Part I

The Beginnings

1

The Problem of Heresy

Heresy, and the horror it inspires, intertwines with the history of the Church itself. Jesus warned his disciples against the false prophets who would take His name and the Epistle to Titus states that a heretic, after a first and second abomination, must be rejected. But Paul, writing to the Corinthians, said, 'Oportet esse haereses', as the Latin Vulgate translated his phrase – 'there must be heresies, that they which are proved may be manifest among you'[1] – and it was understood by medieval churchmen that they must expect to be afflicted by heresies.

Heresy was of great importance in the early centuries in forcing the Church progressively to define its doctrines and to anathematize deviant theological opinions. At times, in the great movements such as Arianism and Gnosticism, heresy seemed to overshadow the Church altogether. Knowledge of the individual heresies and of the definitions which condemned them became a part of the equipment of the learned Christian; the writings of the Fathers wrestled with these deviations, and lists of heresies and handbooks assimilated this experience of the early centuries and handed it on to the Middle Ages.

Events after Christianity became the official religion of the Empire also shaped the assumptions with which the Church of the Middle Ages met heresy. After Constantine's conversion, Christians in effect held the power of the State and, despite some hesitations, they used it to impose a uniformity of belief. Both in the eastern and in the western portions of the Empire it became the law that pertinacious heretics were subject to the punishments of exile, branding, confiscation of goods, or death. These regulations survived the fall of the Empire, and so did the assumption that it was the right of the Church to call on the State to put down heresy.

1 Titus 3: 10; 1 Cor. 11: 19. H. Grundmann, 'Oportet et haereses esse: Das Problem der Ketzerei im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Bibelexegese', *AKG* XLV (1963), pp. 129–64. For the Greek term see L. Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, tr. R. A. Guelich (London, 1970), pp. 165–77. For heresy in the early Christian centuries, E. Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (1980) (*PHA*) (trans. extracts with intro.), pp. 1–3, 13–56.

Heresy was not thought to be the product of the individual speculative intelligence, or of devout men and women seeking a higher ethical life – still less of oppressed lower classes demanding better conditions and masking their economic objectives in the outwardly religious forms of their age. All these interpretations have been put forward by modern historians of medieval heresy, but they are quite alien to the assumptions of churchmen, whether of the Middle Ages or of the early centuries of the Church. They believed that heresy was the work of the devil. Descriptions of heretics were couched in sets of favourite adjectives and texts, passed on from author to author, and only too often imposed with scant discrimination on the heretics, their beliefs and practices.[2] Some were an inheritance passed on to the Middle Ages from the age of the Fathers; others were developed in the Middle Ages themselves. The descriptions served primarily to develop a set of conventional characteristics of the type-figure of the heretic: his pride, which must be a feature, for he has set himself up against the teaching of the Church; his superficial appearance of piety, which must be intended to deceive, and cannot be real, since he is in fact the enemy of the faith; and his secrecy, which is contrasted to the openness of Catholic preaching. He may well be described as unlettered (even if this is not entirely true), since *a priori* he lacks the equipment of the orthodox churchman; he may be accused of counterfeiting piety while actually indulging in libertinism – an accusation which strangely repeats those made by pagan writers against early Christians, and sometimes appears to feed on the same material. His beliefs may be crudely assimilated to the heresies of the patristic age, even when they are quite unrelated, though this tendency fades as more accurate knowledge of actual medieval heresy penetrates the conventions. The bulk of sources emanate from the repressing forces or the chroniclers on the Catholic side, and their descriptions are thus shaped by these conventions. Surviving work of the heretics, in which we can see for ourselves the nature of their teaching, is very much less, either because the heresy was conveyed more often by word of mouth than by writing, or because repression has destroyed documents.

The historian thus faces acute problems of evidence when he wishes to study the behaviour, motives and beliefs of the medieval heretic. He is dealing much of the time with underground movements existing behind a barrier of secrecy – and because Church and State are most often combined against them, they are willy nilly secret opposition movements hostile to authority. As a modern historian, he must elucidate motives from sources which are very rarely concerned with them, and scrape off layers of convention and prejudice from his originals in order to reach a true delineament of the heretics.

