleman in the service of Richard, duke of Normandy. A cleric in his household named Heribert went to Orléans to study and was there drawn into the heretical sect of Stephen and Lisois. When he returned to his home, Heribert attempted to lure Aréfast into the sect, but Aréfast detected that the cleric had been drawn into heresy. He informed Duke Richard, who in turn informed the king, and a plan was agreed to. Aréfast would forthwith go to Orléans and infiltrate the sect, exposing it when the moment was right. Along the way he stopped at Chartres, seeking the advice of bishop Fulbert. Fulbert was absent, so he received advice from a sacristan named Evrard in how to fortify himself spiritually against the wiles of the sect that had so successfully drawn Heribert in.²⁷

Once in Orléans, Aréfast began to infiltrate the sect. They apparently began their indoctrination by teaching stories from the Bible and, when they were satisfied of his zeal, brought him deeper into their cult. His teachers spoke of the process as being akin to transplanting a tree from the forest into a garden; one must remove the thorns and excess branches, grafting a better cutting onto what remains.

So you, in like manner, being transferred from the evil world into our holy companionship, will be well supplied with the water of wisdom until you are instructed and are strong enough to be shorn

²⁶ Paul of St. Père de Chartres, “De rebus quas dedit Arefastus monachus Santo Petro” *Vetus Aganon*, ed. Benjamin-Edmé-Charles Guérard in *Capitulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*, Collection des Cartulaires de France, ser. 1. 2 vols. (Paris: 1840), 108.

²⁷ Paul of St. Père de Chartres, “The Narrative of Paul, a Monk of Chartres,” in Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, eds., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 76-77.

of the thorns of evil by the sword of the Word of God, and when we have driven absurd teachings from the shelter of your heart, you can receive with purity of mind our teaching, bestowed by the Holy Spirit.²⁸

Following this, they revealed their secret doctrines to him.

According to Paul, the sect rejected the most important beliefs of Christianity. We have seen this before. They denied the reality of the Incarnation. The sacrament of baptism did not cleanse a person of his sins. Priests did not consecrate the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Saints and martyrs could not intercede on behalf of those who prayed to them. Paul adds an important detail, and one that will be telling for those who seek the origins of Western heresy in the efforts of Bogomil missionaries. Initiates into the sect are brought into full membership and knowledge by the imposition of hands.²⁹

To this, Paul adds lurid descriptions of their behavior. The group is visited by demons and, once the demons arrive, the lights are extinguished and an orgy ensues. Babies born of these rites were cremated, the resultant ashes being revered as the Eucharist would be revered and offered to the sick as a sacrament. The ashes served another purpose as well. “Indeed,” Paul writes, “such power of devilish fraud was in these ashes that whoever had been imbued with the aforesaid heresy and had partaken of no matter how small a portion of them was scarcely afterward able to direct the course of his thought from this heresy to the path of truth.”³⁰ Paul seems to understand, he even winks to the reader, that this business of orgies and powders is

²⁸ Ibid., 77.

²⁹ Ibid., 78.

³⁰ Ibid., 79.

something of a digression. Cutting off his discussion, he says “[t]he barbarity of the infidels will be recounted in brief fashion, lest a more prolix recital of the controversy induce disgust in the fastidious reader.”³¹

While Aréfast was going about the business of infiltrating the cult, the king and queen had arrived in Orléans, along with an assemblage of bishops. Upon their arrival the group was brought in to the church of the Holy Cross, whereupon Aréfast exposed himself as an agent of the king. When questioned, the heretics at first refused to speak. In order to goad them to confess, Aréfast began enumerating their doctrines for the council. When he had finished, the group was asked by the bishop of Beauvais whether the beliefs listed by Aréfast represented their true beliefs, to which the members of the group replied in the affirmative.³² To the bishop’s response that he preferred a savior born of a virgin who took on flesh, suffered on behalf of humanity, and rose from the dead, they replied “We were not there and we cannot believe that to be true.”³³ When asked specifically about the Virgin birth, they replied, “What nature denied is always out of harmony with the Creator.”³⁴ At last, apparently impatient with the questions before them about creation, they announced,

You may spin stories in that way to those who have earthly wisdom and believe the fictions of carnal men, scribbled on animal skins. To us, however, who have the law written upon the heart by the Holy Spirit (and we recognize nothing but what we have learned from God, Creator of all), in vain you spin out superfluities and things inconsistent with the Divinity. Therefore, make an end

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., 79-80.

³³ Ibid., 81.

³⁴ Ibid.

to words and do whatever you wish with us. For we shall see our King reigning in heaven, Who will raise us in heavenly joys to everlasting triumphs at His right hand.³⁵

Following this declaration, attempts were made to turn them from their error. When these efforts failed, they were escorted from the chamber to meet their doom in the flames. As they were leaving, Queen Constance struck out Stephen's eye with a staff since, according to this account, he had once been her confessor. Before the burning, one priest and one nun repented and were spared the flames. The rest were burned along with the diabolical viaticum.³⁶

Paul's is by far the most detailed of the accounts. As in Glaber's account, the heresy is discovered by the actions of an outside agent tied to the duke of Normandy. He includes diabolical orgies, and the leader of the heretics possesses a magic powder, which we will also see in the earlier, if less reliable, account of Adémar of Chabannes. The heretics in Paul's account claim to be inspired by the Holy Spirit. Finally, we are given a specific indicator of the closeness of at least one heretic leader to the royal party.

Adémar of Chabannes

We have been examining the accounts relating the events at Orléans in order of reliability, not chronology, which brings us now to Adémar of Chabannes. For while he was the second author to address the topic, following John of Ripoll, we shall see that he actually offers little to our understanding of this signal event. We will address the influences on his work in the next chapter, so for now we will discuss his writing on heresy. He addresses the topic of

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

contemporary heretics in each of the three versions of his *Chronicon*, which are generally referred to as *Alpha*, *Beta*, and *Gamma*. The first instance of heresy he reports is dated to 1018 and, since this outbreak is of supreme importance to an understanding of his description of the group at Orléans, it must be considered.

Though Adémar spent most of his career as a monk at the monastery of Saint-Cybard d'Angoulême, he is most often associated with the community of Saint-Martial of Limoges and 1018 was important for the latter community for a reason other than the apparent arrival of heretics. It was in 1018 that a tragedy befell the monastery. Fifty worshipers perished in a stampede at the basilica of Saint Martial, who was the focus of an intensifying cult in the early decades of the eleventh century. In all the versions of Adémar's *Chronicon*, the arrival of heretics comes fast on the heels of this calamity. The *Alpha* version reports:

From that moment (*E vestigio*), Manichaeans arose throughout Aquitaine, seducing the indiscriminate multitude from truth to error. They proposed to deny baptism, the sign of the holy cross, the church, and the redeemer of the world himself, the honor of the saints of god, legitimate marriage, the eating of meat, whereupon many simple people turned away from the faith.³⁷

By the *Gamma* version the text has changed somewhat:

A little bit after (*Paucis post tempore*) that time Manichaeans arose throughout Aquitaine, seducing the masses, denying holy baptism and the power of the cross, and everything which is sane doctrine, fasting like monks and feigning chastity, but between themselves

³⁷ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievals* 129, ed. by R. Landes and G. Pon (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1999), 13. *E vestigio exorti sunt per Aquitaniam Manichei, seducentes promiscuum populum a veritate ad errorem. Suadebant negare baptismum, signum sanctae crucis, ecclesiam, et ipsum redemptorem seculi, honorem sanctorum Dei, coniugia laegitima, aesum carniū, unde et multos simplices averterunt a fide.*

practicing all luxuries; certainly as messengers of Antichrist they made many turn away from the faith.³⁸

Some details are added, such as the fact that the heretics act like monks, but practice secret depravity. They are called messengers of Antichrist.

But even more important is the sense of connection to preceding events. Richard Landes has argued that the use of *E vestigio* is meant to imply that the arrival of Manichaeans is a direct result of the trampling at the basilica. By switching to *Pauco post tempore* in the later versions, Adémar is distancing the two events, so that Saint Martial cannot in any way be held responsible for the arrival of the heretics. Landes sees in this an understanding on Adémar's part that the incident at the basilica alienated the faithful in such a way that they would be receptive when another group, this one decrying the sort of relic worship that had led to the tragedy of 1018, began preaching.³⁹

Four years after the trampling at the basilica and the appearance of "Manichaeans" throughout Aquitaine came the execution of the clerks of Orléans. Adémar writes,

At that time, ten among the canons of the church of the Holy Cross at Orléans, who appeared to be more religious than others, were shown to be Manicheans. Whom King Robert, when they did not wish to be reverted to the faith, first had defrocked, then removed from the church, and then ordered them cremated by fire.⁴⁰

³⁸ Ibid., 170. *Pauco post tempore per Aquitaniam exorti sunt manichei, seducentes plebem, negantes baptismum sanctum et crucis virtutem, et quidquid sane doctrine est, abstinentes a cibis quasi monachi et castitatem simulantes, sed inter se ipsos omnem luxuriam exercentes; quippe ut nuncii Antichristi, multos a fide exorbitare fecerunt*

³⁹ Richard Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Adémar of Chabannes 989-1034* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 176-177.

⁴⁰ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, 180. *Eo tempore decem ex canonicis Sanctae Crucis Aurelianis, qui videbantur aliis religiosiores, probati sunt manichei. Quos rex Robertus, cum nollent alicatenus ad fidem reverti, primo a gradu sacerdotii deponi, deinde ab ecclesia eliminari, et demum igne cremari iussit.*

His account does not appear in the *Alpha* version of the *Chronicon*; this account is drawn from the *Beta* and *Gamma* version, where the word *alicatenus* has been added to the story, along with an important piece of evidence about the origin of the heretics, and of a secret which we have seen in the account of Paul of Chartres.

For they were deceived by a certain rustic of Périgord—who himself claimed to make miracles, who carried with him the ashes of dead children, by which one would soon be made a Manichaean were one able partake of them—worshiped the devil, who appeared first as an Ethiopian and then in the form of an angel of light, and offered much silver to them daily. Obeying his words, they thoroughly rejected Christ in secret, and in hiding practiced abominations and crimes which it is still shameful to have spoken, and in public appeared as true Christians.⁴¹

Of their specific beliefs we are told nothing; by calling them Manichaeans, Adémar is apparently intending for the reader to apply the beliefs of the earlier heretics of Aquitaine.⁴²

The story of Orléans is then interrupted to warn of still more “messengers of Antichrist” in the area of Toulouse, before returning to the membership of the group. We are told that a cantor of the church, named Theodatus, who had died three years earlier, was a member of the sect. Bishop Odolric had his corpse exhumed and thrown into the wasteland. Adémar also identifies the leaders of the sect as Stephan and Lisois, the latter of whom “the king loved greatly, because of the sanctity he believed him to have.”⁴³ The men apparently did not fear the

⁴¹ Ibid. *Nam ipsi decepti a quodam rustico Petragoricensi, quie se dicebat facere virtutes, et pulverem ex mortuis pueris secum deferebat, de quo si quem posset communicare, mox manicheum faciebat, adorabant diabolum, qui primo est in Etyopis, deinde in angeli lucis figuracione apparebat, et eis multum cotidie argentum deferebat. Cujus verbis obedientes, penitus Christum latenter respuerant, et abominationes et crimina quae dici etiam flagitium est in occult exercebant, et in aperto christianos veros se fallebant.*

⁴² Bautier, “L’hérésie,” 72.

⁴³ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, 170. *Rex valde dilexerat propter sanctitatem quam eum habere credebat.*

flames. At the conclusion of the account we are told that “into the flames they went; they had promised to emerge [unharm]ed] and laughed as they were lashed to the pyre. Without delay they were reduced to ashes that nothing of their bones might be found in the remains.”⁴⁴

So while he tells us little of the beliefs of the Orléans sect, Adémar offers us some additional information. He names Stephen and Lisois as the leaders of the group. The story of Theodatus suggests that the sect was believed to have been around for at least three years. He identifies Odolric as the bishop of Orléans, an important detail as we consider the episcopal contest being played out there. Even the detail about the remains being reduced to ashes is significant. Finally, and most importantly for our purposes, is the insertion into the *Gamma* text of Périgord as the origin of the rustic who spread the heresy.

⁴⁴ Ibid. *a flammis se inlesos exire promittebant, et ridentes in medio ignis ligati sunt, et sine mora penitus in cinerem redacti sunt, ut nec de ossibus residuum inveniretur eorum.*

Table 1: Comparison of accounts of the 1022 heresy at Orléans

John of Ripoll	André of Fleury	Ralph Glaber	Paul of St. Père de Chartres	Adémar of Chabannes
Eyewitness	Eyewitness	Possible eyewitness source	Possible eyewitness source	No eyewitness source
Deny the grace of baptism	Baptized do not receive the Holy Spirit		Baptism does not give pardon for sin	
Reject Eucharist	Deny Incarnation		Deny Incarnation and Eucharist	
Cannot receive pardon for sin	Cannot receive pardon for sin	Reject penance		
Corrupt marriages	Do not marry, sexual license	Sexual license	Diabolical orgies	Sexual license [†]
Fourteen heretics	Heretics were clerics, led by Stephen and Lisois	Heretics led by Herbert and Lisois	Heretics led by Stephen and Lisois	Ten canons; Lisois named
Eat no meat or fat				Eat no meat [†]
Heretics burned by King Robert	Heretics burned by King Robert	Heretics burned by King Robert	Heretics burned by King Robert	Heretics burned by King Robert
	Deny the Trinity	Deny the Trinity		
	Deny the Church			
	Deny bishops the power to ordain			
		Heresy comes from Italy		Heresy comes from Périgord
		Heretic leaders close to the king	Stephen close to the queen	Lisois close to the king
		Discovery from outside	Discovery from outside	
			Magic powder	Magic powder
			Illumination by the Holy Spirit	
			Demonic presence	Diabolical apparition

[†] These are inferences drawn from the 1018 account of “Manichaeans” in Aquitaine.

“Héribert”

Nothing is known about the author of the document known as the “Letter of Héribert, save that he was a monk and claimed to have been a direct witness to events involving the heretics of Périgord. Whoever he was, he wrote in the eleventh century about events in Aquitaine. His letter was meant to be a rallying cry against the depredations occurring under color of religion.

To all Christians who are in the East and the West, in the North and the South, believers in Christ, Peace and Grace in God the Father, and his only begotten Son our Lord, and the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵

There have been differing interpretations of this greeting. Since the oldest version of it comes from the Cluniac monastery of Saint-Germain d’Auxerre, the assumption is that it is a production of a Cluniac monk. The greeting, calling to the four corners of the Earth, has (like the rest of the letter) been a matter of dispute. Guy Lobrichon, who sees the entire letter as a coded polemic against critics of Cluny, argues that in addressing all Christians, the letter-writer is going around the traditional powers—the bishops, especially—who opposed the Cluniac reform program.⁴⁶ Claire Taylor has argued that this greeting draws a dividing line between Christians who have an orthodox conception of the Trinity and those who do not.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Guy Lobrichon, “Latin Texts of the ‘Letter’ of Heribert” in Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press: 1992), 347. *Omnibus christianis qui sunt in oriente et occidente, meridie et aquilone, credentibus in Christo, pax et gratia in Deo patre, filioque eius unigenito domino nostro, et spiritu sancto.*

⁴⁶ Idem., “The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre,” *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, ed. Richard Landes and Thomas Head, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992), 94.

⁴⁷ Claire Taylor, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (Rochester, N.Y.: The Boydell Press, 2009), 93.

After the greeting Héribert launches into his story, telling of a “new heresy” and of the “pseudo-apostles” who spread it.⁴⁸ They follow austere practices, refusing meat and wine, except for a small portion every third day, and they genuflect a hundred times per day.⁴⁹ In their seeming holiness they take no money and practice communalism with what property they do have.⁵⁰ Charity was not accepted: “They said alms were nothing, because one ought not own [property] whence they are made.”⁵¹ The new heretics are a group apparently devoted to discipline and poverty, a not uncommon aspiration at the time. In their assertion that one ought not have property, they showed themselves a little more radical than most, but there is still nothing completely unorthodox.

Behind this apparent holiness lay more sinister transgressions. The heretics, for instance, do not go into the church, except to recruit new members to their sect.⁵² Their doxology was reportedly strange; instead of the usual “Glory to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,” the heretics say, “because yours is the kingdom, you are master of all creatures forever, amen.”⁵³ Mass was seen as having no value, and communion was seen only as bits of blessed bread.⁵⁴ The chant used during the service was said “to be vain and invented for the favor of men.”⁵⁵ When they did enter the church, always in the cause of seducing converts, they would not chant

⁴⁸ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 347. *Nova heresis horta est in mundo, incipiens hoc tempore a psOdo apostolis.*

⁴⁹ Ibid. *Carnem non comediunt, vinum non bibunt, nisi per modicum tertio die. Centies genua flectunt...*

⁵⁰ Ibid. *Pecuniam non solum non recipiunt, sed habitam prout videtur decenter dispertiunt.*

⁵¹ Ibid., 348. *Elemosniam dicunt nihil esse, quia nec unde fieri possit debere possideri.*

⁵² Ibid., 347. *Nam ecclesiam non intrant, nisi causa seductionis.*

⁵³ Ibid., 347-348. *“Gloria patri et filio et spiritu sancto” nusquam dicunt sed pro illa dicunt “quoniam tuum est regnum, et tu dominaris omni creaturae in saecula saeculorum amen.”*

⁵⁴ Ibid., 348. *Missam pro nichilo ducunt, nec communionem debere percepi nisi solummodo fragmenta panis benedicti.*

⁵⁵ Ibid. *Canticum ecclesiasticum vanum esse asserunt, ac pro favore hominum inventum.*

the canon or take communion.⁵⁶ Two strategies were used to avoid taking communion: the heretics either skirted the altar or, if they were unable to turn away, spit the Host behind the altar.⁵⁷ The heretics also had an iconoclastic streak, refusing to adore the Cross and the crucified Lord. Those worshiping the Cross were to be pitied, “Oh how miserable are those who adore you, says the Psalmist. *Idols of the Gentiles*, etc. [Psalm 113b-4].”⁵⁸

The membership is described as consisting of “not only laymen relinquishing all property, but also clerks, priests, monks and nuns.”⁵⁹ They are able to convert people with ease, “for no one is such a rustic that when he joins himself with them, who is not within eight days wise in letters, words and examples, that he is not able to be overcome anywhere by another in any way.”⁶⁰ Héribert describes other miracles, such as an imprisoned heretic escaping from a wine barrel and leaving the barrel full, and the inability of authorities to keep them enchained. When the heretics are ready to die, “they long to find [others] who will torture and betray them to death.”⁶¹

The picture Héribert paints is one of radicals who pretend to be monks, but who secretly reject everything the Church stands for. Innovations like ecclesiastical chant are rejected, as is the adoration of the Cross. When they do go to Mass, they do so with the intention of converting others to their perverse beliefs. Their prayer is unorthodox, and if they cannot avoid the Mass

⁵⁶ Ibid. *Missam si quis horum decantaverit causa seductionis, nec canon dicit, nec communionem recepit*

⁵⁷ Ibid. *aut retro aut iuxta altare vergit. Hostiam vero in missalem aut post altare proicit.*

⁵⁸ Ibid. *Crucem seu vultum domini non adorant sed et adorantes prout possunt prohibent, ita ut ante vultum stantes fando dicant, “O quam miseri sunt qui te adorant, dicente psalmista ‘Similacra gentium,’ et cetera*

⁵⁹ Ibid. *Non solum laicos propria omnia relinquentes, sed etiam clericos, presbyteros, monachos et monachas.*

⁶⁰ Ibid. *Nemo namque tam rusticus se cum eis iungit, qui non infra octo dies sit sapiens, litteris, verbis et exemplis, ut nec superaria quoquam ulterius ullomodo possit.*

⁶¹ Ibid. *Ut velint invenire qui eos crucient et morti tradant.*

they spit out the Host. Their educational program is without compare; it takes only eight days to fully indoctrinate a member to the extent that he cannot be overcome in argument. They exhibit magical powers of escape and by the end seek a painful death. On the face of it, Héribert is facing actual heretics.

Table 2: Comparison of accounts of heresy from 1018, 1022 and the "Letter of Héribert"

1018 “Manichaeans”	Accounts of the heresy at Orléans	“Letter of Héribert”
No eyewitness testimony	Eyewitness testimony (1,2,3,4 [†])	Eyewitness testimony
Denial of baptism	Denial of baptism (1,2,4) Rejection of Eucharist/ Incarnation (1,2,4)	Rejection of Eucharist
Denial of the Cross	Denial of the Cross (5 [‡])	Denial of the Cross
Eat no meat	Eat no meat (1,5 [‡])	Eat no meat
Sexual improprieties	Sexual improprieties (1,2,3,4,5 [‡]) No pardon for sin (1,2,3) Heretics burned (1,2,3,4) Deny the Trinity (2,3) Bishops have no power to ordain (2) Heresy from Italy (3) Heresy from Périgord (5) Magic powder (4,5) Illumination by the Holy Spirit (4) Demonic presence (4,5) Made up of clerics (all) and nobles (1)	Deny the trinity [*] Heresy from Périgord
	1. John of Ripoll	Made up of clerics and laymen
	2. André of Fleury	Drink no wine
	3. Ralph Glaber	Pray 100 times daily
	4. Paul of St. Père de Chartres	Poverty
	5. Adémar of Chabannes	Infiltrate churches
		Spit out the Host
		Rapid indoctrination

[†] Glaber and Paul of St. Père de Chartres are possibly based on eyewitness testimony

[†] These are inferences drawn from the 1018 account of "Manichaeans" in Aquitaine.

- Inferred from the doxology described by Héribert

Chapter Three: Common Threads

Having examined the primary source material on the heresy at Orléans, we must now step back and look at the context from which they sprung. For the accounts of John, André and Paul—whose protagonists may have been participants in the affair—this means understanding the political events unfolding in Orléans during the first decades of the eleventh century. Adémar’s account is shot through with his concerns over the Peace of God and the emergence of saints’ cults, movements apparently repudiated by the “Manichaeans” he detected both in Aquitaine and Orléans. Glaber’s chiasm captures the millennial anxiety that was almost certainly part of the zeitgeist.

In discussions of the events, the accounts of Paul of Chartres and Adémar of Chabannes have been favored, despite the proximity of John and André to the events and the greater likelihood that Glaber’s report came from a participant in the proceedings.¹ Bautier was among the first to note the absurdity of this, when he argued that André and, above all, John of Ripoll, should be considered the best witnesses to the affair.² He also calls our attention to the political aspects of the events surrounding the heresy, especially

¹ Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, eds., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), the most exhaustive collection of documents on medieval heresy reprints the accounts of Adémar and Paul on pages 74-82. R. I. Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1997; reprint Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1995), does the same on 10-15. Malcom Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992; reprint, Barnes & Noble Books, 1998), nods in Bautier’s direction, but focuses primarily on Paul’s account on pages 9-16, an emphasis repeated in the third edition on pages 14-21; the first edition contains a chart on pages 344-345 that does mention the other sources.