2 H. Grundmann, 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlichen Anschauung', *Kultur- und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift für Walter Goetz* (1927), pp. 91–107 (fundamental for approach to sources); for coll. articles, of fundamental importance, see *Ausgewählte Aufsätze* I: *Religiöse Bewegungen* (1976), II: *Joachim von Fiore* (1977), III: *Bildung und Sprache* (1978); obituary assessment: A. Borst in I, pp. 1–25, bibliography: H. Lietzmann, I, pp. 26–37. A Patschovsky, 'Der Ketzer als Teufelsdiener', *Papsttum, Kirche und Recht im Mittelalter*, ed. H. Mordek (1991), pp. 317–34. P. Biller, 'The *Topos* and reality of the heretic as *illiteratus*', Id., *Waldenses* (below p. 158, n. 1), pp. 169–90. Id., 'Through a glass darkly: seeing medieval heresy', *The Medieval World*, ed. P. Linehan, J. Nelson.

The subject is also two-sided. It takes two to create a heresy: the heretic, with his dissident beliefs and practices; and the Church, to condemn his views and to define what is orthodox doctrine. It was in the persistent resistance to the teaching of the Church that heresy consisted: error became heresy when, shown his deviation, the obstinate refused to obey and retract. In the thirteenth century Robert Grosseteste's definition stated that 'a heresy is an opinion chosen by human perception contrary to holy Scripture, publicly avowed and obstinately defended'. The Church, confronted from the twelfth century onwards with a challenge from hostile sects, was forced, step by step, to recognize how these sects differed from those of late antiquity, and to take new measures to deal with them. A machinery was created both for defining doctrine and for uncovering and putting down those who refused to accept the decisions of authority. It came to be accepted that Christianity was a system of beliefs 'that were self-evidently true, so that rejection of any of them implied ignorance or malice'.[3] Not all of these developments have been fully studied by medievalists, for, although we have known much since Lea of the origins and workings of one of the instruments of repression, the inquisition, much more needs to be known about the doctrinal decision-making of ecclesiastical authority and the way in which the medieval concept of heresy was built up. Moreover, the search for understanding of the motives of the heretic will take the historian into the study of medieval societies and economic changes and into the issues of the morale of the faithful, the conditions in regional Churches and the effect of abuse in stimulating heresies. All are subjects open to investigation, where often enough no final word, even within the limitations of our sources, has yet been said.

Not only the existence of the assumption that State and Church have a duty to persecute, and the emergence of a machinery to detect and examine religious dissidents, shaped the conditions of existence of the medieval heretic. He was also subject to one basic principle of medieval Christianity generally: that the heretic who wilfully persisted in his error was condemned to the pains of Hell for eternity. The persistent dissident was thus not only defying a visible authority – and, as we shall see, that authority was not always very clearly in evidence, or actively pursuing heretics; he was also challenging the fear of damnation, and backing his own judgement or that of his group against a spiritual authority with the power to decide his eternal future. That groups of men and women in medieval society were prepared to make this defiance is one of the striking facts to record, and one major theme of this book will be the examination, where possible, of the motives which led them to do it. Second only in interest to this question is that of the failure of all medieval heretical movements that made this defiance to survive in the long term. Why, we may ask, having once challenged authority, were these heretics severally unable to maintain the independence of their beliefs?

3 N. Tanner's comment, 'Penances', *LG*, p. 236 (see below, p. 266, n. 1). On the medieval notion of heresy, see *MBPH*, pp. 1–7 and *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th–13th C.)*, ed. W. Lourdaux, D. Verhelst (1976). See also prologue to G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages* (1967), 2 vols (survey stressing intellectual factors). A. S. McGrade, 'The medieval idea of heresy: what are we to make of it?' *SCH* Subsidia XI, pp. 111–39 (see esp. for varied views in Augustine).

The search for salvation, coupled with the conviction that the Church no longer channelled the means of salvation or had distorted the teaching of Christ or was temporarily in the hands of evil men, was the most important single factor impelling the leaders of heretical movements to challenge ecclesiastical authority. Conviction that their reading or hearing of Scripture or an inner illumination or the instruction of a holy man and the conferring of a valid sacrament where the Church's sacraments had become valueless, overrode the decisions of priests, bishops or popes.

The search for salvation moved the rank and file of such movements as well as the leaders: we have a vivid demonstration of this in the battle for souls at the deathbed between the Cathar *consolamentum* and the Catholic last rites, and the wavering of the sick and their relatives between rival claims.