² Robert-Henri Bautier, “L’hérésie d’Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XI^e siècle: documents et hypothèses,” reprinted in *Recherches sur l’histoire de la France médiévale: Des Mérovingiens aux premiers Capétiens*, ed. Robert-Henri Bautier (Brookfield, Vt.: Gower Publishing Company, 1991), 71-72.

the contention surrounding the episcopal see of Orléans, and why we should suspect the later account written by Paul of Chartres.

Politics and Heresy

Orléans was the center of a contest in the early years of the Capetian dynasty between the new kings and some of their more powerful vassals. Within the diocese itself, there was an ongoing struggle between the bishop and the monastery of Fleury, with the bishops seeking more control over the monastery and its possessions and the abbots working to preserve its independence. The story is further complicated by the fact that the monastery had been under the direct protection of the king since before the accession of Hugh Capet in 987. With concessions gained by Abbo, abbot from 988 to 1004, the monastery legally claimed its only spiritual superior to be the pope and its only temporal lord to be the king.³ All of these factors played in to the persecution of the heretics of 1022.

While the Carolingian kings ruled, the royal protection of Fleury was less troublesome in the monastery's relations with the bishop. There were disputes over how much loyalty, if any, the abbot owed the bishop, but none as acute as those that erupted following the accession of Hugh Capet in 987. While Hugh was a willing patron of the monastery, one of his most prized advisers was bishop Arnulf of Orléans, who believed

³ Marco Mostert, *The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, A study of the ideas about society and law of the tenth-century monastic reform movement* (Hilbersum, Netherlands: Verloren Publishers, 1987), 36.

that the monastery should be subordinate to the episcopate.⁴ Though Hugh was able to broker a compromise on the payment of taxes levied by the diocese on monastic property, the dispute between the abbots of Fleury and bishops of Orléans would continue at least as long as the bishops were the creatures of the king. Indeed, the successors to Abbo and Arnulf, Gauzlin and Fulk, would continue the struggle, and it would further play out in the contest to succeed Fulk.⁵

The dispute between abbot and bishop extended beyond the see of Orléans, drawing in other secular and religious leaders. Early in the abbacy of Gauzlin, there was an argument over the right of Fleury to turn away the bishop if the latter did not seek permission before coming to the monastery, a right that had been granted by papal decree. Bishop Fulk, making an unannounced visit, was turned away by the townspeople with physical force. In an appeal to his archbishop, Fulk was joined by Bishop Fulbert of Chartres in arguing against the rights of the monastery, a position ultimately rejected by the pope. Abbo's position had triumphed, but Abbot Gauzlin had made enemies not only of Fulk, but also of Fulbert.⁶

Bishop Fulk died sometime around the year 1013 and was succeeded by another man supported by the king, Theodoric. The new bishop though, was not unchallenged; Odolric of Pithiviers, nephew of Bishop Roger of Beauvais and the man of Count Odo of

⁴ Ibid., 36.

⁵ Thomas Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orléans 800-1200* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 255.

⁶ Ibid., 256-257.

Blois wanted the episcopal throne as well. Odolric was supported in his claim by none other than Bishop Fulbert of Chartres, who consecrated Odolric as a priest but refused to consecrate Theodoric as bishop forcing him to seek the blessing of the archbishop of Sens.⁷ The dispute continued throughout the prelature of Bishop Theodoric, despite his attempt to defuse it by appointing Odolric as his successor, and even escalated to include an attack on Theodoric by Odolric's partisans. However, it is possible that the two eventually worked out a scheme of joint rule by the early 1020s, which would have been shattered by the events of December, 1022.⁸

When the heretics were discovered in 1022, their discovery must have been a profound embarrassment for Bishop Theodoric and for his sponsor, King Robert. For both men, the revelation of the group provided ammunition for their political foes. Theodoric's opponents could use it as evidence of his lack of fitness to serve as bishop. Robert's humiliation was even greater, for not only did the heretics apparently flourish under the nose of his chosen bishop, but he and the queen also had a very personal connection to the leaders of the heretics. Adémar, Glaber and Paul, though they do not agree on the names, state that Steven (or Herbert) and Lisois enjoyed a close relationship with the king. Glaber, identifying the heretic leaders as Herbert and Lisois, tells us that the pair "enjoyed friendship of the king" as long as their secret was unknown. Adémar

⁷ Bautier, "L'hérésie," 78.

⁸ Head, *Hagiography*, 266.

names only Lisois, “whom the king had loved for the sanctity he believed him to have.”⁹ Paul, typically, provides the most detail, stating that the heretics’ leaders, named Stephen and Lisois were “in popular repute distinguished above all others in wisdom, eminent in holiness and piety, bountiful in charity.”¹⁰ Stephen is indentified in this account as the queen’s confessor and Paul tells us that for this betrayal the queen struck out his eye with a staff.¹¹ André, as we have seen above, wrote of their holiness; John is silent on the specific actors.

The political relationships between all of the major actors is complicated, but can be parsed. Theodoric was the king’s man, successor to Fulk as bishop of Orléans. Given the troubled past relationship between the see of Orléans and Fleury, it might be expected that Abbot Gauzlin would be Bishop Theodoric’s opponent, but this is not the case. Gauzlin had been elevated to the archbishopric of Bourges by the king, much to the consternation of Bishop Fulbert of Chartres, placing the abbot of Fleury squarely with the king and his chosen bishop in the contest with Odolric.¹²

Bishop Fulbert of Chartres was aligned against King Robert, Bishop Theodoric and Abbot Gauzlin and with Odolric. In Paul’s account, it is a subordinate of Fulbert’s, the sacristan Evrard, who instructs the nobleman-turned-detective who uncovers the

⁹ Ademari Cabannes, *Chronicon*, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 129, ed. by R. Landes and G. Pon (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1999), 180. *quem rex valde dilixerat propter sanctitatem quam eum habere credabat.*

¹⁰ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 76.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 81.

¹² Head, *Hagiography*, 268.

heresy in how to protect and conduct himself in his investigations. Odolric also had support from Count Odo of Blois whose animus was not only political but personal. Before his marriage to Constance, Robert II had been married to Odo's stepmother, Bertha of Burgundy. He later renounced this marriage and wed Constance, leading to a bitter personal rift.¹³ There was also an ongoing political dispute, wherein King Robert contested Count Odo's inheritance to Meaux and Troyes.¹⁴ Several lines of conflict were crossing in Orléans; it was precisely the wrong time for anyone, especially partisans of the king and his chosen bishop, to step out of line.

"Manichaeans" in Aquitaine and Orléans

Meanwhile, there were reports of heresy in Aquitaine, which Adémar tied to his report of the heresy at Orléans. It is worth recalling at this point that Adémar wrote in his *Chronicon* about "Manichaeans" in Aquitaine who appeared in 1018. The *Alpha* version of 1025 reports that they denied "baptism, the sign of the cross, the church, the redeemer of the world himself, the honor of the saints of God, legitimate marriage, [and] the eating of meat."¹⁵ Three years later, in the *Gamma* version the heretics are "fasting like monks and feigning chastity, but between themselves practicing all luxuries." There is a more

¹³ Ibid., 267.

¹⁴ Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1190* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 192. For Odo's point of view on his relations with Robert, see Robert Fawtier, *The Capetian Kings of France*, translated by Lionel Butler and R.J. Adams (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1960) 65-66. A more detailed explanation of the political situation can be found in Guillot, Oliver and Yves Sassier, *Pouvoirs et Institutions dans la France Médiévale: des origines à l'époque féodale* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1994) 244-52.

¹⁵ Adémar, *Chronicon*, 13.

apocalyptic tenor as the heretics are called “messengers of Antichrist.”¹⁶ Slight changes in emphasis, not only in the relationship of the arrival of the Manichaeans to the basilica tragedy of the same year, but also in the traits of the group of heretics, are important markers as we move forward.

There is no account of the affair at Orléans in the *Alpha* version of Adémar’s text. The accounts in *Beta* and *Gamma* are remarkably similar with one important and telling change. *Beta* tells us the canons of Orléans were deceived by a “rustic.”¹⁷ It is this rustic who possesses the magic powder that cemented converts into their heresy and who claimed to make other miracles.¹⁸ “Rustic” was frequently used by writers of the time as a catchall term for the uneducated or the unorthodox, so it is not surprising to see it applied to the originator of the Orléanais heresy. Such common usage makes this designation of the heresiarch useless as information about him. *Gamma* proves more helpful in this regard; in it Adémar identifies the rustic as coming from Périgord, the locus of the heresy described in the letter of Héribert.¹⁹ Does this mean that Adémar had seen the letter of Héribert or had some other contact with happenings in Périgord? Any such assertion would be mere inference from Adémar’s interpolation of Périgord into the *Gamma* text.²⁰

¹⁶ Ibid., 170.

¹⁷ Ibid., 180 *ipsi decepti* [the canons having been deceived] *a quodam rustico*

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid. The critical edition of the *Chronicon* indicates the addition to the *Beta* text by the use of a different typeface for *Petragoricensi*.

²⁰ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 666 n.3, suggest that, following Arno Borst, this is an interpolation by a twelfth-century scribe, citing the then-current interest in heresy in Périgord. This follows partially from the

Yet there is much to suggest some sort of connection, besides the common origin I have adduced. The groups described by Adémar and Héribert both deny the efficacy of baptism and both have a position that seems to deny the power of the cross. Héribert's heretics eat no meat, a common enough ascetic practice at the time, but one worth mentioning since Adémar's *Alpha* account makes the same assertion, one which is modified in the *Gamma* text to "fasting like monks."²¹ If one were looking for connections, it seems supportable to extend Adémar's description of fasting to the heretics' abstinence from wine noted in Héribert's account.²² Indeed, this might be further extended to the latter group's prayer practices and embrace of poverty under the assumption that the heretics are acting like monks—and even consisting of monks, as in the "Letter"—in order to seduce the unwary.

Both groups also have a relationship with the cross and church doctrine that is troublesome for their orthodox chroniclers. In both of Adémar's accounts, he makes it a point to note that the heretics deny the power of the cross. The group described by Héribert, we should recall, called images of the crucified Christ "idols of the Gentiles." On the matter of the Trinity, the Héribert writer is explicit in noting that the heretics deny this doctrine. Adémar makes no specific mention of the Trinity, but notes in the *Gamma*

thinking that the "Letter of Héribert" dated from the twelfth century. They also assumed a date of 1147, 666 n.l.

²¹ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, 170. *Abstinentes a cibis quasi monachi*

²² See Table 2 above.

account that the heretics deny “everything which is sane doctrine.”²³ Given these similarities, not only in doctrine but in location it seems that, whether the chroniclers are describing heretics or reformers, they are describing the same group.

What of the heretics of Orléans, whom Adémar also describes as “Manichaeans”? Why use the term at all? The heretics, as described in the 1018 account, reject meat, deny the Cross, deny baptism, deny the Eucharist, deny marriage and practice (or pretend to practice) chastity. Adémar would have known the Manicheans from the writings of Augustine, who was a member of the sect before converting to Christianity. Augustine said of their founder, Manes,

He invented two principles, different from and opposed to each other, both eternal and coeternal; that is, he imagined they have always been. Following other ancient heretics, he also believed that there were two natures and substances, that is one good and one evil. Proclaiming on the basis of their teachings a mutual strife and commingling of the two natures, purgation of good from evil, and eternal damnation, along with the evil, of the good which cannot be purged, these heretics devise many myths.²⁴

Because of this, there is good substance, divine stuff, mixed in with matter and it must be liberated. It is contained in food and,

[m]oreover, they believe that this portion of the good and divine substance which is held and mixed and imprisoned in food and drink is more strongly and fully bound in the rest of men, even their own Auditors [adherents who hear,

²³ Ibid. *quidquid sana doctrina est.*

²⁴ Edward Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980), 33.

but have not taken vows in the faith], but particularly in those **who propagate offspring** (emphasis added)²⁵

Of course, Augustine accuses them of secret libertinism. He further tells us that they do not eat meat or eggs, and that though the Elect- that is to say those who are initiated into the highest knowledge of the faith- counsel against marriage for Auditors, they allow marriage, but are adamantly against procreation, as it traps the divine stuff in matter. They are Docetic in Christology, averring that he only had the illusion of flesh and could not therefore suffer and die.²⁶ This fits both with the descriptions of Adémar and Héribert, suggesting either that the heretics were *bona fide* dualists or that Adémar, seeing a group preaching a different sort of Christianity, determined that they were heretical and invoked the most feared enemy of the early Church.

We must also expect a similar sort of familiarity on the part of Héribert. The manuscript in which the letter is located also contains the *De haeresibus* of Augustine, as well as anti-heretical texts by Ambrose of Milan and Agobard of Lyons.²⁷ Yet it is important to note that the writer does not employ the term “Manichaeon” as Adémar does and certainly he would be no less familiar with the sect than his counterpart in Angoulême. It seems clear that the reader is to assume that the two groups were linked

²⁵ Ibid., 34.

²⁶ Ibid., 37

²⁷ Guy Lobrichon, “The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre,” *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, ed. Richard Landes and Thomas Head, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992),” 90.

and to assume that they held the same beliefs.²⁸ By labeling them as “Manichaeian,” Adémar wants the reader to recall Augustine’s dealings with the sect of which he had been a member. Adémar’s interpolation of Périgord further supports this interpretation, supplying an Aquitanian origin for the group at Orléans. That Périgord, among all other possible sites, was picked suggests that Adémar had caught wind of religious stirrings in that region, and was applying the “Manichaeian” label indiscriminately.

The Peace of God and the Cult of Saints

There is good reason to believe that Adémar would have been privy to news from Périgord—his involvement in the promotion of the cult of Saint Martial and the connection of Limoges to the Peace of God movement. Limoges was the site of a seminal event of the Peace of God, the movement in which certain protections were accorded peasants and clergy and secured by oaths sworn on relics, an event Adémar chronicled. The area was plagued by “fire sickness,” most likely the fungal disease ergot, a time when “the invisible flames fed on the corpses of men and women beyond number, and everywhere lamentations filled the land.”²⁹ Bishops and relics were summoned from throughout Aquitaine, but the plague was only lifted when

the body of Saint Martial, **patron of Gaul**, was raised,
whence a great rejoicing filled all and all the infirmities

²⁸ Bautier makes the same point in “L’hérésie,” 72.

²⁹ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, 157. “*Corpora enim virorum et mulierum super numerum invisibili igni depascebantur, et ubique planctus terram replebat.*”

everywhere ceased, and in turn the duke joined a pact of the first principles peace and justice.³⁰ (emphasis added)

Martial's power cured disease and brought peace.

Relics were immensely popular, and the oaths sworn on them had immense symbolic power. Remains of the saints were a nexus between heaven and earth, intercessors for the sinful in the court of Heaven. Wealthy men donated great sums to be buried near their remains in monasteries that became *de facto* shrines for a sort of ancestor worship and "cult centers for the nobility."³¹ Pilgrimage increased, even for believers of lesser means, both to Jerusalem and to local sites along the routes to Saint James of Compostela. Pilgrimage was a sacramental and penitential act, consonant with contemporary modes of religious expression.³² Glaber famously referred to the first decade of the eleventh century as a time when "the whole world was, as we have said, clothed in a white mantle of churches" and "the relics of many saints were revealed by various signs where they had long hidden."³³ At these churches and in the monasteries, clergy were fashioning new reliquaries, writing hagiography and attempting to acquire new relics to attract the throngs of pilgrims.

³⁰ Ibid. "*corpus sancti Martialis, patroni Galliae, de supulchro sublatum est, unde leticia immensa omnes repleti sunt et omnis infirmitas ubique cessavit, pactumque pacis et justicia a duce et principibus vicissim foederata est.*"

³¹ Bernhard Töpfer, "The Cult of Relics in Burgundy and Aquitaine at the Time of the Monastic Reform" Head and Landes, *Peace of God*, 44.

³² Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: the Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c.1130* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 205.

³³ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories*, edited and translated by John France (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 127.

Saint Martial's relics were especially popular. It was the crowd that had come to celebrate his feast day in 1018 that precipitated the stampede resulting in the deaths of some fifty people. The competition for relics, and the pilgrims and donations that came with them, led to some questionable practices. Adémar reports, for instance, that monks of the monastery of Angely discovered the skull of John the Baptist and of the joy with which this discovery was received by Duke William of Aquitaine.³⁴ The fact that a church in Antioch already claimed to possess this relic seems to have mattered little; the discovery appears to have led to greater pilgrim traffic.³⁵ The monastery of Saint-Martial de Limoges was also a participant in the relic frenzy. Adémar's final years were consumed by a concerted campaign to have Martial, who was known as a third-century confessor of the faith, recognized as a full apostle, a campaign that included rewriting the saint's *Vita* and the creation of supporting materials.³⁶

Limoges was on one of the primary pilgrimage routes to the most important shrine in the west, that of Saint James at Compostela. The route began in Vezelay and progressed through Limoges, joining other routes to cross the Pyrenees into Spain. In between lay Périgord. A cult in Périgord dedicated to Saint Front developed in this time, apparently to rival nearby Saint Martial. While he was in the midst of doctoring the credentials of Saint Martial, Adémar went as far as to accuse the partisans of Périgord of

³⁴ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, 175.

³⁵ Richard Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Adémar of Chabannes 989-1034* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 47.

³⁶ Landes tells the complete story with all of its twists and turns in *Relics*, 197-281.

doctoring their own saint's credentials. Marcus Bull has even suggested that Adémar's revised *Vita* of Saint Martial might have been based on that of Saint Front.³⁷

Was Adémar, in naming Périgord as a source of "Manichaeans" attempting to cast doubt on a competitor for pilgrims? It seems unlikely, since he does not name Périgord as the source for all of the heretics in his accounts, only of those at Orléans, and since he had not yet begun the full-bore effort to have Martial's apostolicity recognized. It is also important to note that the *Beta* version, which does not include the reference to Périgord, was written while Adémar was a monk in Angoulême at Saint-Cybard. While *Gamma* may have been started in that community, Adémar took it with him to Limoges.³⁸ The likeliest scenario is that Adémar, now at a prime stop on the pilgrim route, heard the news of religious stirrings in Périgord, the movement of heretics who were reminiscent of the "Manichaeans" of 1018, and assigned this as the origin of the heretics at Orléans. That their origin was a rival pilgrimage center was perhaps an unexpected boon.

Millennialism

The importance of the turning of the millennium as an inspiration for heretics and other religious groups has been a subject of vigorous debate.³⁹ Regardless of whether the turning of the calendar to the year 1000 inspired the heretics at Orléans, it certainly seems to have mattered to two of the chroniclers—Ralph Glaber and Adémar of Chabannes.

³⁷ Bull, *Knightly Piety*, 219-221.

³⁸ Landes, *Relics*, 217 notes the increase in references to matters in the Limousin,

³⁹ The best summary of the arguments for either case can be found in a pair of articles already cited, Richard Landes's "The Birth of Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon" and R.I. Moore's "The Birth of Popular Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon?"

Glaber's *Historiarum* is offered "for those who will come after us all the many things, not in the least negligible, which are seen to take place in the churches of God and amongst the peoples."⁴⁰ He writes for the glory of God and humbly offers to fill the gap left since the Venerable Bede wrote *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People* and Paul the Deacon wrote the *History of the Lombard Nation* in the late seventh and eight centuries. The *Historiarum* is shot through with millennial concerns, as the author informs us from the start, when he mentions the unusual events occurring around the thousandth year since the Incarnation.⁴¹

Indeed, so prominent was the year 1000 in the *Historiarum* that Richard Landes, pre-eminent scholar of millenarianism, claims that "the central organizing principle of his work is the passage of the millennium."⁴² Though one may argue whether the turning of the calendar to the year 1000 was a source of general alarm, a position which Landes holds⁴³, a glance through the *Historiarum* shows the importance of the year 1000 to Glaber. Book One starts in 900 and covers the years until the accession of Hugh Capet in 987. Dates in this book are often given as the number of years since the Incarnation. This changes in Book Two, which covers the time period from 987 to the year 1000. Dates in this book are given in the number of years until the millennium, and as the event draws closer, the number of prodigies increases. Book Two closes with two accounts of

⁴⁰ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum*, 3.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Richard Landes, "The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000: Augustinian Historiography, Medieval and Modern," *Speculum* 75 (January, 2000), 133.

⁴³ Ibid., 97.

heresy in Italy, that of Leutard of Vertus in the year 1000, and that of Vilgard of Ravenna.⁴⁴ In Book Three, dates are given in years after the millennium, including the date of a certain heresy in Orléans, which occurred “[i]n the third year from the twentieth after the millennium.”⁴⁵

Glaber provides the strongest direct evidence that millennial expectation was immense around the turn of the year 1000. It has been noted that the first two books of the *Historiarum* indicate a general decay of religious life in the tenth century, followed by a resurgence of religious enthusiasm around the turn of the eleventh.⁴⁶ Leutard, who was mentioned briefly above, is one manifestation of this. Landes sees in him Glaber’s interpretation of the “false Christ” figure that Gregory of Tours wrote about in his *History*, noting also that Glaber refers to the appearance of Leutard and Vilgard of Ravenna as the fulfillment of Saint John’s prophecy that the devil would be loosed after 1000 years.⁴⁷

It should also be noted that while Glaber wrote the part of his *Historiarum* that covered the events at Orléans, he lived at the monastery of Saint-Germain d’Auxerre, itself a locus of apocalyptic thought. Abbot Hedricus (989-1009) was known to have copied and illustrated the Ezekiel commentary of the ninth-century Abbot Haimo

⁴⁴ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum*, 89-93. The generally accepted date for Vilgard of Ravenna is circa 970.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 139.

⁴⁶ Edward Peters, “Mutations, Adjustments, Terrors, Historians and the Year 1000” in Michael Frassetto, ed. *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 12-13.

⁴⁷ Landes, “Birth,” 37-38

personally.⁴⁸ A sermon from Auxerre written sometime between 1003 and 1010 for Abbot Maiolus compares the monks of that monastery to the 144,000 who were to follow Christ on the Day of Judgment, and this identification of resurgent monasticism with the signs of an impending end was not uncommon in Cluniac thought at the turn of the millennium.⁴⁹ “Héribert,” whose work was discovered in a codex of Saint-Germain, may also be writing in this vein as he describes the pseudo-apostles who spread heresy.

Adémar’s work shows the influence of millennialism as well. Landes points to a vision Adémar received in 1010, of a crucified Christ weeping “rivers of tears” over Angoulême in the same year that the Holy Sepulcher was razed in Jerusalem as evidence that he was moved in some way by millennial fears and expectations.⁵⁰ It is the motif that is important; Glaber reports a mass vision of an icon weeping rivers of tears at Orléans in 988.⁵¹ More direct are the references in the accounts of the Manichaeans, both the 1018 group from Aquitaine and the clerks of Orléans, as “messengers of Antichrist.”

Besides the overtly millenarian aspects of the texts, we must also consider the possibility of a general suffusion of millenarian views at the time. Richard Landes sees the expectation of cosmic change around the turn of the millennium as underpinning the explosion of active religiosity that was evident in the Peace of God, the cult of relics and

⁴⁸ Johannes Fried, “Awaiting the End of Time around the Turn of the Year 1000,” in Richard Landes, et al., eds., *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 20.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 33.