Eloquence could change lives – briefly or permanently. If the preacher could fuse through his exhortation social and economic grievance and a religious exaltation, extraordinary events became possible. For a moment at Le Mans in 1116, Henry the Monk, blending Lenten revivalism with anticlerical emotions, broke down social barriers, brought prostitutes to repentance and induced young men to marry them; on a far wider scale in Bohemia three centuries later, radical Hussite preachers led peasant families to go *en masse* on pilgrimage to the hills, joining large-scale preachings and celebrations of communion in both kinds, breaching the normal barriers of society and creating the manpower for the most effective of Hussite armies.

The appeal of the great heresies, Cathar, Waldensian, Lollard, was perennial, supra-regional and transcended the personalities of their leaders. Given that this was so, it is necessary to look at local and regional conditions in order to understand why a heretical movement survived or even prospered in one area rather than another; to explain this, the political, social or economic circumstances of a region will be decisive.[4] Northern Italy was the land of heresy *par excellence* because of its social pressures and its intellectual vitality, and above all because its cities prized their independence so highly that they preferred to tolerate heretics rather than surrender to the demands of their bishops or of popes. Parts of Languedoc were a seed-ground for Catharism because of its chronic political anarchy, which deterred secular authority from repression of religious dissidence, and because of a certain casual, meridional tradition of tolerance, which gave time for its missionaries to gain recruits and build up their Churches. The city of Rome's material grievances gave Arnold of Brescia a political and religious platform for his teaching on poverty and the disendowment of the Church. It was no accident that Milan was at one and the same time a fast-growing industrial centre and the cradle of proliferating heretical groups. The

4 Anthropology shows itself fruitful; for general comments, see J. L. Nelson, 'Society, theodicy and the origins of heresy: towards a reassessment of the medieval evidence', *SCH* IX, pp. 65–77; another view: T. Asad, 'Medieval heresy: an anthropological view', *Social History* XI (1986), pp. 354–62; survey of hypotheses: J. B. Russell, 'Interpretations of the origins of medieval heresy', *MS* XXV (1963), pp. 26–53.

clash of Czech and German speakers in Prague and the social tensions of the New Town account for much in the history of Hussitism.

And yet, however much the fate of the movements with mass support rested on these varying terrestrial circumstances, the actions of the dedicated heretic were dictated far more by conscience and his conviction that he was doing the will of God as he braved persecution. Some historians have been inclined to see in the chroniclers' accounts of heretics accepting their fate with equanimity, even with joy, literary *topoi* with an insecure basis in fact. Not so: better-recorded narratives of the bearing of dedicated men and women before the fire, and some modern medical information, make these stories wholly credible. The stake was the last and fiercest test; the courage of the heretical missionaries and the strongest of their supporters developed over the years made them ready, when all opportunities of escape failed, to face a cruel death. Their religious convictions account for the longevity of the movements for which they sacrificed their days.

Defiance none the less ended either in destruction or at least in the cowing and marginalizing of these movements. Repression makes martyrs, but, efficiently conducted, it is also largely successful. In a sufficient number of cases, orthodoxy commanded the services of the secular arm, the emperors, kings and aristocrats with military and economic power. Studies devoted to the analysis of medieval heresies may often unwittingly conceal this point, because they are concerned with the exceptions, the occasions when repression was ineffective or not even attempted. At most times and in most places orthodoxy had support, and not only the support of the leadership in society, but of rank and file too. In the Albigensian Crusade, for example, volunteers repeatedly came to serve in the south of France in order to repress heresy, and although some came in the expectation of winning land, others came out of religious conviction and served the time needful to gain the crusading indulgence, then went home. In the long history of Lollardy, the bulk of the English populace remained indifferent to the heresy. Some were positively hostile, as is demonstrated by the grim evidence of the will of a London goldsmith, bequeathing money to buy faggots for the burning of heretics. That hostility lasted in some quarters into the Reformation epoch. In Exeter sticks and gorse were thrown on to the burning fire of a heretic in 1533.[5]

More than that of any other scholar, the work of Herbert Grundmann has shaped the approach of this book. His insistence that, in order to understand the rise and influence of heresies, the historian must look at the history of orthodoxy, his determination to avoid the constricting influence of denominationalism and denominational history and to look beyond the well-recorded story of Catholic religious orders to the lesser, often short-lived medieval experiments in religious life so revealing of general trends in Church and society and, finally, his understanding that heresy is born primarily of religious conviction, are keynotes in my exposition. An initiative of R. E. Lerner has brought Grundmann's classic work,

5 M. E. Aston, *Faith and Fire* (1993) (coll. articles), p. xiv.

the *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* of 1935,[6] coupled with a historiographical essay, to English readers, who can now judge for themselves why the book has been so durable a guide to its subject.