⁵⁰ Landes, *Relics*, 300.

⁵¹ Ibid. Glaber, *Historiarum*, 65.

the emergence of popular—as opposed to learned—heresy in the West. The Peace is viewed as a radical departure in which elites and commoners were joined together, attempting to realize God’s kingdom on earth.⁵² The instability of movements built on popular enthusiasm often proves fatal, leading to disillusionment among their adherents. When such a movement collapses, the energies which had sustained it need to go somewhere, and it is certainly possible that one potential destination is radical religious thought. Movements, both orthodox and heretical, embracing the apostolic life might then be seen as products of a millennial wave.⁵³

⁵² Landes, “Birth,” 40.

⁵³ Ibid., 40-42.

Chapter Four: Questions of Influence

The chief difficulty for the historian in approaching the events at Orléans is addressing questions of influence, since these are never stated openly and documentation is slight. Practically from the moment Adémar selected the term “Manichaeian” to describe both the heretics of Aquitaine and the group in Orléans, the question of dualism has been a thorny one. There is scant documentary evidence pointing to Bogomil penetration of the West before the twelfth century; arguments for their appearances are inferences from the scattered reports of heresy in this period. Yet we must contend with those references if we are to understand what the eleventh-century chroniclers were talking about when they described the heretics of Orléans. It is not sufficient simply to say that since there is no direct evidence of Bogomil evangelizing that none took place. If the accounts of heretical groups describe actual phenomena that are not related to Bogomilism, the currents giving rise to those groups must be identified as well. As we will see, there were numerous influences operating that could give some impetus to the groups described.

Orthodox Influences

Though the reports of Glaber and Paul are suggestive of dualist heresy having arisen in Orléans, it is Adémar’s that needs to be immediately addressed, both on the strength of his use of the term “Manichaeian” to describe the group and because his accounts are so often cited as evidence of dualist heresy in France. Accepting that, in his use of the term, Adémar is expecting his readers to recall the heretics described as arising throughout Aquitaine in 1018—a conclusion

based on the fact that he uses the term with no further explanation in describing the group at Orléans—we need to examine this group as closely as possible. If dualist heresy is to be found in France at this time, it will be in Aquitaine. The best place to look for dualist heresy in Aquitaine is not in the *Chronicon* of Adémar, but in a supposed eyewitness report to the perfidy and power of the heretics; the best place to look is in the “Letter of Héribert.” We must also look here because Adémar names Périgord as the origin of the heresy at Orléans. The table below presents a quick comparison of the attributes of the “Manichaeans” of 1018 and the heretics described in the “Letter.”

Table 3: "Manichaeans" of 1018 and the "Letter of Héribert"

1018 “Manichaeans”	“Letter of Héribert”
No eyewitness testimony	Eyewitness testimony
Denial of baptism	
	Rejection of Eucharist
Denial of the Cross	Denial of the Cross
Eat no meat	Eat no meat
Sexual improprieties	
	Deny the trinity [*]
	Heresy from Périgord
	Made up of clerics and laymen
	Drink no wine
Acted like monks	Genuflect 100 times daily
	Poverty
	Infiltrate churches
	Spit out the Host
	Rapid indoctrination

Faced with the multiple interpretations of the “Letter of Héribert” we have seen—coded polemic, description of Bogomil-influenced heretics, proto-communists—we are still left with the deceptively simple question: who were the people described in this text and what did they believe? If we accept Lobrichon’s contention that the letter is a coded polemic aimed at the

^{*} Inferred from the doxology described by Héribert

enemies of Cluniac reform, then we still need to consider what these enemies were saying that was so dangerous. However, Héribert does not place the heretics in Auxerre, or in a region where Cluny was active. The heretics spread out from Périgord.¹ The influence of Cluny was not widely felt in Aquitaine, the region encompassing Périgord, in the first half of the eleventh century; Claire Taylor notes that the only Cluniac conquest in Aquitaine in the early eleventh century was Saint-Saveur de Sarlat, and suggests this as the home of Héribert.² Placing him here damages neither her argument nor Lobrichon's, and does explain how he remained current on events in Aquitaine, but he need not be based here for our purposes.

Among the perversions of the Christian faith attributed to the heretics, some are relatively non-controversial: the refusal to eat meat or drink wine, the constant prayers, the refusal to take money and sharing property in common. Indeed, these are not specifically dualist traits, and have long been characteristics of those who "claim themselves to live the apostolic life."³ Taylor may find more convincing evidence of dualism in Héribert's assertion that the heretics "reckon the Mass as nothing" and see communion as nothing other than "pieces of blessed bread."⁴ While it is true that such positions were embraced by Bogomils, they have also been embraced by believers who deny the validity of sacraments given by unworthy priests. This is indeed a heretical error, known in ancient times as Donatism, but it is also worth noting that in the coming

¹ Guy Lobrichon, "Latin Texts of the 'Letter' of Heribert" in Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* (Ithaca, N Y: Cornell University Press: 1992), 347. *in petragorensis regionem*

² Claire Taylor, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249* (Rochester, N.Y.: The Boydell Press, 2009), 93. For the spread of Cluniac monasticism in France, see H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1970) 67-112.

³ Lobrichon, "Latin Texts," 347. *dicunt se apostolicam vitam ducere*

⁴ Ibid., 348. *Missam pro nichilo ducunt, fragmenta panis benedicti*

period of reform, Popes Alexander II and Gregory VII will advise the faithful to avoid the services of priests guilty of simony or nicolaitism, the suggestion of which Moore reminds us comes close to this error.⁵ This is not to deny that the heretics in this discussion are in error, but to point out that it is not always easy to know where error lies.

Héribert does, however, attribute several characteristics to the heretics that are highly suggestive of dualism, even if dualism is not necessary to explain them, and these must be addressed. Two of them seem linked: refusal to venerate the Cross and the denunciation of ecclesiastic chant. Of the Cross, the heretics say that it and other representations are “idols of the Gentiles.”⁶ Taylor sees in this a Bogomil’s disgust at the notion that God could take physical form.⁷ Their beliefs about the cross may just as easily be seen as a rejection of the cults of relics that were so popular in Aquitaine at the time, or they may, as Landes suggests, simply be indicative of a native strain of iconoclasm.⁸ They also criticize ecclesiastic chant, which is described as “vain and invented for the approval of men.”⁹ The reasons for this are given to us by Héribert; these believers are rejecting a novel practice that they see detracting from worship.

Most damning among the charges are those included in this passage:

⁵ R.I. Moore, *Origins of European Dissent* 2nd ed. (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985; reprint, Buffalo, N.Y.: University of Toronto Press), 61.

⁶ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 348. *Simulacra gentium*.

⁷ Taylor, *Heresy*, 94.

⁸ “La vie apostolique en l’an mil: paix de Dieu, culte des reliques et communautés hérétiques,” *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 46 (May-June 1991), 584. On page 585, he makes an interesting link between the iconoclasm and anti-hierarchical bent of dissident groups and that of the Jews. *Cette similarité de thèmes et d’attitudes- iconoclasm, refus des hiérarchies rigides, valorisation du travail manuel- dans les communautés juives et chrétiens dissidents suggère la possibilité d’une influence des premières sur les secondes.*

⁹ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 348. *Canticum ecclesiasticum vanum esse asserunt, ac pro fauore hominum inuentum.*

[...]they will not enter a church, unless in the cause of seduction. They never say, “Glory to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,” but instead of that say, “Because yours is the kingdom, and you are master of all creatures forever, amen.”[...] If anyone of them repeats the Mass in the cause of seduction, he does not say the canon, nor receive communion, but turns beside or behind the altar. In fact, he throws the host in the missal or behind the altar. They do not adore the cross or the countenance of the Lord, as also insofar as they can prohibit worship, thus when standing before the visage they say, “Oh, how miserable are they who worship you. Says the psalmist, *An idol of the Gentiles*, and so forth.”¹⁰

There are three charges here that we have yet to address and that are redolent of Bogomil practice: they only enter churches to win converts, the odd doxology at the end of the Lord’s Prayer and the disposal of the host. We have already addressed the matter of the adoration of the Cross. Of these allegations, it is the doxology that is most damning. Taylor notes that the doxology in its regular form was seldom used in the West during this time, arguing that its mere inclusion is intended suggest an Eastern origin for the group; its anti-Trinitarian content is supposed to reflect the refusal of the Bogomils to utter the doxology, a refusal also reported in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*.¹¹ In denying the Trinity, Taylor argues that the prayer acknowledges the dominion of evil in the world, associated with the God of the Old Testament, and expressing “the fear of the demiurge in the detested physical universe.”¹²

¹⁰ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 347-348. [...] *ecclesiam non intrant, nisi causa seductionis. Gloria patri et filio et spiritui sancto nusquam dicunt, sed pro illa dicunt quoniam tuum est regnum, et tu dominaris omni creaturae in secula seculorum, amen.* [...] *Missam si quis horum decanteravit causa seductionis, nec canon dicit, nec communionem receipt, sed aut retro aut iuxta altare uergit. Hostiam vero in missalem aut post altere proicit. Crucem seu vultum domini non adorant sed et adorantes prout possunt prohibent, ita ut ante uultum stantes fando dicant “O quam miseri sunt qui te adorant, dicente psalmista. Simulacra gentium, et cetera.”*

¹¹ Taylor, *Heresy*, 96.

¹² Taylor, *Heresy*, 103.

I believe we can dispose of the charge of discarding the host simply, leaving only the charges of entering the church in order to win converts and the unique ending given to the Lord's Prayer. Charges of spitting out the host were also leveled against Bogomils by their Byzantine critics. Janet and Bernard Hamilton have pointed out that the accusation of spitting out and trampling the host was leveled against the Bogomils by Euthymius Zigabenus and, pairing it with the assertion that Bogomils used urine to wash away an Orthodox baptism, express skepticism on the charges.¹³ Taylor does not make much of this either, noting only that "churchmen in the east complained that Bogomils did likewise."¹⁴ If our skepticism is warranted, and it would seem to be, we can dismiss the accusation as Orthodox hyperbole, leaving only the charges of entering churches to seduce the unwary and the matter of the odd doxology. Our discussion of the host points to a novel solution, one that does involve a sort of missionary activity, but not by Bogomils.

Early heresiologists are often accused of throwing around terms like "Manichaeism" to describe heretics in these times because by using "one of the most infamous names in the constellation of medieval churchmen" they raise the maximum possible alarm.¹⁵ The underlying assumption is that when addressing heresy, chroniclers such as Adémar of Chabannes and the putative Héribert had recourse only to ancient sources and would have derived their descriptions

¹³ Janet Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650- c.1405* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), 34-35

¹⁴ Claire Taylor, "The Letter of Heribert of Perigord as a source for dualist heresy in the society of early eleventh-century Aquitaine," *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000), 343

¹⁵ Malcom Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992; reprint, Barnes & Noble Books, 1998), 20.

from Augustine and the warnings of Paul about people who, in the end times, would reject marriage and the consumption of meat. However, one need not reach so far back to find a source of unintentional misinformation; the possible source or sources might have been contemporary and close at hand in the form of traveling Greek Orthodox monks.

If, as seems likely, the suggestion that Bogomils spit out the host was a spurious one, why should we expect this behavior of Western converts to their faith? I suggest that Héribert's accusation is spurious, meaning that he either fabricated it from whole cloth or adopted it from somewhere else. The confluence of seemingly dualist errors could have a single source, Orthodox correspondents who were familiar, at least in passing, with the errors of the Bogomils. We can advance this to encompass other aspects of the heresy described by Héribert that are specifically dualist; there will be reasons not to discount the other traits. This supposition will of course raise the immediate question as to why it is plausible that monastic writers could be influenced by Orthodox visitors from Byzantium while nascent heretical movements were not influenced by Eastern counterparts. Neither, of course, is more possible than the other, nor does the occurrence of one preclude the other. The reason that any Byzantine influence seems more likely to have been exerted on the clerics writing about heresy is simple, elegant and close to a historian's heart: visits from Orthodox monks to their western counterparts are documented while Bogomil missionaries are not. One well-known visit of this kind occurred in the life of Adémar of Chabannes. It is known that he spent several weeks in 1027 with a pair of monks named Simeon and Cosmas, during which time he "eagerly questioned them about events in the

East so as to include them in his *Historia*.”¹⁶ Their influence has been seen by Robert Lee Wolff, in the scattered references to events in Byzantine lands that showed more detailed knowledge than might be expected of a distant observer.¹⁷

Medieval chroniclers often used disease as a metaphor when speaking of heresy.¹⁸ One would be rash, when considering this, to reject the assertion of Bernard Hamilton, another proponent of the Bogomil thesis, who asserts that “educated churchmen thought it important to diagnose heresies correctly” so better to cure the afflicted.¹⁹ Yet it is difficult to establish the etiology of a disease when one’s instruments are faulty, so while one can agree with Hamilton and Taylor that establishing the presence of “Manichaeans” in France at this time would be symptomatic of a Bogomil infection, one must, as Hamilton does, apply Occam’s razor.²⁰ Taylor, following Hamilton’s work, makes much of increased interaction between Orthodox and Western monks, contacts that increased in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.²¹ It is

¹⁶ Richard Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse and the Deceits of History, Ademar of Chabannes 989-1034* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995) 158. The identity of these monks is not well known. There was a Cosmas the Priest who wrote against the Bogomils in the 970s. Bernard Hamilton in “*Orientalis Lumen et Magistra Latina*: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900-1100) in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)* (London: Valiorum Reprints, 1979), V, 184, notes a connection between this Cosmas and the Church of St. John in Salerno. While it is in theory possible that this was the same man who later visited Adémar, it is also highly unlikely as Cosmas would have had to be around eighty years old by this time. Further intrigue is added by the fact that Cosmas died on this voyage, while sojourning in Limoges in Adémar’s company.

¹⁷ Robert Lee Wolff, “How the News was Brought from Byzantium to Angoulême; or, the Pursuit of a Hare in an Ox-cart,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 4 (1978), 149-150.

¹⁸ This theme is explored in detail in R.I. Moore, “Heresy as Disease,” in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th-13th C.)* ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst. Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain May 13-16, 1973 (Louvain, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1976) 1-11.

¹⁹ Bernard Hamilton, “Bogomil Influences on Western Heresy,” in *Heresy and the Persecuting Society: Essays on the work of R.I. Moore*, ed., Michael Frassetto *Studies in the History of Christian Traditions* 129 (Boston: Brill, 2006), 95.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 95-96.

²¹ Taylor, “Letter,” 333

possible that among the large numbers of Byzantine monks traveling to the west at the time were some closet heretics who spread the contagion of Bogomilism among the clergy and through them to the populace. More likely, however, is that the reports of Orthodox monks on the heresy at home found their way into descriptions of French heretics, which accounts for the repetition of spurious charges in Western accounts.²²

Italy

Having suggested an alternate source for the description of heretics in the “Letter of Héribert and cast serious doubt on the notion that they were Bogomil-influenced Christian dualists, we can proceed to discuss who they might have been and where their ideas came from. Before continuing, though, we should once more enumerate the accusations leveled against them, and pursue the origins of those that need explaining. We have, I believe, accounted for the most serious of these charges: those concerning the host, the Cross and their doxology. These charges are most likely spurious, reflecting the influence of Orthodox monks visiting the monasteries that generated reports of heresy. That the heretics claim to live the apostolic life, neither eating meat nor drinking wine, that they pray continuously, reject the mass, communion and ecclesiastic chant, have yet to be addressed.

²² I do not wish to push this too far by applying it in all instances. Adémar of Chabannes had already labeled the heretics of Orléans “Manichaeans” by the time Simeon and Cosmas visited him. However, there are no characteristics of the sect he described that are specifically dualist. Robert Lee Wolff in his article “How the News was brought from Byzantium to Angoulême; or the Pursuit of a Hare in and Ox Cart,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 4 (1978), 139-187 shows how Adémar most likely gained knowledge for the few Byzantine events in his *Chronicon* from these monks and later fallaciously appealed to their authority in a forgery to help “prove” the apostolicity of Saint Martial. Arthur Siegel uses the presence of Greek monks to account for the differences in the description of heretics in the different versions of the *Chronicon* in his unpublished dissertation *Heresy, Reform and Regional Power in Eleventh-Century Italy: A Re-Evaluation of the Montforte Sect* (University of Delaware, 2003), 82.

Interestingly, and yet to be fully discussed, is the accusation that “not only will they receive no money, but even distribute property according to what seems fit.”²³ Coupled with the further claim that “alms are worthless, because one ought not own [property] whence they are made,”²⁴ there is an explicit rejection of personal property. Their membership also needs to be addressed; the group is composed of “not only laymen relinquishing all property, but clerics, priests, monks and nuns.”²⁵ Again, there is the prominence of property; those in the sect come from the propertied class, though they have given it up, and from the ranks of those whose religious vocation should prevent them from having property. There is no mention of the poor among the members of the sect, so one is left to infer that they are either not members or that Héribert does not find them worth mentioning.

On the matter of diet we need not search far to find Western antecedents that would have been familiar to the monks and nuns of the group, especially those who came from a Frankish Benedictine background. One need only recall Benedict of Aniane, one of the reformers of Carolingian monasticism. His biographer, Ardo, tells us that when he had first professed a monastic vocation he took to extremely ascetic practices,

he tried to grasp the pinnacle of continence, to deprive his body of sleep, to check his tongue, **to abstain from food, to take wine sparingly**, to prepare himself like a skilled athlete for future struggle.²⁶

²³ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 347. *pecuniam non solum non recipiunt, sed et habitam prout uidetur decenter dispertiunt.*

²⁴ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 348. *Elemosniam dicunt nihil esse, quia nec unde fieri posit debere possideri.*

²⁵ Lobrichon, “Latin Texts,” 348. *non solum laicos propria omnia relinquentes, sed etiam clericos, presbyteros, monachos et monachas*

²⁶ Ardo, *Vita Benedicti*, 1:2. Allen Cabaniss, *The Emperor’s Monk: Contemporary Life of Benedict of Aniane* by Ardo (Devon, UK: Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd., 1979). Emphasis added.

Those looking for Eastern influence would do well to look here, though they will find no Bogomils; having found the traditional rule of Benedict of Nursia—the Benedictine Rule—too weak, Benedict of Aniane instead embraced the harsher asceticism of Orthodox monastics, exemplified by Pachomius and Basil of Caesarea.²⁷ Though within a few years of founding his monastery, he would determine that the rule he had embraced was too rigorous for Western monks and return to the Benedictine Rule, this asceticism is part of his legacy and has been seen as one inspiration for the twelfth-century Cistercian movement.²⁸

One might also find more contemporary inspiration in the life of St. Romuald of Ravenna, a proponent of the eremitic and ascetic life in the late tenth century. His embrace of eremitical asceticism was to influence Peter Damian, himself a major advocate for the adoption of the eremitic life after 1050, and who recognized two types of hermits: those who fled the world to remote places and wandering monks whom it has been suggested might better be termed pilgrims.²⁹ These new hermits sought to reform the world by staying in it, seeing not only to their own salvation as traditional hermits, but attempting to bring their fellows to the heavenly city. Whatever the nature of the eremitism adopted, men such as Romuald and Peter Damian clearly thought it the best way to serve God in the business of salvation.³⁰ Currents of

²⁷ Ibid., 2:5

²⁸ Bede K. Lackner, *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux* (Washington, D.C.: Cistercian Publications, 1972), 35.

²⁹ Giles Constable, “Eremetical Forms of Monastic Life,” in his *Monks, Hermits and Crusaders in Medieval Europe* (Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, U.K.: Valiorum Reprints, 1988) V, 243.

³⁰ Colin Phipps, “Romuald- Model Hermit,” in *Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, ed. W.J. Shiels (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 67.

self-denial, then, were already in evidence in Western Christianity by the early eleventh century, though they had yet to achieve the prominence given them after mid-century.

The renunciation of property is also part of this practice of self-denial. Though some historians have seen this as a reaction to spiritual crises arising from the growth of urbanism and the greater use of money in a nascent profit economy, this ignores the fact that renunciation of property has long been a part of Christian monastic practice.³¹ In renouncing possessions, one announces a separation from the world, regardless of whether one enters a hermitage or remains as a preacher and living example to others. It has been noted elsewhere that in all of the great monotheistic traditions that poverty has long been valued as “a condition of closeness to God.”³² The early Benedictines, for example, had taken to individual poverty in this sense.³³

With such ideas already in play, then, we need not look to the eleventh-century east for potential sources for the ascetic characteristics described in the “Letter of Héribert.” There is abundant precedent to be found in current trends of thought in the west that can account for the asceticism of the group within western Christendom. Ralph Glaber provides implicit support for this notion when he identifies the source of the heresy practiced by the heretics of Orléans as Italy.³⁴ Glaber is one of the two sources for another heresy in Italy, one that occurred at

³¹ Such a crisis is described in Lester K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978) especially on pages 19-41.

³² Michel Mollat, *The Poor in the Middle Ages: An Essay in Social History*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1986), 21.

³³ *Ibid.*, 46.

³⁴ Rodolphus Glabri, *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories*, edited and translated by John France (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 139.

Montfort in 1028.³⁵ Though in Glaber's telling, the sect was simply involved in devil-worship, the other source, written by Landulf Senior in his *Historia mediolensis* during the latter half of the eleventh century, describes sectaries much like those in the "Letter of Héribert" who were dedicated to personal and communal poverty, anticlerical and eschewed the eating of meat, as well as being devoted practitioners of chastity.³⁶

Incidents such as this one, and the earlier heresy of Vilgard, have led Arthur Siegel to propose that those seeking the origins of heresy in the eleventh-century west may need to look to the nascent movements of communalism, reform and increases in literacy in the Italian cities.³⁷ In positing this theory, Siegel points not only to Monforte, but also to a group of heretics uncovered in Arras in 1025, whose leader was also said to have come from Italy.³⁸ As Siegel notes, heresy and eremitism were both threats to the clergy, since they threatened to break the stranglehold of the clergy on the interpretation of Biblical texts.³⁹ They shared between them a focus on morality and on knowledge of the Biblical text, forming textual communities.⁴⁰ Some of these sects might stray beyond the pale, in which case they would become, or be labeled, heretics.

Italy is also a logical entry point for a more immediate Greek influence on Western monastics for the simple reason that there were numerous Orthodox monasteries on the

³⁵ Ibid., 177-181

³⁶ Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, eds., *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 86-89.

³⁷ Arthur Siegel, "Italian Society and the Origins of Heresy," *Heresy and the Persecuting Society in the Middle Ages: Essays on the Work of R.I. Moore*, ed. Michael Frassetto (Boston: Brill, 2006), 45.

³⁸ Ibid., 48-49.

³⁹ Ibid., 57.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 63.

peninsula. Calabria and the Terra d'Ostranto in southern Italy were part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the region saw a surge in Orthodox residents during the ninth century, when Muslims invaded Sicily.⁴¹ Contacts between monks of Greek and Latin rites were not limited to southern Italy; by the early tenth century there were at least four Orthodox communities in Rome and from 977 to 1004, the community of Sts. Boniface and Alexius housed a dual-rite community, with Orthodox monks living according to the rule of St. Basil and Catholic monks following the Benedictine Rule.⁴² Traveling Orthodox monks such as Symeon the Hermit visited monasteries throughout the west, where they generally found welcome.⁴³ Though there was a shift to land-based pilgrim traffic after the Byzantine conquest of the Balkans in the early years of the eleventh century, Italy provided an important early point of contact for Orthodox and Catholic monks, where their ideas on monastic life, and their descriptions of heretics, could both find an audience and spread to the north.