My first edition provided a working synthesis of the state of research on popular heretical movements from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries, designed both for the undergraduate reader who needed a one-volume introduction and as a handbook for the scholar working in one portion of this vast field, for quick reference on the subject as a whole. 'Popular' was taken to mean movements with a substantial following among laymen: individual heretical episodes involving small numbers were only included in so far as they revealed a stage in the growth of a movement on a larger scale. Intellectual heresy would have made another book: it was not analysed except in those cases where it gave a direct impetus to a popular heresy. So Abelard, despite the general interest aroused, was excluded while Wyclif, because of his effect on the Lollards, was given a chapter, and space was devoted to learned disputes about Wyclif and his teaching in the University of Prague as essential to the understanding of the popular movement of the Hussite revolt.

Heresy was taken to mean whatever the papacy explicitly or implicitly condemned during the period.[7] The growth of heresies and the failure of local authorities to deal effectively with them was one factor in the extension of papal power in the Church and it was some time before a clear legal concept of heresy emerged from the uncertainties of the eleventh and twelfth centuries: nevertheless, this definition served as a convenient working tool. It may incidentally lead to criticism in relation to the Hussites: some historians, not without reason, regard the moderate wing of the Hussites as reformers rather than heretics and note that the condemnation of Hus was the work of a Council that itself had unorthodox views on the papacy. Yet Hus denied the medieval doctrine of the papacy and even the moderate Utraquists received papal condemnation. I, therefore, with consistency, treated the Hussite movement as heretical. Where Byzantine heresy was concerned, I followed the decisions of the patriarch of Constantinople; for early heresy the decisions of the undivided Church.

When dealing with certain Western heresies, I felt justified in making a distinction between 'real' heresies that involved a major distortion of orthodox belief or practice and 'artificial' heresies, which as an ensemble in a living context did not exist, as in the case of the Free Spirit. The heresy of the *fraticelli* and the

6 1st edn, Berlin, 1935; 2nd, Darmstadt, 1961, trans. S. Rowan as *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages* (1995), intro. R. E. Lerner, pp. ix–xxv (on Marxism, pp. xvii–xviii, xxiii–xxv); reflections, J. L. Nelson, 'Religion in "histoire totale": some recent work on medieval heresy and popular religion', *Religion* x (1980), pp. 60–84.

7 H. Kaminsky, 'The problematics of later-medieval heresy', *Husitství–Reformane–Renasence*, ed. J. Pánek *et al.* (1994) (essays for F. Šmahel), pp. 132–54, criticizes historians defining the term 'heresies' 'as whatever the papacy condemned' on the grounds that they 'will see them under the same aspect in which they appeared to the medieval inquisitor' (p. 137). The inference is incorrect. A condemnation is merely a starting-point for investigation, seeking to establish the factors behind the condemnation, what the heretics believed, who they were and why they so acted.

case of the poverty of Christ occupy a curious position. The distortions of the ideal of poverty threatened to overturn the balance of Christian ethics; yet the actual decisions whereby the pope of the time condemned them and tried to uproot their basis in the Franciscan order were in fact based on technical issues and may fairly be called 'artificial'. The concept of 'artificial' heresy also enabled me to give attention to the cases in which unpopular groups or individuals were smeared with slanderous charges by authority at various levels or by local opinion and to allude, but no more, to the closely allied subject of witchcraft.

The second edition maintained the assumptions of the first but extended the scope in time, carrying the story of the Hussites from 1436 to the Reformation and extending the slim epilogue of the first edition to a full chapter on the sixteenth century. New scholarship also induced me to alter my view on the importance of Bogomil infiltration from Byzantium as a factor in the rise of heresy in the eleventh century, to give place instead to indigenous Western factors and to rewrite much of the Lollard chapter to incorporate the fruits of manuscript research by Anne Hudson and others.

The third edition keeps the shape and the time-scale of the second but remodels parts of the chapters on the Cathars, the Waldensians after 1218 and the Lollards, and makes significant additions on the eleventh-century emergence of heresy.

Eleventh-century origins continue to intrigue historians. About a half dozen episodes give material for analysis; one writer has argued that the sources are too few and too frail to justify the volume of research which has descended on them since Grundmann published seven pages on the subject in an appendix to *Religiöse Bewegungen*. That view is misguided. One needs only to glance at the expositions of two distinguished historians in the 1940s and 1950s which set controversy alight, A. Dondaine and R. Morghen, now outpaced by exploration of the social context and deeper analysis, to see that this most opaque of subjects has advanced. Chronicles and trial reports are now viewed with more sceptical and perceptive eyes; the major movements of secular history, expounded by Duby and Barthélemy, have been brought into play to explain or, better, deconstruct heresy reports; the Peace of God movements and the strange thought-world of Adémar of Chabannes have been recreated; finally, a number of historians have lately turned back to the thesis of Bogomil infiltration as partial explanation of these early outbreaks and made cogent points in its favour. Reading the latest work, I feel like Mr Toad being talked to by Badger in the smoking room – entirely convinced when inside, but somehow not so certain after a lapse of time. I continue to believe that events and emotions in the West provide the major explanations, but have modified my analysis to give scope to fresh theories of Eastern missionizing.

Deconstruction has been a growing theme of heresy research, not only in analysis of the eleventh century. *Inventer l'Hérésie?*, a collection of articles edited by Professor Monique Zerner in 1997, repeatedly asks the question: when is heresy really heresy? Guy Lobrichon, who has successfully redated the letter of Heribert de Périgord from the twelfth to the eleventh century, queries the trial report of the

bishop of Cambrai/Arras as true evidence of heresy in 1025 in a more thoroughgoing fashion than anyone else; Zerner herself demonstrates that Manselli muddled the sources for Henry the Monk, casts doubt on the exact nature of his relationship to Peter of Bruis and makes it likely that Henry was a fiery Donatist preacher of repentance and never at any stage as profound a heretic as Peter; Dr. Iogna-Prat convincingly notes how the MS tradition of transmission of the text of the Arras trial fits into a Cistercian tradition of seeking to master heresy by persuasion; M. Rubellin attempts to put Valdes himself into a new relation to the work and ideals of an orthodox, reforming archbishop.

However far deconstruction may go in the future – and M. G. Pegg's *The Corruption of Angels* is an intriguing example[8] – the fact remains that the faint springs in heretical episodes of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries have turned into great torrents by the early thirteenth century. While some heresy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries may yet be deconstructed, other research has begun to give a little more body to Catharism in Northern Europe, long a mysterious subject, as P. Biller looks again at Cathars in England and at the evidence for a once fertile Catharism in Northern France, and B. Delmaire draws out the implications of sermons denouncing 'Bougres' in Arras and at La Charité sur Loire. G. Rottenwöhrer's fourth volume crowns his encyclopaedic analysis of Cathar sources and doctrines, drawing together the threads of his earlier investigations and demonstrating beyond doubt that the fissiparous nature of Cathar faith and its internal dissensions were realities and not figments of the imagination of inquisitors and hostile polemicists.

English readers are now well served, with accounts of the Albigensian Crusade and Catharism in Languedoc by M. Costen and M. Barber, and an overall survey of my own, designed to supplement and bring up to date A. Borst's *Die Katharer*, still a major source of references and now translated into French. Janet Shirley has translated *The Song of the Cathar Wars* and the Siblys, Pierre des Vaux de Cernay's chronicle, with extensive notes. M. Roquebert's five-volume narrative history of the crusade, its aftermath and the end of Catharism in Languedoc concludes with a moving exposition of the last century of their existence, 1244–1329. In her *Les Femmes Cathares*, Anne Brenon recreates from a pro-Cathar standpoint the day-to-day life of Cathar women, especially towards the end, again in Languedoc. Some novel points may be expected from P. Jiménez-Sanchez's thesis, lately defended, on the development of Cathar doctrine in the University of Toulouse-Mirail.

Italy has been less well served, but now, in addition to synthesizing the valuable but fragmentary work of Italian scholars, Carol Lansing has produced a close investigation of Orvieto. Short articles can be illuminating: B. Hamilton explains convincingly the extraordinary resolution of so many of the Cathar perfect, rank and file as well as leaders, who died bravely. 'They came', he says, 'to fear life more than death.'[9] Similarly, L. Paolini, in his article on Italian Catharism and

8 Below, p. 147; also p. 36, n. 79.
9 B. Hamilton, 'The Cathars and Christian perfection', *SCH* Subsidia XI, pp. 5–23.

written culture, throws a new, clear light on the major Cathar texts discovered by Dondaine.