Intersections

Adémar's account of the events at Orléans, then, should be seen as questionable at best. As we have seen, he adds nothing to the description of the heretics or our understanding of their beliefs except for the salacious details about the magical powder and demonic summoning. His description of the group as "Manichaeans" forces the reader to recall the earlier group from Aquitaine. We have also seen how this older group can be identified with the heretics described

⁴¹ Bernard Hamilton, "Orientale Lumen," 181-182.

⁴² Ibid., 187-188.

⁴³ Ibid., 196-197.

by “Héribert” and how the latter group may be radical Christians slandered by Catholic chroniclers influenced by Orthodox monks. Where, then, does that leave the heretics of Orléans?

For further enlightenment we must return to the most detailed account, that of Paul of St. Père de Chartres and to the story of Aréfast. Wakefield and Evans consider Paul’s account reliable despite the long gap between the incident and the telling because, “he had known Aréfast, one of its principals, as a monk at Saint-Peter and, it may be presumed, had obtained some of the information from him.”⁴⁴ Malcolm Lambert seems to accept most of Paul’s account, writing off the more lurid details as standard tropes used in writing about heresy, while accepting that there was a secular component to the affair, and stating that “the occasion for unmasking the heretics was political—the heresy itself was real.”⁴⁵ R.I. Moore, who sees the heresy at Orléans as a political matter, opines, following R.H. Bautier, that “Paul has been exposed... not only as late, poorly informed and a peddler of literary stereotypes, but as the apologist for the winning side in what was a highly political affair.”⁴⁶ Indeed, Paul was a monk at Chartres and it had been the bishop of Chartres in 1022 who was “the man seen as most responsible for Odolric’s success in gaining the see of Orléans.”⁴⁷

So why trust Paul on anything? If it were merely a matter of his account I would tend to doubt him completely. But there are multiple accounts, written by multiple authors, each with

⁴⁴ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 75.

⁴⁵ Lambert, *Medieval Heresies*, 2nd ed., 15.

⁴⁶ R. I. Moore, *Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe c.950-c.1250* 2nd ed. (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 15.

⁴⁷ Thomas Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orléans 800-1200* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 266.

his own agenda. John of Ripoll wrote to abbot Obila is to sound the alarm for his abbot about the heresy in Orléans and to report on the actions of Oliba's friend Gauzlin. The account by André of Fleury in the *Vita Gauzlini* is a part of the new hagiography that arose in Fleury at the time⁴⁸, that celebrating contemporary religious heroes; his account in the *Miraculi Sancti Benedicti*, with its miracle story as a coda, is an example of the power of the saint. The version of the story told by Ralph Glaber hews to his millennial concerns and shows anxiety about Italy as a source of heresy. Knowing this, we must approach each cautiously and accept none uncritically but on perhaps one account. Where their stories intersect, with one exception, I believe we must assume that something actual is being described. What is the one exception? Absent more corroborating evidence, the label of heresy—and in Adémar's case, of Manichaeism—is too laden with other possible meanings to accept unchallenged.

Focusing on the point where the accounts intersect will bring us first to Stephen and Lisois. As we have seen, two of our early sources, Adémar and Glaber, place them in close relationship with the king. André of Fleury does not mention them, nor does the letter of Jean. Paul does, calling them “in popular repute distinguished above all in wisdom, eminent in holiness and piety, bountiful in charity.”⁴⁹ We learn that they are the supposed leaders of the heretical sect, but the nature of their relationship with the king is not revealed until later in the

⁴⁸ For an understanding of the new hagiography and the role of Fleury in creating it, see Head, *Hagiography*, chapter two. Head says that the new hagiography dealt in contemporaries and, on page 79, that clerics “began to redefine their concept of sanctity by recognizing the possibility of its presence in their own midst,” and that some of the stories in these collections “were remembered by the authors themselves.” Accepting Head's assertion, on page 259, that André had probably attended the trial of the heretics with Gauzlin, and that, indeed, this kind of hagiography was being practiced, then the *Vita Gauzlini* must properly be seen in this light.

⁴⁹ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 76.

narrative when, in a bit of fine political theater, “the queen, with a staff she held in her hand, struck out the eye of Stephen, who formerly was her own confessor.”⁵⁰ It is no accident that the queen and her relationship to Stephen show up so prominently in Paul’s account. Among the sticking points in the conflict between King Robert and Count Odo was the marriage to Queen Constance, for whom Robert had set aside an earlier marriage to Odo’s stepmother, Bertha of Burgundy.⁵¹ This is a case of a personal struggle that became political, and which was played out by proxy in the struggle between Theodoric and Odolric.⁵² The connection between Stephen and Lisois and the king is not disputed; even the skeptics embrace it and use it as one of the foundations of the argument that this is primarily a political affair.

There is more agreement among contemporary sources over doctrines such as the rejection of penance, the power of the Church, marriage, ordination, etc., though, again, not much with Adémar’s nor with Paul’s account. What errors does Paul impute to the heretics? There is the accusation of unrestrained license behind the veneer of chaste virtue, the literary stereotype Paul is accused of peddling. More substantively we are told that, when brought before the king,

the reckless men disclosed the dregs of their wickedness, hitherto
buried under the words of Holy Writ; they said that Christ was not

⁵⁰ Ibid., 81.

⁵¹ According to Head, *Hagiography*, 267. Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1180* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 192, points to a later political conflict over Odo’s inheritance of Meaux and Troyes in 1021.

⁵² Moore, *Formation*, 15-16. Head, *Hagiography*, 266-7. For Odo’s point of view on his relations with Robert, see Robert Fawtier, *The Capetian Kings of France*, translated by Lionel Butler and R.J. Adams (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1960) 65-66. A more detailed explanation of the political situation can be found in Guillot, Oliver and Yves Sassier, *Pouvoirs et Institutions dans la France Médiévale: des origines à l’époque féodale* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1994) 244-52.

born of the Virgin, nor did He suffer for men; nor was He truly laid in the tomb, nor did He arise from the dead; and they added that in baptism there was no cleansing of the sins, nor was there a sacrament in the consecration by a priest of the body and blood of Christ. They held for naught the invocation of holy martyrs and confessors.⁵³

While this is heretical thought, it is not Manichaeism. It is a wholesale renunciation of the sacerdotal authority of the Church, and of the Incarnation. One might adduce some sort of gnostic thought, in that there is a secret doctrine available only to the initiate, but anything beyond this is inference.⁵⁴

Paul and Adémar converge on one more point as well: the magic powder. In Adémar's account, the powder is made from the ashes of a dead child, and is used to cement converts in their heresy. Paul is more specific. He describes orgiastic rites wherein when the heretics meet, a demon is summoned, the lights go out and each man grabs whichever woman is nearest to hand and has sex with her. He continues,

When a child was born of this most filthy union, on the eighth day thereafter a great fire was lighted and the child was purified by fire in the manner of the old pagans, and so was cremated. Its ashes were collected and preserved **with as great a veneration as Christian reverence is wont to guard the body of Christ, being given to the sick as a viaticum** (emphasis added) at the moment of their departing from this world.⁵⁵

⁵³ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 77-78.

⁵⁴ This is the position that Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 15-16, concluding that the executions were "a burning of true heretics."

⁵⁵ Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies*, 79.

This is a trope—the whole account trades in tropes—but this one appears to hearken back to accusations pagans made against Christians of secret licentiousness.⁵⁶ Why is this detail about the viaticum important, beyond its slanderous nature? First, it is a mockery of the rite of the Eucharist. Second, it is the creation by impure means, and veneration of, a *relic*. Even the execution of the heretics may be concerned with relics. Adémar tells us in his account that having entered the pyre “without delay they were reduced to ashes **of their remains not even bones might be found** (emphasis added).”⁵⁷ In other words, they left no relics behind. Head has taken up this argument and points to a belief, based on the notion that relics would not perish in church fires, that the veracity of relics was frequently tested by fire.⁵⁸ He goes further and asserts that Adémar “at least in part, viewed the execution of the heretics as such an ordeal in reverse.”⁵⁹ Their reduction to ashes is proof of their error. As the impresario of the relic cult of Saint Martial, Adémar would have had a special interest in these matters.

Heresy at Orléans and Beyond

Of the five accounts of the heresy, most of our attention has been given to Adémar’s because of the prominence historians have given it in the history of medieval heresy. As we have seen, his account is flawed, primarily because when he writes about the events that took place at Orléans, he is not really writing about the events that took place at Orléans. At best, he

⁵⁶ Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 14.

⁵⁷ Ademari Cabannensis, *Chronicon*, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 129, ed. by R. Landes and G. Pon (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1999), 180. “*sine mora penitus in cinerem redacti sunt, ut nec de ossibus residuum inveniretur eorum.*”

⁵⁸ Head, *Hagiography*, 268.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 269.

is associating the group uncovered there with the “Manichaeans” who appeared throughout Aquitaine in 1018. By following the trail backwards, we have seen that the group Adémar described as appearing in 1018 bears striking similarities to a group described in the “Letter of Héribert,” written sometime in the first decades of the eleventh century. We have also seen that that earlier group need not have been heretical, but perhaps represented an early manifestation of the reforming spirit that would arise later in the century, perhaps influenced by ascetic reformers in Italy. We have also seen, in the repetition of spurious charges first leveled against the Bogomils, the hand of Orthodox monks visiting Western monasteries in the description of these heretical movements.

John of Ripoll and André of Fleury have shown us, albeit obliquely, the place of the accusation of heresy in the political situation of Orléans. André is especially concerned with this, a concern shown by the orthodox profession of faith he places in the mouth of Gauzlin. This profession is clearly aimed at separating the abbot from the accused men, who had served under his political ally, Bishop Theodoric. Paul’s account, so mired in the ecclesiastical and secular politics of the time that we must approach it with extreme caution, is shot through with such concerns. Glaber’s shows his millennial concerns and provides us with a pointer towards Italy. It seems clear by now that the sources are so muddled and the authors’ motivations so suspect and various that we must question even the existence of heresy in Orléans. We are left, then, wondering what to make of the events at Orléans, and what implications they hold for our understanding of heresy beyond 1022.

One lens through which to view the events of 1022 is provided by R.I. Moore in his *Formation of a Persecuting Society*. As we have noted earlier, Moore follows Bautier in emphasizing the political aspects of the events at Orléans and casts doubt on the notion that there was, in fact, a group of true heretics. He notes the association of Stephen and Lisois with followers of Gerbert of Aurillac, who had himself been accused holding of heretical positions, an accusation for which there is no available evidence.⁶⁰ The affair at Orléans is viewed as one set of literate, clerical elites battling with another for control of an important diocese. It is presented as an early manifestation of the process, a process which intensified in the twelfth century, leading these elites to take up the habit of persecution as a means to secure their positions. Moore suggests that the origins of the heresy accusation lie in “the world of the court and political power” rather than in the detection of actual heresy.⁶¹

This highlights the problem Orléans presents for the study of heresy in eleventh-century France. If we are looking for a unified heretical presence in the West, then Orléans must obviously be considered, if only on the strength of Adémar’s account and his use of the term “Manichaeism.” But we have seen how problematic the label is, not only in the connotations the term seems to have held for him, but also in the unconsidered manner with which he transfers it from the heretics of 1018 to those accused at Orléans four years later. The political overtones of the situation, the centrality of the episcopal struggle between Theodoric and Odolric, and the particular interests of the chroniclers make the truth still harder to approach. All the while, the

⁶⁰ Moore, *Formation*, 15.