My Waldensian chapter has undergone more changes than any other. The English reader is again well served. The broad reflections of G. Audisio on Waldensianism, based on his masterly researches into the Waldensian underground, have been translated; Euan Cameron has given an account with full emphasis on the varying doctrines and geographical settings of Waldensian groups from Valdes into the Reformation epoch. Peter Biller's articles, long valued by professionals, are gathered into one volume and completed by his unpublished work on the *Liber Electorum*, a key text for understanding fourteenth-century Waldensianism and its time of troubles.

Pierrette Paravy's two volumes on Catholicism, witchcraft and heresy in Dauphiné, a definitive, Gallic research project covering a multitude of themes within the dioceses of Embrun and Grenoble in the late Middle Ages, has brought the Waldensians of Dauphiné into the light in a work which ranks beside Audisio's *Luberon*. In a series of articles and an edition of sources, Katrin Utz Tremp has clarified the Waldensianism of Fribourg. My earlier version did scant justice to the Waldensianism of the towns and, together with Biller's articles, Utz Tremp's work has enabled me to fill the gap.

I open the revised chapter 8 with Bishop Fournier's interrogation of the Waldensian deacon Raymond de Sainte Foy, because his answers reveal the nub of the Waldensian challenge to the Church. Fournier perceived that in many things the deacon accepted Catholic belief, but all attempts to convert him broke down on his rejection of purgatory – because he could not accept that it had any base in Scripture. Authority in the last resort was Scripture, not the Church; on that the bishop burnt him. Modern researchers rightly stress the degree to which Waldensians were still anchored in medieval Catholicism. They insisted on access to Scripture, in its bare text, but made relatively few challenging inferences from it, in striking contrast to sixteenth-century Protestants; yet Scripture remained the authority.

The study of Wyclif and Lollardy continues apace and is a tribute to the one book that K. B. McFarlane, a master of later medieval English political history, published in his lifetime, a slim but pungent life of Wyclif and his followers – a curious choice for a political historian who was professedly no theologian. He reacted against hagiographic work of the Methodist H. B. Workman, who carefully investigated Wyclif's writings but lacked historical experience: he is belaboured anonymously in the body of the book. McFarlane's work acted like a stone flung into a quiet pool and stimulated waves of research by himself, his pupils and others, the 1990s carrying common judgement on Wyclif, his motivation and the movement he founded farther away from the McFarlane biography.

The nuanced account of Wyclif and Wycliffism in J. Catto's contribution to the history of the University of Oxford, while never explicitly rejecting McFarlane (the evidence is seldom decisive), has quite a different tone. Anne Hudson, her colleagues and pupils have by their editing and analysis of the massive corpus of vernacular Lollard texts revealed the earnest, scholarly tone of so much of their

missionizing, and forced a revision on the potential threat posed by Lollardy. A major work of transcription of Lollard vernacular sermons by Anne Hudson and Pamela Gradon was concluded with the issue of volumes 4 and 5 in 1996. There are now two volumes of perceptive articles by Margaret Aston in print, and N. Tanner, who has put all scholars in his debt by his edition of the Norwich and Kent heresy trials, is, with Shannon McSheffrey, preparing a text with analysis of the Coventry trials. Pertinaciously analyzing Lollard meetings and cells in the light of sociology in her *Gender and Heresy*, McSheffrey concludes that, by and large, women had no more significant role in Lollardy than in ordinary society, a view which can be compared to existing analyses of women in Catharism and Waldensianism.[10] A conference on *Lollardy and the Gentry* grappled with politics, Lollardy and class adherence, and carried work on the Lollard knights a stage further. R. Lutton introduces us to the inner world of the Lollard-influenced Wealden village of Tenterden and the particular character of wills in Lollard-inclined families. D. Plumb's researches have spanned the Reformation age and given an intriguing glimpse of an apparent continuity in one region between Lollardy and seventeenth-century early Protestantism. Lollardy merged into the new Protestantism, but the exact nature of its contribution and the degree to which it influenced opinion remains uncertain.

No one who writes on heresy can leave the inquisition out of account. Bayreuth University has established itself as a centre for the study of heresy, inquisition and witchcraft under the leadership of P. Segl. Papers at a conference published in 1993 wrestled with the problem of the beginnings of inquisitorial proceedings, taking as the criterion that, to be a true inquisitor, the churchman must combine the duties of investigating and judging in one office.[11] Herein, of course, lay both the source of a new efficiency and the open road to arbitrary injustice. The conference also gave publicity to W. Trusen's pioneer work exposing the quirks whereby Innocent's passion for disciplining the higher clergy and speeding investigation and judgement by proceeding *per inquisitionem* led, in other hands, to the development of inquisition against heresy. J. B. Given has used the rich Languedoc material against a background of sociology to establish in detail the reasons for inquisitors' successes. In a too-little known Denis Bethell Memorial Lecture, A. Murray points out how, by the end of the thirteenth century, some friars seconded to inquisitorial duties acted as a force on their own, no longer punishing heresy but procuring gain, abetted by Italian municipalities. The history of the inquisition and heresy diverges.

In a collection entitled *Religious Enthusiasm in the Medieval West* and an article on revivalism as a medieval religious genre, G. Dickson, with good ground, establishes a new subject, drawing sustenance from a close scrutiny of chronicles and the study of modern revivalism and such concepts as the 'burnt-over district'. Revivalism straddled the worlds of heresy and orthodoxy and Dickson's work has been decisive for my expositions on the Amalriciani and Flagellants.

10 Below, p. 292; cf. Cathars, pp. 124–6, Waldensians, 162, 178, 181.
11 Segl, *Die Anfänge der Inquisition*, below, pp. 106–7, 109.

The story of Hussitism has been altered less than any other part of the book. Writing from a pro-Taborite view, T. A. Fudge makes Taboritism more understandable and adds a contribution on Hussite propaganda and a full bibliography. Especially in his comments on Bohemian climate and temperature on the occasions of the alleged Adamite orgies, A. Patschovsky convinces me that these stories are nothing other than slander. The conference proceedings, *Jan Hus. Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*, edited by F. Seibt in 1997, contains a wealth of articles, not least the editor's own reflections, fruit of decades of his own work and reading. In his European articles and the conference he led in Munich, F. Šmahel remains a leading figure in modern Hussite studies in Prague; the German translation of his *Hussite Revolution* is anticipated at the end of 2001.[12]

The end of Marxist governments has liberated scholars from the rigidities of party dogma, and from the thunder of quotations from Marx, Engels and others previously necessary for publication. E. Werner devoted his last book on Jan Hus to a subject from his native Czechoslovakia. M. Erbstösser will be found in the Waldensian chapter elucidating the leading class of laymen in Germany who were intermediaries between masters and their congregations; B. Töpfer has published a definitive work on propertylessness and the concept of the state of innocence. 'Deconstruction' has, in a manner of speaking, taken over from orthodox Marxism: both approaches argue that heretical movements have as their driving force other factors, political or economic, rather than religious.

Experienced historians inevitably come to resemble undertakers: they deal only too often in loss and tragedy and must develop resistance to emotions which would prevent them carrying out their duties. Nowhere is this more true than in the study of heresy. Pleasure at the continual volume of valuable investigation in this field should never cause us to lose sight of the human disasters which lie behind the research. The pioneer of the study of medieval heresy in modern times for the English reader was H. C. Lea, the historian of the inquisition; seriously outdated in many aspects, his three volumes remain the most comprehensive treatment of the subject and may still be used with profit. He wrote with a powerful indignation. He hated the Middle Ages and its Church and he lacked any sympathetic understanding of the persecuting churchmen and their ideals. Yet the reader who, while admiring Lea's detailed scholarship, disagrees with him and his lack of perspective, must still be reminded that the history of medieval heresy is a terrible story – one of persecution of men and women for their religious opinions.[13]

12 *Husitská revoluce*, 2nd edn, I–IV (Prague, 1996); review, F. Seibt, *Bohemia* XL (1999), pp. 529–34.
13 H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (1888); review, J. Dahlberg-Acton, *EHR* III (1888), pp. 773–88; E. Peters, 'Henry Charles Lea 1825–1909', *Medieval Scholarship* I, ed. H. Damico, J. B. Zařadil (1995), pp. 89–99.