⁶¹ Ibid.

case seems illustrative of Moore's central point, that the identification of proscribed groups—heretics in this case—served as a means to securing power.

Yet Moore's thesis does not necessarily imply that all accusations of heresy were false. However much accusations of heresy may have contributed to the security of the class consisting of literate clerics and courtiers, they may have been describing actual phenomena. This, in fact, may account for the vigor with which charges of heresy were pursued. Istvan Bezcy has argued that members of other outsider groups Moore identified, such as Jews and lepers, were treated throughout this period with a degree of tolerance that the notion of a persecuting society would not lead us to expect.⁶² Such leniency was not extended to heretics. Tolerance, he argues, "was a way of walking honestly towards outsiders; towards insiders, strictness prevailed."⁶³ Steven Runciman made the same point about tolerance when he noted that it was a social virtue as opposed to a religious one. The greater danger presented by the heretic arose from the fact that while professing the same orthodox doctrine, in his perversion he endangered the entire community.⁶⁴ Such distinctions do little to undercut the central point, that the identification and persecution of outsider groups was central to the consolidation of power. Even if we accept that greater tolerance was shown to Jews than to heretics, for instance, we must also note that for all the tolerance shown them, they were only accorded a place on the margins of society.⁶⁵ We are

⁶² Istvan Bejczy, "Tolerantia: A Medieval Concept," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58 (July, 1997), 371-374.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 375.

⁶⁴ Steven Runciman, in *Medieval Manichee: A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1947), 1.

⁶⁵ Bejczy, "Tolerantia," 374-375.

also left to wonder where this vaunted tolerance went in the twelfth centuries and beyond when Jews were more and more subject to separation and to violence from the Christian population.

The implications for the study of medieval heresy are troubling. If all heretical events in the eleventh-century are to be seen as manifestations of a Bogomil infiltration, then Orléans presents huge problems considering that the identification of dualists there rests on such shaky ground. There has been a recent attempt to redeem Adémar through the study of his autograph sermons by Michael Frassetto. Frassetto notes that these sermons, written in the last years of Adémar's life—after he had been disgraced in his attempts to have Saint Martial recognized as an apostle—contain detailed refutations of heretical positions central to dualism.⁶⁶ These sermons were written between 1029 and 1033, and may reflect actual ideas circulating at the time. However, we must also remember that during this time, Adémar was also writing sermons and letters in an attempt to continue the Martial campaign.⁶⁷ In those documents, Adémar proved willing to use the language and accusation of heresy against his opponents. He called Benedict of Chiusa, his antagonist in the debacle of Saint Martial, “antichrist, a devil, a wolf in sheep's clothing, a Lombard dog, heretic, Manichaeon and Ebionite.”⁶⁸

We are left to treat each instance of heresy as *sui generis* until the evidence forces us to do otherwise. Orléans can then be seen for what it was: a largely—if not entirely—political affair, without casting doubts on other accusations of heresy. Those in turn must be examined in

⁶⁶ Michael Frassetto, “The Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes and the Letter of Heribert: New Sources Concerning the Origins of Medieval Heresy,” *Revue Bénédictine* 109 (1999), 330.

⁶⁷ Daniel Callahan, “The Sermons of Adémar of Chabannes and the Cult of St. Martial of Limoges,” *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), 250-295.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 273.

context if sense is to be made of them. But we must follow the trail wherever it leads, with no preconceptions. Not every heretical occurrence can be viewed as part of a nebulous Bogomil infiltration nor, in all likelihood, will each be shown to be purely political. We have seen how the accusation of dualism at Orléans can be traced back and connected to accusations against other groups very much caught up in the spirit of the times, preaching a return to simpler forms of worship. Further investigation may well show evidence of Bogomilism in France at this time, but historians will likely not find it at Orléans.

Bibliography

- Ademari Cabannensis. *Chronicon, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 129 edited by R. Landes and G. Pon. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 1999.
- André de Fleury, *Vie de Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury, Vita Gauzlini Abbatis Floriacensis Monasterii* translated by Robert-Henri Bautier. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989.
- Ardevald of Fleury, Aimo of Fleury, André of Fleury, et al. *Les Miracles de Saint-Benoit*. Paris: Chez M^{me} V^e Jules Renouard, 1858; reprint, Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Elibron Classics, 2006.
- Ardo. *Vita Benedicti* in Allen Cabaniss, *The Emperor's Monk: Contemporary Life of Benedict of Aniane by Ardo*. Devon, UK: Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd., 1979.
- Bautier, Robert-Henri. "L'hérésie d'Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XI^e siècle: Doucements et Hypothèses," in his *Recherches sur l'histoire de la France médiévale: Des Mérovingiens aux premiers Capétiens*. Brookfield, Vermont: Gower Publishing Company, 1991. III, 63-98.
- Bejczy, Istvan. "Tolerantia: A Medieval Concept," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58 (July, 1997). 365-384.
- Bull, Marcus. *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: the Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c.1130*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Cabaniss, Allen *The Emperor's Monk: Contemporary Life of Benedict of Aniane by Ardo*. Devon, UK: Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd., 1979.
- Callahan, Daniel. "Ademar of Chabannes and the Bogomils" *Heresy and the Persecuting Society: essays on the work of R.I. Moore*, Michael Frassetto, ed. *Studies in the History of Christian Traditions* 129. Boston: Brill, 2006. 31-41.
- _____. "The Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes and the Cult of St. Martial of Limoges," *Revue Bénédictine* (86) 1976. 250-295.
- Constable, Giles "Eremitical Forms of Monastic Life," in his *Monks, Hermits and Crusaders in Medieval Europe*. V, 242-264.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J. *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1970.

- Dondaine, Antoine. "L'Origine de L'Hérésie Médiévale: A Propos d'un Livre Récent *Estratto da Revista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, Anno 6 (April 1952): 47-78.
- Dunbabin, Jean. *France in the Making 843-1190*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scriptures and Faiths We Never Knew*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Fawtier, Robert. *The Capetian Kings of France*, translated by Lionel Butler and R.J. Adams (New York: St. Martin's Press), 1960.
- France, John. "Introduction," *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories*, by Rodolphus Glabri. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Frassetto, Michael, ed. *Heresy and the Persecuting Society: essays on the work of R.I. Moore*, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 129. Boston: Brill, 2006.
- _____. "The Sermons of Ademar of Chabannes and the Letter of Heribert: New Sources Concerning the Origins of Medieval Heresy" *Revue Bénédictine* 109 (1999) 324-340.
- _____. Ed. *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Fried, Johannes. "Awaiting the End of Time around the Turn of the Year 1000," in Richard Landes, et al., eds., *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. 17-63.
- Glabri, Rodolfus. *Historiarum Libri Quinque- The Five Books of the Histories*, edited and translated by John France. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Guillot, Olivier and Yves Sassier, *Pouvoirs et Institutions dans la France Médiévale: des origines à l'époque féodale*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1994.
- Hamilton, Bernard. "Bogomil Influences on Western Heresy" *Heresy and the Persecuting Society: essays on the work of R.I. Moore*, Michael Frassetto, ed. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 129. Boston: Brill, 2006. 93-114.
- _____. "*Orientale Lumen et Magistra Latinitas*: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900-1100) in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900-1300)*. London: Valiorum Reprints, 1979. V, 181-216.
- Hamilton, Janet and Bernard. *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c.650- c.1405*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1998.

- Head, Thomas. *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: the Diocese of Orleans 800-1200*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Head, Thomas and Richard Landes, editors. *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- John of Ripoll, *Johannes monachus ad Olibam* in *Vie du Gauzlin, Abbé de Fleury- Vita Gauzlini Abbatiss Floriacensis Monasterii* translated and edited by Richard-Henri Bautier. (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989) 180-183.
- Lackner, Bede K. *The Eleventh-Century Background of Cîteaux*. Washington, D.C.: Cistercian Publications, 1972.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *The Cathars*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- . *Medieval Heresy, Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2nd ed. 1992; reprint, New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1998.
- . *Medieval Heresy, Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd ed. New York: Blackwell, 2002.
- Landes, Richard. "The Birth of Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon," *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000), 26-43.
- . "The Fear of an Apocalyptic Year 1000: Augustinian Historiography, Ancient and Modern" *Speculum* 75 (2000), 97-145.
- . *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Adémar of Chabannes 989-1034*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- . "La vie apostolique en Aquitaine en l'an mil: Paix de Dieu, culte des reliques, et communautés hérétiques" *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 46 (Mai-Juin, 1991), 573-587.
- Little, Lester K. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Lobrichon, Guy. "The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre," *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, edited by Richard Landes and Thomas Head. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992. 80-103

- _____. "The Latin Texts of the Letter of Héribert," *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, edited by Richard Landes and Thomas Head. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992. 347-350
- Mollat, Michel. *The Poor in the Middle Ages: An Essay in Social History*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Moore, R.I. *The Birth of Popular Heresy*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1975; Reprint, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- _____. "The Birth of Popular Heresy: A Millennial Phenomenon?." *Journal of Religious History* 24 (2000): 8-25.
- _____. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, c.950-c.1250*, 2nd edition. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- _____. "Heresy as Disease" in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th- 13th C)*, W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst, eds. Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain, May 13-16, 1973. Louvain: Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1976. 1-11.
- _____. *The Origins of European Dissent*, 2nd ed. London: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1985; reprint, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- _____. "Property, Marriage, and the Eleventh Century Revolution: A Context for Early Medieval Communism" in Michael Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998. 179-208.
- Morghen, Raffaello. "Problèmes sur l'origine de l'hérésie au moyen-âge" *Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle, 11^e-18^e siècles*, ed. Jacques LeGoff. Paris: Moulton & Co., 1968. 121-132.
- Mostert, Marco. *The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury, A study of the ideas about society and law of the tenth-century monastic reform movement*. Hilbersum, Netherlands: Verloren Publishers, 1987.
- Paul of St. Père de Chartres, "De rebus quas dedit Arefastus monachus Santo Petro" *Vetus Aganon* ed. Benjamin-Edmé-Charles Guérard in *Capitulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Père de Chartres*. Collection des Cartulaires de France, ser. 1. 2 vols. Paris: 1840. 108-115.
- _____. "The Narrative of Paul, a Monk of Chartres" in Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991) 76-81.
- Peters, Edward. *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980.

- _____. "Mutations, Adjustments, Terrors, Historians and the Year 1000" in Michael Frassetto, ed. *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Phipps, Colin. "Romuald- Model Hermit" in *Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, ed. W.J. Shields (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 65-76.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Medieval Manichee A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1947; reprint, 1996.
- Siegel, Arthur. *Heresy, Reform and Regional Power in Italy: A Re-evaluation of the Montforte Sect*, unpublished dissertation, University of Delaware, 2003.
- _____. "Italian Society and the Origins of Heresy," *Heresy and the Persecuting Society in the Middle Ages: Essays on the Work of R.I. Moore*, ed. Michael Frassetto. Boston: Brill, 2006. 43-72.
- Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Taylor, Claire. *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, 1000-1249*. Rochester, NY: The Boydell Press, 2005.
- _____. "The letter of Heribert of Perigord as a source for dualist heresy in the society of early eleventh-century Aquitaine," *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000), 313-349.
- Töpfer, Bernhard. "The Cult of Relics in Burgundy and Aquitaine at the Time of Monastic Reform" *The Peace of God: Social Violence and religious Response In France Around the Year 1000*, edited by Richard Landes and Thomas Head. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1992. 41-56
- Wakefield, Walter L. and Austin P. Evans. *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969; reprint, 1991.